

ON HUNGER

ON HUNGER

Science, Ethics and Law

Laura Westra



BrownWalker Press
Irvine • Boca Raton

On Hunger: Science, Ethics and Law

Copyright © 2017 Laura Westra

All rights reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording, or by any information storage and retrieval system, without written permission from the publisher.

Universal Publishers, Inc,
Irvine • Boca Raton
USA • 2017
www.universal-publishers.com

978-1-62734-682-5 (pbk.)

978-1-62734-683-2 (ebk.)

978-1-62734-684-9 (hbk.)

Cover image: *Spraymen* by Caoimhghin Ó Croidheáin
(www.gaelart.net)

Typeset by Medlar Publishing Solutions Pvt Ltd, India

Publisher's Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Westra, Laura.

Title: On hunger: Science, Ethics and Law/Laura Westra.

Description: Irvine, CA: Brown Walker, 2017. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2017942176 | ISBN 978-1-62734-682-5 (pbk.)

| ISBN 978-1-62734-684-9 (hardcover) | ISBN 978-1-62734-683-2 (ebook)

Subjects: LCSH: Food Supply. | Public Health. | Agricultural industries. | Food industry and trade. | Genetically modified foods. | BISAC:

SOCIAL SCIENCE/Agriculture & Food. | MEDICAL/Public Health.

| BUSINESS & ECONOMICS/ Industries/Agribusiness.

| BUSINESS & ECONOMICS/ Industries/Food Industry.

Classification: LCC TX353 .W47 2017 (print)

| LCC TX353 (ebook) | DDC 363.8--dc23.

