AP ES: Allan Savory Responses and Articles:

#### Responses on TED:

#### [Michelle Martin](http://www.ted.com/profiles/1997817)

Aug 9 2013: Allan Savory isn't telling the whole story, which is dangerous. Do your research, and you will find that the information presented here is not the whole side of the story. For starters, what CAUSES desertification--the loss of 30 million acres of trees per year? The need for grassland for LIVESTOCK, as well as livestock feed. The truth is...less meat is still best for the planet.  
  
Check out this critique, which argues that Savory's methods were not always replicated as well as he shows:

<http://www.slate.com/articles/life/food/2013/04/allan_savory_s_ted_talk_is_wrong_and_the_benefits_of_holistic_grazing_have.html>

Also, this peer-reviewed study demonstrates that livestock accounts for 51% of greenhouse gas emissions. <http://www.worldwatch.org/files/pdf/Livestock%20and%20Climate%20Change.pdf>   
  
Could these techniques really counterbalance those kinds of figures? What if we strove to cut down fewer trees for livestock and feed in the first place? Now THAT'S a powerful fight against desertification!  
  
I leave you with some quotes:   
  
In Central America, 40 percent of all the rainforests have been cleared or burned down in the last 40 years, mostly for cattle pasture to feed the export market—often for U.S. beef burgers…. Meat is too expensive for the poor in these beef-exporting countries, yet in some cases cattle have ousted highly productive traditional agriculture.   
—John Revington in World Rainforest Report  
  
The Center for International Forestry Research reports that rapid growth in the sales of Brazilian beef has led to accelerated destruction of the Amazon rainforest. “In a nutshell, cattle ranchers are making mincemeat out of Brazil’s Amazon rainforests,” says the Center’s director-general, David Kaimowitz.   
—Environmental News Service

#### [Stefhan Gordon](http://www.ted.com/profiles/1872152)

Aug 15 2013: I hope you realize that the author of the Slate article James McWilliams is an absolutist vegan who doesn't believe that live stock should be used under any circumstance. Since animals are rotated (managed) between paddocks), the density increase noted as "fact" in that article you linked is a fallacy. The author has made similar mistaken claims in other articles. The fact is land currently used to grow GMO grain crops fed to livestock would be better utilized for grazing especially from an environmental perspective, since the application of herbicides and fungicides even without tillage has been killing the soil microbes that help to sequester carbon. Though McWiliams also advocates for GMO's, and feeding those GMO's to consumers. So again any accounting by McWilliams of the success or failure of Savory's initiatives is editorialized per this author's absolutist perspective.

#### [Jaime Hope](http://www.ted.com/profiles/877362)

Aug 22 2013: Thanks Mr Gordon for making this clear. I may add that Veganism is not a solution, as lack of meat in diet accounts for a lot of diseases that are only being studied. Assuming that Savoury calls for deforestation for livestock growing is wrong and deceitful, as he shows how to recover already desert areas in which there s no hope for any other type of economy; and there s work in several places in which trees and livestock live together. On the other hand, soybean, the heart of a vegan diet-, can bare no sunlight competition whatsoever, and machinery for harvesting cannot dribble through trees. Same with most of vegetable growing farms. I think we should all be constructive in acknowledging new findings, improving them and realizing that unlimited rent (from privates in chase of wealth, and from public in ever increasing taxation and debt, for which unlimited private wealth is a main source) is what will really finish our days in earth a species.

#### [Kyle Schmidt](http://www.ted.com/profiles/2027869)

Aug 25 2013: 1) The peer reviewed study you cite includes cattle that eat grain. Cattle shouldn't be eating grain, they should be eating grass. The study also does not account for the carbon-negative effects of well establish grasslands when calculating the carbon impact of grass fed cattle.  
  
2) The quotes you cite from Revington and ENS only serve to support Savory's methods. Again, rain forests are destroyed to plant the grain crops that are used to feed cattle in CAFOs. They're not destroyed to allow cattle to roam freely over lush grasslands. If we take Savory's approach, we'll no longer be feeding grain to cattle, and they will be flourishing on land that is currently dead and carbon-positive, thereby reinvigorating said land and making it carbon-negative. There will be no need to destroy forests.  
  
The flaw in your logic is that you're relying on current cattle management practices to argue against a method that bears absolutely no resemblance to the current regime.   
  
The simple fact is that grain, legumes, and tubers are destroying the planet. The only way they can be produced is by altering the earth's natural ecosystem. Instead, we should be working to reverse the destruction we've created since the beginning of the neolithic era and restore the earth's natural grasslands using Savory's methods as a catalyst.

<http://www.worldwatch.org/files/pdf/Livestock%20and%20Climate%20Change.pdf>