

THE WORLD PEACE DIET Mastery Training Program



“Imagine the world we can create...”

with DR. WILL TUTTLE,
author, The World Peace Diet



Supplemental Readings

Module 3 – Awakening Our Capacities to Know and to Serve

Three articles on Heifer International

<http://www.vermontcynic.com/heifers-health-and-omnivorous-insolence-1.2426100>

Heifers, health and omnivorous insolence

by Josh Macgregor

Published: Thursday, December 9, 2010

"If you give a man a fish, you have fed him for a day. But teach a man to fish, and you have fed him for a lifetime."

These are the confusing words that affront a reader upon visiting the mission page of Heifer International's gut-wrenching website, and not coincidentally my column this week.

Rife with images of happy calves, global maps and smiling third-world children, this nonprofit charity organization has established itself in the public eye as dedicated to compassion: ending poverty and global hunger one calf, kid, camel, pig or lamb at a time.

Clicking the ubiquitous red "GIVE" icon transports shoppers to a page where they may choose to pay in full or contribute in part to the purchase of farm animals; the idea being that by "donating an animal" you, the giver, are securing a family's physical and financial well-being indefinitely.

While Heifer International may seem sound on the surface, the organization's approach to ending hunger is not quite as warm and fuzzy as the fluffy little animals depicted in their glossy handouts and incessant pop up advertisements.

Certainly in principle, tending to world hunger is no less than admirable, but the means whereby this end is executed are seriously flawed.

In promoting animal-based agriculture as a solution to world hunger, Heifer International is ultimately promoting something else: namely some serious misconceptions about the causes of hunger to begin with. Misconceptions that, left uncorrected, only perpetuate the issue.

Why are these families being taught how to raise livestock on ill-equipped farms, how to grow food and allot resources for animals when they're already starving? Because meat and animal products are essential to western, industrialized diets and economies.

The organization does offer tree and seed donation options but the emphasis is clearly on giving the gift of life; that is, an animal's life.

Every time someone pays the \$500 to donate Clarabelle Cow to a starving family, they are projecting western standards of animal objectification and a costly meat and dairy based diet onto the third-world poor.

Humanity, despite common belief, does not need meat or dairy to survive; Americans and Europeans do.

Salad is an appetizer, a prelude to a rack of lamb. Onions, tomatoes, cucumbers, pickles: garnishes for a bacon cheeseburger. Likewise, trends in agriculture have swayed toward feeding livestock. Vegetation, it seems, is only as valuable as the steak it's feeding in the public eye.

Why are we not instead helping families raise cheaper, far more efficient crops like potatoes or carrots?

When we recognize that these gifts are about the survival of these families, there is no other explanation for these gross oversights other than the deliberate projection of a western diet onto third-world families.

Meat is a lot of things. You don't have to agree with me that it's murder, but one thing it's definitely not is the solution to world hunger.

With exorbitant amounts of resources being poured into animal agriculture every year, the meat and dairy industry is a catalyst to world hunger, not a means of resolution.

[Comment on above article by Jim Corcoran:](#)

Heifer International (HI) is an organization that claims to work against world hunger by donating animals to families in developing countries. Its catalog deceptively portrays beautiful children holding cute animals in seemingly humane circumstances. The marketing brochure for HI does not show the animals being transported, their living and slaughter conditions, or the erosion, pollution and water use caused by the introduction of these animals and their offspring.

By definition, animals raised for food are exploited in a variety of ways. The animals shipped to developing countries are often subject to; water and food shortages, cruel procedures without painkillers, lack of veterinary care resulting in extended suffering as a result of illness or injury.

A large percentage of the families receiving animals from HI are struggling to provide for themselves and cannot ensure adequate living conditions, nutrition, and medical care for animals they have been given. HI provides some initial veterinary training to individuals and the initial vaccines. But, long term care for these animals and their offspring is up to the individuals.

To make matters worse, animal agriculture causes much more harm to the environment than plant-based agriculture. The fragile land in many of the regions HI is sending the animals cannot support animal agriculture. Although they say they encourage cut and carry feeding of the animals to avoid erosion, the reality is often quite different.

