



GCSE

4171/02



S15-4171-02

**ENGLISH/ENGLISH LANGUAGE
HIGHER TIER
UNIT 1 (READING)**

A.M. TUESDAY, 2 June 2015

1 hour

ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

Resource Material.

An 8 page answer book.

INSTRUCTIONS TO CANDIDATES

Use black ink or black ball-point pen.

Answer **all** questions.

Write your answers in the separate answer book provided.

INFORMATION FOR CANDIDATES

The total mark available for this unit is 40.

The number of marks in brackets will give you an indication of the time you should spend on each question or part-question.

Answer **all** the following questions.

The **separate Resource Material** is a newspaper article, 'Can sending a cow feed a country?' by Paul Heiney.

The text on the opposite page is taken from the internet, 'Don't follow the herd – don't give a cow for Christmas' by Andrew Tyler.

Read the first page of the newspaper article in the separate Resource Material, 'Can sending a cow feed a country?'

1. Why did Paul Heiney think that the *Send a Cow* charity would be a success? [10]

Read the rest of the newspaper article.

2. Explain in what ways *Send a Cow* has improved people's lives. [10]

Read the internet text on the opposite page, 'Don't follow the herd – don't give a cow for Christmas'.

3. How does Andrew Tyler try to persuade readers that donating an animal is **not** a good idea? [10]

Use information from both texts to answer the following question.

4. Compare and contrast what the writers say about:
- what happens to the animals that are sent to Africa;
 - the problems these schemes cause for the environment.
- [10]

You must make it clear from which text you get your information.

Don't follow the herd – don't give a cow for Christmas

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

Christmas is the season of gut-busting excess, when the tills don't stop ringing and our appetites for giving and receiving get well and truly satisfied. 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, is increasingly popular. The aid agencies Oxfam and Christian Aid started the trend but this year about a dozen agencies are using your money to send goats, chickens, sheep, camels, donkeys, pigs and cows to the world's starving.

The message might bring comfort to the donor, but such schemes, sadly, are not a good thing. Many animals will die before reaching their destination in Africa and when they arrive they serve only to increase poverty because farming animals is inefficient and expensive. Animals such as cows are environmentally disastrous because they consume huge quantities of food, leaving land barren, and they deplete water supplies by consuming such large quantities of water. On top of this they require shelter from extremes of weather and expensive veterinary care. Such resources are in critically short supply in much of Africa, causing some animals to suffer or even die.

In a statement last week, World Land Trust (WLT) declared: "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 these schemes as a means of raising quick money for charities over the Christmas season".

It is indisputable that introducing goats into fragile farming areas will turn the land into desert, causing further human poverty. But if goats are environmentally disastrous, cows are worse. A milking cow requires up to 90 litres of water a day, a lot of food and veterinary treatment to cover widespread problems such as scours, mastitis and lameness. In the hostile African environment, these diseases have become more widespread. But where do the vets come from and 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 directly, rather than devoting those resources to fattening animals.

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

Andrew Tyler



GCSE

4171/02-A



S15-4171-02A

**ENGLISH/ENGLISH LANGUAGE
HIGHER TIER
UNIT 1 (READING)**

A.M. TUESDAY, 2 June 2015

Resource Material

Can sending a cow feed a country?



Four thousand miles is a long way to travel to see a cow, but I wanted to know if a scheme set up 20 years ago had actually worked. Send a Cow was a simple idea but I felt it would be so easy to achieve. It was dreamt up by a group of British farmers who believed they could relieve poverty in Africa by donating an animal. Kind donations and the continual support of the generous British public made this dream a reality. Now I wanted to be certain that our money was well spent.

Send a Cow aimed to improve people's lives. For a poor Ugandan farmer, ownership of a milking cow brought immediate benefits. Its milk added to the family's poor diet and surplus milk could be sold. Feed for the cow had to be grown, which might need extra labour, but that too could be paid for out of the milk money. The animal had suddenly turned into a real cash cow. Add to that the increased soil fertility after liberal doses of cow manure, resulting in better crops, and you start to understand why this charity thought it could make a real and lasting difference.

I was convinced, yet critics said, "How can you condemn a cow to such an intolerable life? It will fry under the sun." But I knew that the Ugandan farmers were given lengthy training and the climate in the high plateau was similar to Devon on a summer's day, which suited the cows down to the ground. The Ugandans were herdsman. I was confident they would understand cows. Several subsequent reports of healthy, flourishing herds suggested my optimism was not misplaced.

Each cow came with a promise: the first-born calf would be given as a gift to another needy family. The scheme was heavily criticised but I was certain that the investment would double, and go on increasing, calf after calf.

Our first cow was called Tutti and she flew to Uganda in June 1994. Now, on the twentieth anniversary of the founding of Send a Cow, it was time to see if what worked so beautifully on paper did just as well in reality.

When I arrived, there was a cow peacefully chewing her cud. She was the latest of Tutti's direct descendants. Tutti's first calf, Jacob, was a bull who fathered approximately 500 cows in three years. He is fondly remembered. "When Jacob was born," Mrs Luyombyas, says, "we were so proud that the whole family worked together to care for him."

And what has Send a Cow done for the Luyombyas family? For a start, the mud hut in which they had lived their entire lives and raised seven children has been replaced by a brick-built house. "Look, we've got proper windows which close," she boasts, while Mr Luyombyas adds that by drinking the milk "we are much healthier. And we have been able to buy beds!" They have also bought an old Singer sewing machine, a huge investment bought with milk money. They use it to make school uniforms and employ another local woman, who in turn can better provide for her own family.

Many families have profited from the scheme and the extra money they have made is spent wisely. Ask any farmer what they will spend the money on and the answer is always the same – education. "Learning is our children's freedom." One girl who holds a degree tried to explain to me what her life would have been like if her family had never been given a cow, but she broke down, distraught at the thought. She is one of seven children. Her brother has just received a degree in engineering. The cow paid for that too.

Critics argue that the scheme is unsound because cows are inefficient animals who put pressure on a fragile environment by consuming significantly more food and water than they produce. They also frequently break wind which emits damaging methane. I disagree that they are inefficient. The story of Send a Cow is one of farming and feeding, but beyond that it gives families hope and choice. It also builds communities where before there were none. African farming has profited from this ambitious scheme and it is believed that the survival rate of rural animals has improved significantly. It is cows that have achieved this, with the help of a handful of British farmers who have inspired thousands of African families and their future generations.



Paul Heiney