

Re: The True Cost Of Meat

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.med.nutrition/2004-08/0993.html>

From: pearl (tea_at_signguestbook.ie)

Date: 08/15/04

Date: Sun, 15 Aug 2004 23:55:16 +0100

"Psalm 110" <MOONIES@SwiftVets.NK> wrote in message
news:r2bvH0h65uovvj26ttfrs8lm8ssn14209u@4ax.com...
> On Sun, 15 Aug 2004 16:54:11 GMT, "George Conklin"
> <nilknoc@earthlink.net> wrote:
>
>>
>> "pearl" <tea@signguestbook.ie> wrote in message
>> >news:cfnhvp\$35c\$1@kermi.esat.net...
>>>
>>> I disagree with the author's stance on eating fish and chicken,
>>> but otherwise a very interesting and informative article;
>>>
>>> <http://www.newscientist.com/opinion/opinterview.jsp?id=ns24601>
>>>
>>>
>> All this is very old, old news. If you feed an animal grain, you get back
>> 9%–15% in food. Chickens are the worst. Pigs are 15%.
>>
>> And then of course is the water, since animals need a lot of it.
>> However, as Atkins points out, we evolved to eat meat, not pasta.
>>
> Conversion ratio of feed to live animal weight is about 2:1 for fish,
> 3.7:1 for chickens/rabbits small animals, 4:1 for pigs, up to 10:1 for
> cattle.
>
> Cattle however eat a large portion of their food as (indigestible to
> humans) range and pasteur grasses, hay and silage. They are loaded up
> in the last few months with grains.

. Worldwide, grasses of more than 10,000 species once covered more than 1/4 of the land. They supported the world's greatest masses of large animals. Of the major ecotypes, grassland produces the deepest, most fertile topsoil and has the most resistance to soil erosion. Livestock production has damaged the Earth's grassland more than has any other land use, and has transformed

sci.med.nutrition: Re: The True Cost Of Meat

roughly half of it to desertlike condition. Lester Brown of the Worldwatch Institute reports that "Widespread grassland degradation [from livestock grazing] can now