The consumption of animal products has been shown in reputable studies to contribute significantly to life-threatening diseases such as heart disease, stroke, diabetes, and a variety of cancers. Regions that have adopted a diet with more animal products see an increase in these diseases. The remote communities supposedly served by HI have no way of dealing with the health consequences of joining the high-cholesterol world.

While it may seem humane and sustainable to provide just one or two dairy cows here or there, the long term consequences are an increased desire for animal products in local cultures leading to an increase in production. These communities may be able to absorb the additional water use of one or two cows, what happens when there are hundreds or thousands of dairy cows, each consuming 27 to 50 gallons of fresh water and producing tons of excrement? The heavy cost to animals, the environment and local economies is not figured into HI's business practices.

.....

<http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/andrew-tyler-dont-follow-the-herd-and-give-a-cow-for-christmas-426054.html>

Andrew Tyler: Don't follow the herd and give a cow for Christmas

These gifts are not a good thing. They serve only to increase, not diminish, poverty

Monday, 27 November 2006

We're about to enter the season of gut-busting excess, when the tills don't stop ringing and our appetites for giving and receiving get well and truly sated. Just in time, another gift idea has come along that is not about self-indulgence but doing good in the world; or so it would seem.

Paying for farm animals to be gifted to impoverished communities in the developing world, notably Africa, has moved from novelty to omnipresent fashion. The aid agencies Oxfam and Christian Aid made the early running. But this year about a dozen agencies are using your money to punt [goats](#), chickens, sheep, camels, donkeys, pigs and cows to the world's starving. Prices vary : £70 will get you a cow from Help The Aged, whereas Send A Cow demands £750 per animal. Farm Friends wants £30 for a goat, while World Vision will settle for £91 for a whole herd.

The marketing strategy is resolutely upbeat. "Socks? A CD?," asks Farm Friend, "The search for a genuinely memorable present is over." The cow on Help the Aged's leaflet, meanwhile, is

garbed in a Santa hat to distinguish the agency's effort from the rest of the herd.

The message might bring comfort to the target audience, but such schemes, sadly, are not a good thing. They serve only to increase not diminish poverty. Why? Because farming animals is an inefficient, expensive and environmentally destructive way of producing food. All farmed animals require proper nourishment, large quantities of water, shelter from extremes of [weather](#) and veterinary care. Such resources are in critically short supply in much of Africa. In fact, the wide variation in prices asked by the donor agencies testifies to this reality: arguments have broken out between Send A Cow on the one hand and Christian Aid and Oxfam on the other, as to the "quality" of the animal delivered and whether the many supplementary costs are covered in the asking price.

Sceptical readers might, at this point, accuse me of dressing up a concern about animal welfare as a concern for the world's poor. Let's be clear that there are major animal welfare issues involved in sending animals to, for instance, the Horn of Africa where, earlier this year, up to 80 per cent of cattle perished in a drought and many of the remainder were washed away in the [floods](#) that followed. But this is not about cows taking precedence over people.

The reality is that animal gift schemes are, in the words of the conservation charity World Land Trust (WLT), "environmentally unsound and economically disastrous". In a statement last week, WLT declared: "Now that the grave consequences of introducing large numbers of goats and other domestic animals into fragile, arid environments is well documented, WLT considers it grossly irresponsible ... to continue with the schemes ... as a means of raising quick money for charities over the Christmas season".

It is incontestable that desertification and further human impoverishment will follow the introduction of goats into already degraded areas. But if goats are environmentally disastrous, cows are extraordinarily burdensome economically. A newly lactating animal requires up to 90 litres of water a day, a lot of food and veterinary treatment to cover endemic problems such as scours, mastitis and lameness.

But where do the vets come from? EU dairy farmers receive \$2 a day per cow to remain financially viable. For many years, British sheep farmers have received more than 40 per cent of their income from the taxpayer. If such feather-bedding is needed in the comparatively benign [agricultural](#) environment of the West, how can we expect the poorest people on earth to cope with their animal "gifts"? It is many times more efficient to use the available agricultural resources - land, labour, water - to feed people direct, rather than devoting those resources to fattening animals.