To

*Papa Francesco
The Club of Rome
and
Herman Daly*

Worthy nominees for the Nobel Peace Prize

CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-------------|
| <i>Acknowledgments</i> | <i>xi</i> |
| <i>Introduction</i> | <i>xiii</i> |
| 1 International Law and Accountability for Hunger and Survival | 1 |
| 1.1 Introduction: The Right to Health and the Right to Food | 1 |
| 1.2 Food Safety and Health | 6 |
| 1.2.1 Corporate Agribusiness and Health in North America | 7 |
| 1.3 Agribusiness and Health Controls and the Promotion of Inappropriate Diets | 12 |
| 1.3.1 The Problems of Food Testing for Safety: The European Approach | 15 |
| 1.4 The Right to Food and to Health and the Commercialization of Genetically Modified Organisms | 18 |
| 1.4.1 Genetically Modified Organisms in the Environment | 21 |
| 1.4.2 Monsanto Breaks the Law, or Makes the Law? | 23 |
| 1.4.3 Canadian Law and Related Jurisprudence: From Regulatory Offences to Crimes | 28 |
| 1.4.4 Agrochemical Pesticides, Larvicides and the 2016 Zika Epidemic | 34 |
| 1.5 Concluding Thoughts | 37 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 2 | Food, Water and Climate Change | 39 |
| 2.1 | Introduction | 39 |
| 2.2 | Diet Choices, Weather Changes and the Responsibility of Governments: Walkerton, Ontario | 42 |
| 2.2.1 | Diet Choices, Preferences, and Megafarms | 47 |
| 2.3 | Climate Change and Food Deprivation | 50 |
| 2.3.1 | The FAO Report on Hunger and Climate Change | 53 |
| 2.3.2 | Two Major Issues that Need Added Emphasis | 55 |
| 2.4 | Climate Change and State Responsibility: The Cases | 57 |
| 2.5 | Climate Change and Another Arctic Case: Kivalina | 63 |
| 2.5.1 | Water as Danger and the Negative Consequences of Climate Change | 65 |
| 2.5.2 | The Kivalina Complaint and “Civil Conspiracy Allegations” | 67 |
| 2.6 | <i>Connecticut et al. v. American Electric Power Company et al.</i> : The Right to Safe Environmental Conditions and Water (State Responsibility) | 72 |
| 2.6.1 | The Public Trust Doctrine and Mary Christina Wood’s Nature Trust | 78 |
| 3 | Globalization and North/South Conflicts: The Impact of Racial Discrimination on Hunger | 83 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 83 |
| 3.2 | “Let Them Eat Junk”? | 85 |
| 3.2.1 | Hunger, Discrimination and State Responsibility | 88 |
| 3.3 | The “Bottom Billion” and Hunger | 91 |
| 3.3.1 | Obligations to Future Generations in the Law: The Proposal of Edith Brown-Weiss | 94 |
| 3.3.2 | Justice and Ecojustice: Rationality in Natural Law | 97 |
| 3.4 | Dynamic Cosmopolitanism and <i>Lex Lata</i> for Future Generations | 102 |
| 3.4.1 | An Aside on the Limits of the United Nations and the Security Council | 104 |
| 3.4.2 | Vulnerable People and Future Generations: A Question of Justice | 107 |
| 3.4.3 | Racism and Discrimination: “The Colonial Present” | 110 |
| 3.5 | Summing Up: The Right to Food and Accountability | 112 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 4 | The Many Facets of Food | 117 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 117 |
| 4.2 | Hunger and Its Hazards for the First Generation | 120 |
| 4.2.1 | First Nations of Canada and Methyl-Mercury Exposures: The Grassy Narrows and White Dog Reserves of Northern Ontario | 124 |
| 4.3 | The UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage | 129 |
| 4.3.1 | The Significance of <i>Sparrow v. The Queen</i> | 133 |
| 4.3.2 | The Protection of Indigenous Culture “Safeguarding the Intangible Cultural Heritage” | 137 |
| 4.3.3 | Oral History and Tradition and its Role in Proving Aboriginal Rights or Title | 140 |
| 4.4 | The Many Facets and Meanings of Food | 142 |
| 4.4.1 | Food as Meaningful for Indigenous Communities | 147 |
| 4.4.2 | Food as a Symptom of Environmental Health and Sustainability | 149 |
| 5 | Corporate Control of Food and Water: Legality or Corruption? | 151 |
| 5.1 | Introduction: The Right to Water and the Right to Profit in Conflict: The Flint Water Crisis | 151 |
| 5.2 | Illegal Enrichment and the Quest/Acceptance of Economic and Other Benefits as Corruption | 154 |
| 5.2.1 | The Genesis and Development of Anti-Corruption International Law | 158 |
| 5.2.2 | Corporate Attacks on the Right to Life: Corruption in Policy Making | 161 |
| 5.2.3 | The Corporation and the State: An Alliance Against True Democracy | 164 |
| 5.3 | Understanding Corruption in Relation to Human Rights | 166 |
| 5.4 | Supreme Court of the United States: <i>Citizens United v. Federal Election Commission</i> | 170 |
| 5.5 | Corruption and Human Rights: Food, Water, and Health | 174 |
| 5.5.1 | A Brief Overview of the Constitutional Protection Available for the Environment in Colombia and Ecuador | 181 |
| 5.6 | Understanding the Insidious Role of Corruption | 184 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 6 | Toward the Elimination of Hunger in All Its Aspects | 191 |
| 6.1 | Introduction | 191 |
| 6.2 | Global Health Law and Food | 192 |
| 6.3 | States' Obligations and Nature's Trust | 197 |
| 6.4 | "Trusteeship for the Global Commons" | 200 |
| 6.5 | The Commons and the "Ecology of Law" | 203 |
| 6.5.1 | The Commons and Legal Institutions | 206 |
| 6.6 | Ecological Governance and Resilience | 210 |
| 6.6.1 | The Biological/Ecological Integrity Approach | 213 |
| 6.7 | War, Famine, and Disasters: The Reach of Present Immunity | 217 |
| 6.7.1 | Concluding Thought: A Spark at the End of the Tunnel? | 221 |
| | <i>Bibliography</i> | 229 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 249 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

In some way, all the members of my group deserve thanks because I learned so much, over the years, from their varied expertise. But I am particularly grateful to Kathleen Elizabeth Mahoney for her suggestions regarding some aspects of Indigenous peoples' rights, and to Richard Westra for his help with the difficult issue of corruption. Both helped me to shape my own arguments, as did the suggestions and the advice of Tullio Scovazzi. Finally, thanks to Luc Quenneville of the University of Windsor, whose technical work supported the completion of this book in a timely manner.

