


The Wonderful World Of Disney Hypocrisy



(Genus)
Rattus Twofaceous
©RoarOfWolverine.com

In 1998, the Copyright Term Extension Act was being debated by the U.S. Congress, which lengthened the amount of years before a copyrighted material would enter into the public domain. The law would extend the life of a copyright for works of a corporate nature from 70 years to 95 years!

The law was known as the [“Sonny Bono Term Extension Act”](#), but was pejoratively called the “Mickey Mouse Protection Act”, because The Disney Corporation was the biggest driving force behind the Lobby. Why? Because Mickey Mouse was nearing the 70 year mark and would soon enter the public domain. Many other early Disney characters would soon follow, as their copyright expiration dates were closing fast. This would be a huge financial blow to the Disney brand, so it would reason that they would lead this crusade.

Congress awarded the extension in 1998, and I’m quite sure that Disney’s 6.3 million dollars in campaign donations between 1997-1998 had no bearing on the decision. Congress overstepped its power and ruled in favor of corporate welfare rather than their sworn duty to the promotion of “progress”, as written in the Constitution Article 1, Section 8:

The Congress shall have Power... To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

I might not have a problem with Disney's action, had their corporation built its vast empire on originally created material. The fact that Disney used prior works as a springboard to success envelops this all in the stench of hypocrisy. The Disney company had a moderate level of success with the original characters featured in early black and white short films. Disney did not really hit stride until making full length animated features. Giving credit where due, "Fantasia" was original Disney characters and story line, if you want to call it that. "Fantasia" was literally a series of short animated stories edited together to a soundtrack made up of mostly public domain music for which Disney paid no license (with the exception of "The Rite Of Spring").

From there on, most Disney feature animations would be based on stories that had since fallen into public domain. Snow White, Cinderella, Sleeping Beauty and many other princess stories, were based on age-old fairy tales that Disney was not required to pay license or royalties for. Later works would include children's literature like: "Pinocchio", "Alice in Wonderland" , "The Jungle Book" (released just one year after Kipling's copyright expired),— All in the public domain! Disney didn't pay a cent for story license, yet reaped many millions. The "Little Mermaid", "Beauty and the Beast", "Aladdin" and all features made under the reign of Michael Eisner, would be from public domain. Of course, Disney touted "The Lion King" as an original story. Not! Besides being an adaptation of Shakespeare's "Hamlet" told through a pride of lions, there are way too many similarities between The Lion King and a 1960s Japanese animated series called ["Kimba the White Lion"](#). Though Disney claims these a coincidence, they would sue anyone else into oblivion if they came half as close to one of their properties. The clip below illustrates just how "original" Disney's "The Lion King" really is.

Disney has had few original productions not based on time-tested classics, and when they do, they often flopped big

time. The “Aristocats” would be an example.

(Do not confuse Disney with Pixar. Pixar is the brain-child of John Lasseter and had its own talented writing staff, who penned awesome original stories. Disney was only Pixar’s distributor, until they bought them in Jan. 25, 2006. Pixar is still Lasseter’s project, with its own writers.)

Hey, Disney, have you ever heard of “sending the elevator back down”? They built an empire off of other people’s intellectual properties and then sue daycare centers, who dare place any Disney image in the classrooms or playgrounds (real case, [Hallandale, Fl, 1989](#)). Then Disney has the audacity to purchase copyrights on the characters they liberated from the public domain. Yes, they didn’t create the characters, but they now own the iconic image that they created to represent them. Anything even remotely resembling them, they will attack with the ferocity of a pack of hyenas.



During the airing of The Oscars in 1989, a musical skit was performed with a singing Snow White (portrayed by singer-dancer Eileen Bowman). [Disney actually sued the Academy of Motion Pictures and Sciences](#) for having a character wearing a similar wig and costume to the Disney movie version. The character named [Snow White](#) has origins as far back as the middle ages, yet Disney thinks they now own her. When it was discovered that someone else (other than Disney) probably [held the copyright for Bambi](#), Disney began throwing out ridiculous legal concepts to come up with *anything* that would get the copyright out of the hands of this other potential owner – including the claim that Bambi was in the public domain *AND* that Disney owned the copyright to it.

No matter how long something has lived in the public domain, if Disney makes an animated version of it, it now belongs to them. So, if Disney makes an animated version of the Bible or

Koran, they will own those characters as well. I can see the headlines now: “Disney versus the State of Islam over rights to Muhammad”, followed by images of planes crashing into Cinderella’s Castle in Orlando.