Some donor agencies try to confront the inherent inefficiencies of animal farming by setting up "zero-grazing" regimes. In other words, the animals get permanently banded up in sheds. But they still need water and food - and, in such deprived environments, suffer high levels of economically punishing disease, early [infertility](#) and premature death.

Ultimately, my objection is to the commercial forces that are seeking to persuade people of the poor world that their best [nutritional](#)

interests are served by buying into modern, high-throughput farmed animal production processes. With that comes an addiction to high capital input systems, additional stresses on precious water supplies, environmental destruction, a loss of control over the means of production, bad health, a

nightmare animal welfare scenario and more human poverty and malnourishment.

So this year, boycott the donate-an-animal schemes and instead support projects that help people, animals and the environment. Animal Aid, for example, will be seeking support for a scheme to plant 2,000 trees in Kenya's Rift Valley province. They will bear oranges, avocados, mango, pawpaw, kei apple and macadamia nuts. Such efforts won't erase the blight of poverty in Africa, but neither will they add to it.

The writer is director of Animal Aid.

.....
http://www.animalperson.net/animal_person/2006/12/on_heifer_intl.html

On Heifer Int'l and People Who Aren't Thinking

You may find this hard to believe, but someone bought my mother a llama for a family in Bolivia for Christmas through Heifer International. That's not the unbelievable part. The utterly-unfathomable part is that she told me about it. I immediately, said, "I'm sorry; some people just aren't thinking," to which she replied, "What are you talking about? I thought it was a lovely idea!"

I didn't think I'd actually have to do this, but . . .

Let's deconstruct:

- Heifer International is in the business, directly and not, of breeding animals for human use and consumption. It encourages animal-based diets and agriculture.
- We should be encouraging plant-based agriculture and teaching people how to grow food, not how to subjugate, exploit, and kill animals.
- The animals must be shipped to their destinations, and I would bet my net worth that many don't arrive alive, don't arrive at all because some warlord at some checkpoint absconded with them, or arrive ill. And where, pray tell, is the town veterinarian? Is there one? If there isn't Heifer will train local people as "para-vets." Maybe I'll become a para-vet and dole out veterinary care in my neighborhood. Let's see how well that goes over with the moms and dad of the pampered pooches and kitties of suburban Palm Beach County.
- The catalogue and website bring to your attention the kinds of terrible conditions many animals can exist in. They practically tell you that it's okay if they're not comfortable.
- My mother's llama will give milk to children, she says. I'd like to see that--the llama *giving* milk to the children. Are they sucking on the llama's nipple? Maybe. But no matter how the kids get the milk, it is taken, not given. And what do you think happens when she isn't producing any more milk? She gets retired to a local sanctuary to live out her life in peace, right?
- If we are trying to be environmentally responsible, we wouldn't ship animals that weigh hundreds of pounds around the world.

All of the warm and fuzzy photos with children and animals belie the exploitation and abuse of the animals that is intrinsic to the program. Here are the two lines that say it all:

[It's the sustainable use and management of natural resources, accomplished by using social, cultural, economic, political and ecological methods that work together to achieve sustainable agriculture production.](#)

[That means everything is working together to help save the environment – a healing touch for our](#)

[planet that helps reduce our environmental footprint, the impact each one of us makes.](#)

No, it doesn't mean that everything is working together. It means that people are doing what is in their best interests in a way that makes them feel better. The animals aren't "working together" with us. They are created, shipped, and unloaded, to spend their lives in servitude and ultimately be slaughtered. And, as we all have been told many times, the best way to reduce your environmental footprint is to adopt a plant-based diet. Period. It's an insult to my intelligence to call this program "healing."

Heifer Int'l in no way reduces my environmental footprint. In fact, it makes it larger because the animals take resources to breed and raise, and then much more energy to ship to their destinations (and then yet more to keep alive so they can continue to do their jobs). Teaching the people organic, sustainable farming of indigenous foods would reduce our environmental impact, and theirs, as well as end their hunger. And it would help spread the most important ecological ethic: that animals aren't ours. And as far as poverty is concerned, [microloans](#) are probably the most effective, powerful vehicle. Look into [microenterprise](#) if you want to end poverty.