INTRODUCTION

In 1992 a group was formed after the annual meeting of the Great Lakes Association, including ecologists, environmentalists, and one associate professor from the philosophy department of the University of Windsor. The result was, eventually, the formation of an exploratory grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), to discuss and research the meaning of ecological integrity, the basic concept in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. This grant was followed by several others that lasted as long as I was employed by that university, until my retirement in 1999. Through these grants I was able to initiate the yearly meetings of what was eventually called the Global Ecological Integrity Group: I was able to support several students' research and invite many well-established scientists to attend. The group no longer has any institutional support, but it now numbers a couple of hundred members, and a core group plus some new additions continues to meet yearly at various European locations or in Canada.

It soon became clear that there was a clear link between ecological integrity and the most basic human rights, the right to life, to food, to water, and the right to health. Some of these undeniable connections appeared to be indirect, even somewhat remote. But the right to be free from hunger, especially the Hunger that is engendered by the same substances that create the worst cases of disintegrity and pollution in the Great Lakes and that I will define as the production of food that is neither safe nor nutritious, requires the presence of integrity and the control of the industries

that produce those substances. The recovery of the Great Lakes, according to the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (rat. 1988), requires the ecosystem approach to reach ecological integrity:

The purpose of the parties is to restore and maintain the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the waters of the Great Lakes Basin ecosystem, where the latter is defined as the interacting components of air, land, water and living organisms, including humans within the drainage basin of the St. Lawrence River.¹

I have argued this point from various aspects of the problem, especially from the global point of view, necessary today given the ubiquitous presence of chemical industries, their power and their spread through globalization. As well, it is clear that nothing harms us as deeply and fully as whatever penetrates our body, such as food. The First Nations in the Great Lakes area suffer from polluted air and water as well as food. The rest of the local population is equally affected. Thus I believe that a thorough discussion of both hunger (as deprivation of available food) and Hunger (as harmful, inquinated food) and public health is indicated.

This work is intended to explore all the aspects of the problem, from food availability to its quality, its production and distribution, and the problems that arise in that regard. The first chapter raises the question why is agribusiness not held accountable or even controlled, as our health is on the line (while globally the production required is not increased)? Canada follows the approach of the US, where all the chemical products and processes now involved in the production of food, are tested in-house by those who manufacture the products and initiate the processes involved. The argument is that they know their own products best, and that is indeed the case: but their knowledge of and commitment to public health is not at the same level.

Chapter 2 discusses the impact of climate change on both food and water, as it also reiterates the complicit role of the media, which emerged in Chapter 1, influencing diet choices as it does, and the economic pressure on the part of agribusiness on both media and the controlling agencies.

¹Regier, H. *et al.*, 1990, "Integrity and Surprise in the Great Lakes Basin Ecosystem," in *An Ecosystem Approach to the Integrity of the Great Lakes in Turbulent Times*, Great Lakes Commission, Ann Arbor, MI: 17–36.

The state, we note, appears to abdicate its responsibility for both change itself, and for the multiple consequences that ensue. In Chapter 3 another question is raised: is there a racist component in the way agribusiness functions? Why are obligations to future generations not respected? Hunger of all kinds strikes the most vulnerable, the poor in developed countries, and those in the third world, thus global justice and ecojustice coincide in both their intragenerational and intergenerational aspects, but both are ignored.

But food is more than nourishment for the body as it possesses other significant aspects, as it connects to people's traditions and beliefs and even religious practices, as we argue in Chapter 4. The latter aspect is particularly significant for Indigenous peoples, and it is recognized legally in Canadian constitutional law and also acknowledged in international law, in the 2003 UNESCO Convention on the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage. Thus many other important rights are involved in the right to be free from hunger, many of these enshrined in international legal documents.

Chapter 5 returns to the corporate control of food as we raise the question of the legality of financial contributions on the part of agribusiness to political figures and campaigns, as well as its intrusion into the drafting of bills and regulatory regimes. Corruption is considered to be a serious international crime, and the line between legality and illegality appears to be more than unclear in this regard as commercial interests appear to prevail, especially but not exclusively in North America. In addition, even the EU is increasingly under attack from agribusiness, which remains singularly free from condemnation and punishment. However, several environmental groups located primarily in Germany and Austria, but also in other European countries, have been fighting against carcinogenic pesticides (such as glyphosate) and the flawed European Union approval procedures. This is indeed a case of corruption on a grand scale, given the number affected by agricultural products in the world.

Finally, in Chapter 6 we consider other approaches about the grave questions we have exposed in this work. Many others have recently discussed the question of how to effect radical change in governance, in order to give ecological concerns the primacy they deserve. The first thing to note in that respect is that most of these authors do not address the issue of hunger directly although, given that ecologically based governance is the essential prerequisite for any possible solution to the problems we face, at least indirectly their work remains quite relevant.

At least one author, however, discusses hunger in relation to public health, and this supports my suggestions that the World Health Organization (WHO) should take a leading role in addressing hunger, and in the revision of present forms of governance in general. A particularly interesting development that offers some hope for a change for the better is the September 2016 “expansion” of the remit of the International Criminal Court to include environmental crimes. It is too early to anticipate whether that move will effect a substantive change in the way agribusiness operates and the way it pursues its own interests with no respect for the right to life, to health and to the survival of human beings. Yet, given the present oppressive system that prevails with very few exceptions, even the presence of a new possibility—that of a more inclusive legal regime—is cause for rejoicing.

CHAPTER ONE

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND ACCOUNTABILITY FOR HUNGER AND SURVIVAL

1.1 Introduction: The Right to Health and the Right to Food

Anyone dying from hunger was dying from murder.¹

Jean Ziegler's report on the right to food² states that hunger and chronic malnutrition contribute to disease and premature death thus showing clearly the connection between the right to food and that to health. In fact, the right to health forged ahead in law, while the right to food was limited to the references in the 1966 covenants,³ and the few declarations and reports that exist, none of which are binding, although the position of the two Covenants is somewhat more solid.

According to international law as well as domestic instruments everyone has a right to life, which clearly must include the right to the means thereof: minimally food and water.⁴ The question remains, however, even if we establish this human right, who or what has the corresponding

¹Ziegler, J., 2002, *Report of the Special Rapporteur of the Commission on Human Rights on the Right to Food*, document A/57/356, United Nations, New York.

²*Ibid.*

³International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 6 ILM (1966) 368, in force March 23, 1976; International Covenant on Economic Social and Cultural Rights 6 ILM (1966) 360, in force January 3, 1976.

⁴De Schutter, O., 2014, *Final Report: The Transformative Potential of the Right to Food*, UN Doc. GE.14-10537, Human Rights Council 25th session; FAO, 2013, *The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2013: The Multiple Dimensions of Food Security*, FAO, Rome.

2 On Hunger

obligation to ensure that such right is respected. In general, the right to life for a country's citizens is the responsibility of the corresponding state: "Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and of his family, including food, clothing, housing and medical care and necessary social services ..."⁵

Article 11 of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) "recognizes the fundamental right of everyone to be free from hunger," but stops short of imposing specific measures the "parties" must take in order to enable people to enjoy this basic right. However, the right to water (or to be free from thirst) is not explicitly listed, despite the even more basic necessity it indicates.

More complex and explicit is General Comment 12, which outlines the components of the right to food: "availability, stability, accessibility, sustainability, and adequacy."⁶ The comment addresses clearly and explicitly the obligations that states assume in regard to assuring food for their citizens, understood as the "progressive realization" of that right. To protect people from hunger and to fully realize that right, the state may employ a number of measures, "legislative, administrative, economic, financial, educational and social" and the resources allocated may not be "diverted to other areas."⁷

Moreover, the progression toward the actualization of the citizens' rights is also governed by the "principle of non-retrogression," although the progressive pace of the actualization of the right is not clearly specified. The "progression" must be governed by non-discrimination and by the obligation "to regulate the activities of third parties in order to ensure that they do not interfere with the exercise of the right to food of any sector of the population."⁸ The state obligation also includes cooperation with other states, and providing international assistance. Further, the relation between the right to food and other basic rights is explicitly listed: the right to water, to property, to health, to work and fair remuneration.

Craig Scott proposes a "partial fusion of the international Covenants on human rights," based upon the "interdependence of human rights norms,"⁹

⁵Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 1948, art. 25(1).

⁶FAO, 2013: 5.

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸*Ibid.*: 6.

⁹Scott, C., 1989, "The Interdependence and Permeability of Human Rights Norms: Towards a Partial Fusion of the International Covenants on Human Rights," *Osgoode Hall Law Journal*, 27(4): 769–878, here 771.

although the concept of the “interdependence of human rights” has grown in importance from its formal origins in the GA resolution that addresses that topic.¹⁰ The main issue would be, as Scott argues, the “permeability” of one covenant to the other. Scott clarifies:

The idea of permeability is put forward as one means of giving practical, legal effect to the abstract doctrine of interdependence ... By permeability I mean, in broad outline, the openness of a treaty dealing with one category of human rights to having its norms used as vehicles for the direct-or indirect protection of norms dealing with a different category of human rights.¹¹

This effect would be particularly significant if the norms of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), could permeate those of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR). In that case, social, economic and cultural rights “would be subjected to the supervisory jurisdiction of the ICCPR’s Human Rights Committee”¹² and—in general—they would be considered to share the same gravity as the ICCPR’s norms. Valentina Vadi in her discussion of public health, says “The traditional distinction between civil and political rights and economic, social and cultural rights was also based on the assumption that while the first category of rights was susceptible to immediate realization, the second was deemed to be only of gradual implementation.”¹³ The weakness of the CESCR in respect to implementation is also noted by Lawrence Gostin.¹⁴ General Comment 14 on the Rights to the Highest Attainable Standard of Health is less than precise regarding what this standard should include, although it offers the most definitive interpretation of the right to health.¹⁵ Its key principles and “interrelated and essential elements” help to define health. The latter include “health care, public

¹⁰UNGA, “Indivisibility and Interdependence of Economic Social and Cultural, Civil and Political Rights,” RES. 41/117 of December 4, 1986.

¹¹Scott, 1989: 771.

¹²*Ibid.*

¹³Vadi, V., 2013, *Public Health in International Investment Law and Arbitration*, Routledge, Abingdon: 27.

¹⁴Gostin, L.O., 2014, *Global Health Law*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA: 20–21.

¹⁵ICESCR, General Comment No.14; UN Economic and Social Council [ECOSOC] Commission on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, Substantive Issues arising in the Implementation of the International Covenant of Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, para. 15, UN Doc E/C12/2000/4 (General comments) August 11, 2000 (hereinafter General Comment 14).

4 On Hunger

health and the underlying determinants of health”;¹⁶ and the key principles state that health services must be: “(1) available in sufficient quantity; (2) accessible to everyone without discrimination, including being affordable and geographically accessible; (3) acceptable, including ethically, culturally and with respect to privacy ... and (4) of good quality and scientifically appropriate.”¹⁷

However, what is addressed by Gostin is the definition of health services, not the presence or support of health itself. Health services, at best, should be available to everyone, by rights, after their health has been compromised. Yet what concerns us here is the maintenance and protection of health itself, and the elimination of the harms that threaten health in multiple ways. These attacks arise not only from the lack of food, but also from the harmful food available in abundance, and these attacks take place before health services are required. Hence this aspect of food availability, that is, its safety, ought to be our first concern, as we show the interface between the right to food and the right to health.

At any rate, the right to health is based on the right to life and so is the right to food, without which life is not possible. The right to food has been litigated in the courts in both India and South Africa, where it is explicitly connected to the right to housing, water and sanitation.¹⁸

The presence of these rights in the language of the covenants is on one aspect of the connection between the right to health and the rights set out in other documents that give one hope for better controls for safety, at least in principle, such as the many World Health Organization (WHO) reports that confirm the link between food and health. A fairly recent example, among many, is the 2007 report on the connection between nutrition and the prevention of obesity,¹⁹ although the target audience in this case is clearly the population of affluent western countries primarily.

The presence of legal mechanisms for the protection of the public which exist in support of the right to health from antiquity, give one hope regarding the connection between the right to health and the right to food. Vadi explains: “Quarantine, the compulsory isolation to contain the spread of

¹⁶*Ibid.*, para. 12.

¹⁷Gostin, 2014: 259.

¹⁸See *People's Union of Civil Liberties (PUCL) v. Union of India*, Writ Petition (Civil) No.196 of 2001 (Supreme Court of India) Supreme Court Order November 28, 2001; *Government of the Republic of South Africa and Orsi*, CCT 39/09, Constitutional Court of South Africa, October 8, 2009.

¹⁹WHO, 2007, *Nutrition, Physical Activity and the Prevention of Obesity Policy: Developments in the WHO European Region*, WHO Regional Office for Europe, Copenhagen.

disease, represents one of the most ancient regulations concerning public health.”²⁰

We tend to recoil from accepting the isolation of lepers today, although it existed from biblical times through the Middle Ages, although it is once more present today especially during and after the Ebola outbreak of 2013.²¹ Yet, if we consider the principle that guides restraint and the imposition of isolation, we can acknowledge a useful possible tool to be used in future regimes in order to reduce or eliminate public harm. Solid scientific evidence exists against the use of pesticides, fungicides, and numerous pharmaceutical and medical food additives, as we shall see. Hence the time for proposing precaution is long past, as the evidence is clear and compelling, based on the work of highly credible sources such as the WHO, as Lisa Heinzerling suggests.²²

Thus it would seem that there are grounds for the legal imposition of restraints, even against such right as the freedom of movement (see for instance the denial of the right to fly to anyone exhibiting symptoms of Ebola or other lethal viruses), and even the right of the public to impose other restraints against those who appear to pose a threat to health. The principle is that of quarantine. What is particularly important is that there is no need to prove the intent of those imposing threats of harm: the existence of the proven harm or threat to harm is sufficient to mandate the imposition of restraints on the harm imposers.

In fact, even the bell that had to be worn by those afflicted by leprosy was intended as a warning to others that possible contamination and danger were approaching. In contrast, today food that is harmful in a number of ways is sold openly in stores in western countries, while most of the public there is lulled by the media into a false sense of security, and the belief that the various foods readily available are safe and nutritious, although, most often, neither claim is true.

Hence, in the next section we should discuss several relevant aspects of the connection between food and health: first, the connection between food and safety; second, the relation between food and nutrition and third

²⁰Vadi, 2013: 26; see also Gostin, 2014: 35–36.

²¹Urbinati, S., 2016, “Some Considerations on the Role of The Security Council in Facing the Ebola Outbreak,” in L. Westra, J. Gray and A. d’Aloia, eds, *The Common Good and the Role of Ecological Integrity in the Support of Life*, Earthscan, London.

²²Heinzerling, L., 2008, “Climate Change, Human Health and the post-Cautionary Principle,” *Georgetown Law Journal*, 96(2): 445–460.

6 On Hunger

the question of availability and accessibility, not in western affluent countries, but in the South/East countries where hunger prevails.

1.2 Food Safety and Health

Following the discovery in the UK of bacteria that resist the most common antibiotic of last resort, a leading British expert is warning it is “almost too late” to stop a global superbug crisis. News outlets reported Monday that UK government scientists have found a gene, known as *mcr-1*, that gives bacteria resistance to colistin, often used by doctors when other antibiotics fail.²³

There are many ongoing attacks on food safety, all of which follow practices and products that are legal and permitted. They include, common in the North American continent, the promotion of a diet based primarily on industrially grown meat, a product routinely laced with growth hormones and antibiotics. A “normal” diet for those who can afford it, promotes bacon for breakfast, a hamburger for lunch and more meat for dinner. Labels indicating what is contained in the meat, or when the animals were grown, and which foreign substances they might contain are neither available nor required.

Carl Cranor acknowledges the existence of many toxicants in meat and many pesticides and other industrial chemicals in most foods in the US:

Eat steak for dinner and ingest up to six hormones used to accelerate weight gain in beef. Twelve percent of cattle contain these residues. The European Union (EU) found that there is no safe level of these substances for fetuses. A serving of steak also contains fat-soluble toxicants—long-banned pesticides (DDT, dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane), chlordane, dieldrin and others, industrial fluids (polychlorinated biphenyls, PCBs) and dioxins (contaminants from industrial processes), as well as the most recent PFCs and PBDEs. Concentrations of individual contaminants are low, but their toxic effects can be additive.²⁴

²³Fulton, D., 2015, “Antibiotics Expert Warns It’s ‘Almost Too Late’ to Stop Global Superbug,” Common Dreams, accessed December 29, 2015 at <https://www.commondreams.org/news/2015/12/22/antibiotics-expert-warns-its-almost-too-late-stop-global-superbug>.

²⁴Cranor, C.F., 2013, *Legally Poisoned*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA: 2.

Cranor uses his book to do a masterful job of exposing the present situation where, at least in the US he argues, “no matter how we try ... we cannot escape contamination.”²⁵ But, to some extent, his conclusion is based on anecdotal evidence regarding how even vegans or vegetarians cannot escape contamination. However, not all vegans eat beans from cans (one example of toxicants beyond meat) and nothing is said about the possible difference between city living and other areas.

Nevertheless, he is clear and thorough: in North America all products and substances are only tested in house, by the industries that produce them, not by some independent scientific expert. This pre-market testing would make all the difference: “Successful testing would likely reduce some of the risks of the early onset of cancers, neurological dysfunctions of childhood and of old age, lifelong illnesses due to impaired immune systems, heart disease attributed to ill-timed toxicants and attending misery and costs.”²⁶

What is left out of this scathing analysis, however, is the fact that the very agencies who are charged with imposing controls intended for our safety, are most often controlled—in turn—by the very commercial entities that threaten our health with their products and their very operation. This situation is widespread in North America, especially in the US, where even the major regulatory agencies are most often controlled by corporations.

1.2.1 *Corporate Agribusiness and Health in North America*

Due in no small part to profound increases in consumption of saturated fat and cholesterol from products derived from other animals, death rates in the United States from cardiovascular disease more than tripled from 149 per 100,000 in 1900 to 522 per 100,000 by 1960. This type of harm is referred to as “structural violence” when injury and premature death are the results of institutional arrangements—in this instance, especially the workings of the economic system.²⁷

²⁵*Ibid.*: 3.

²⁶*Ibid.*: 246.

²⁷Nibert, D., 2012, “The Fire Next Time: The Coming Cost of Capitalism Animal Oppression and Environmental Ruin,” *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment* 3(1) (March): 141–158, here 149.

8 On Hunger

Hence, even more pervasive than the harms perpetrated by the means of production used by agribusiness is what emerges clearly from a consideration of the history and development of corporate control of (or attacks on) public health: their very goal and purpose is to promote their own interests at the expense of public health. To add further misery to this situation, resulting illnesses require increasing quantities of pharmaceuticals to cure—if not the diseases themselves—at least some of the symptoms and to prolong the life of the victims.

In turn these chemicals impose their own damages upon those who come in contact with them, through drinking water for instance, or in other ways,²⁸ and we will review some of that research in the next section. For now, we can start by discussing the relation between human and animal rights, starting with the history as traced by David Nibert, as the gravest attacks to human health arise from the practice of meat eating and from the industrial provenance of such meat:

Systemic oppression of both human and other animals did not exist until approximately 1000 years ago, with the advent of agricultural society in Eurasia. Humans there captured and began to manipulate biologically and raise sizeable numbers of large, sociable animals such as cows, goats, pigs, sheep and horses and to exploit them as labourers and as a source of food, clothing, and other resources.²⁹

David Nibert shows how various varieties of “social animals” contributed to the increasing disregard for human lives and human rights, first as horses carrying “aggressive” groups (such as those led by Attila the Hun) into their wars of pillage and slaughter; then even instigating the extension of such wars, because of the need of more and more forage for their animals, but also initiating the occurrence of zoonotic diseases in Asia and Europe, presaging similar spreads of disease when eventually, the Spanish conquistadores descended on the Americas.³⁰

Most of the early corporations, such as the Dutch East India Company (1623) supported their trade and slavery expeditions by feeding “salted

²⁸WHO, 2011, *Pharmaceuticals in the Drinking Water*, WHO/HSE/WSH/11.05 World Health Organization, Geneva, accessed January 16, 2017 at http://www.who.int/water_sanitation_health/publications/2011/pharmaceuticals_20110601.pdf.

²⁹Nibert, 2012: 143.

³⁰*Ibid.*: 143.

meat” to their crews.³¹ Eventually, the newly formed enterprises of the “meat packing industry” employed poor immigrants as “slaughterhouse workers” involved in the brutal killing of millions of animals.³²

These sentient animals were turned into “livestock” and “property” by corporate persons, who in turn benefited from US government tax breaks:

Additionally, state-funded land grant colleges and other public institutions used taxpayer funds to develop ways to manipulate biologically and raise increasing numbers of oppressed animals more cheaply and in ways that fostered rapid physical growth of the animals’ bodies. Factory farming was born as the oppression of other animals increased in both scale and intensity. Large confined animal feeding operations (CAFOs), allowed enormous numbers of animals to be raised in tiny areas by feeding them on surplus grains.³³

The special conditions of confinement required also the administration of various pharmaceuticals, including antibiotics, growth hormones and the like, all of which eventually contributed to the health hazards of the humans consuming that toxic meat, and rendered those who became ill and needed—say—antibiotics, to have become resistant to most of them, by the time the humans themselves needed them to survive. At any rate, in this section we are concerned with the public health aspects of those operations, which represent some of the most successful corporate enterprises today. That meat became the basis for the ubiquitous presence of global fast food, McDonald’s especially, but also Burger King, and Kentucky Fried Chicken, for poultry.

These operations, intent as they were on promoting their economic interests, promoted relentlessly the eating of meat, three times a day, through the proclamation of the need for the “four food groups nutritional campaign,” whereby meat and dairy were glorified and institutionalized as necessary.³⁴ In stark contrast with the “Mediterranean diet” promoted by the WHO, which suggests eating cow meat at most once a month (and grown naturally of course), poultry at most once a week, and shifting the onus of providing good nutrition primarily to vegetables, legumes, grains

³¹*Ibid.*: 144.

³²*Ibid.*: 144–145.

³³*Ibid.*: 147.

³⁴*Ibid.*: 148.

and fish, the results of the corporate expansion of “fast food” clearly demonstrates the ultimate control of public health on the part of the corporation. This control now has expanded globally, from North America, where it originated, to the whole world, and the control itself started with their control of the media.

Public health concerns were raised as early as 1970 in the US, but they were not allowed to be disseminated to the public:

Though education is usually considered a safe, harmless and ineffective activity, the meat and egg industries feared that an educational campaign might include information about fats, cholesterol and heart disease. Quick, strong lobbying by the meat and egg industries killed the legislation in the House Agricultural Committee.³⁵

But, as corporate agribusiness pervaded education at the expense of public health, its negative control penetrated the latter through multiple avenues.

A recent WHO report clearly documents in its Executive Summary how it is not only the direct consumption of the meat and fats that have a noxious impact on our health, but also the indirect effects of the way animals are raised which aggravates those impacts: “Many surveys and studies have confirmed the presence of pharmaceuticals in municipal wastewater and effluents, and these have been identified as a major source of pharmaceuticals in the drinking water.”³⁶

These chemicals include hormones so that, in addition to the other pharmaceuticals and antibiotics ingested directly with the meat products consumed, these are an additional cause of concern. In those cases, the corporations involved are not simply the meat packers, the poultry packers and dairy producers, but also the large pharmaceutical companies known as Big Pharma. All of these corporations benefit directly from the very public health disasters they foster and support.

In addition, the status of the corporation and its multiple “rights” work seamlessly with these operations to ensure maximum economic advantage

³⁵Jacobson, M., 1980, “Nutrition and the Politics of Food,” in M. Green and R. Massie Jr., eds, *The Big Business Reader: Essays on Corporate America*, The Pilgrim Press, New York: 128; see also Nibert, 2012: 148–150.

³⁶WHO, 2011: ix; see also Terms, T.A., 1998, “Occurrence of Drugs in German Sewage Treatment Plants and Rivers,” *Water Research* 32: 3245–3260.