Of course Disney is not as adamant about paying royalties as they are at collecting. Disney attempted to stiff singer [Peggy Lee](#) for the royalties for her voice work in “Lady and The Tramp” when it was released for home video in 1987.

Disney claimed that her original contract, signed in 1952, which gave her the right to participate in “transcriptions for sales to the public”, did not specifically cover “home video” sales. The idea of home video technology did not exist in 1952! Thankfully, the [courts ruled](#) in favor of the seventy year old Lee.

Our nation’s founders did not consider inventions and artistic expression as property, but as public goods to which exclusive rights might be granted for a limited time as purely a means of incentive for production. Thomas Jefferson expressed this sentiment in a letter written in 1813:

If nature has made any one thing less susceptible than all others of exclusive property, it is the action of the thinking power called an idea, which an individual may exclusively possess as long as he keeps it to himself; but the moment it is divulged, it forces itself into the possession of every one, and the receiver cannot dispossess himself of it. Its peculiar character, too, is that no one possesses the less, because every other possesses the whole of it. He who receives an idea from me, receives instruction himself without lessening mine; as he who lights his taper at mine, receives light without darkening me

Inventions then cannot, in nature, be a subject of property. Society may give an exclusive right to the profits arising from them, as an encouragement to men to pursue ideas which may produce utility, but this may or may not be done,

according to the will and convenience of the society, without claim or complaint from anybody.” – Thomas Jefferson

Thomas Jefferson and James Madison went as far as to consider such copyright hoarding as a monopoly and we all know how the framers of our Constitution felt concerning monopolies. Jefferson wrote:

Monopolies may be allowed to persons for their own productions in literature, and their own inventions in the arts, for a term not exceeding ___ years, but no longer term, and for no other purpose.” – Thomas Jefferson.

The blank in the quotation was left to be filled in later by an agreed upon vote, but certainly not the 95 years Congress has now awarded. For more information on Jefferson’s attitude concerning copyrights read [here](#).

Jefferson, being a literary writer, [inventor](#) and [musician](#) himself, reluctantly believed that the creator of an intellectually property should be rewarded for an acceptable time, just to give incentive to create. But he also felt that ownership should not transfer to family or companies for eternally long periods. He knew that this promotes hoarding of intellectual properties, only for sale or view for the wealthy. These works need to eventually become part of history and education FOR ALL!

What if Mozart, Da Vinci, Dickens, Shakespeare and the likes, were still privately held? How would people of little means gain access and knowledge? It is not in the best interest of a society to withhold knowledge and art from those of lesser means. Can we see even Disney’s classic works for free?

Hardly. This is exactly what our founders did not want.

It is obviously Disney’s intention that their properties NEVER fall into public domain. You can bet that Disney will again barter congress for more extensions once their new deadline

comes to term, thereby preventing anyone else from duplicating what Walt did. Is this fair? Even Shakespeare built on the prior works of Holingshead's *Chronicles of England* (1573).

Had these idiotic perpetual copyright extensions existed then, we would not have Shakespeare or many other great works that have help the "progress" of society.

If Disney 's 75 year old creations were rightfully allowed to fall into public domain, then other artists could use that art to build new forms of art from it, just as Disney did with old fairy tales and children's literature. And, what if the creators of all those fairy tales and children's literature would have bought government favor to extend the copyrights on their work? They would have charged Disney huge license fees and royalties to use them or refused usage out right (like Disney often does). Of course Walt could not have afforded the license fees as a start-up animation company. With Walt being a man of few original ideas, the Disney company would be just another hack animation company publishing cheap Flash animated shorts on YouTube and history would be forever changed. How is Disney's greed now affecting the future?

Only One Mammal Survives On Low Fat Nutrition

"Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools" – Romans 1:22



When hyper-education overrides instinctual drives and common sense, I can't help but think of this passage. Humans have wasted the last fifty years attempting to make a science of the benefits of a low-fat diet. Though it is counterintuitive to all dietary traditions, by using enough smoke and mirrors, accompanied by plenty of "soundbite recital", it was packaged and sold to an otherwise intelligent people. Sometimes we can over-think ourselves into stupidity.


The influence of the low-fat theory has even found its way into many diets that claim to be of paleolithic design. [Loren Cordain](#) and [Arthur DeVany](#) promote meat-eating, but still stay within the arena of political correctness by advocating the trimming of fat and using only the leanest cuts of meat.

Lipophobia has become a religion of its own. The fear of fat has been so indoctrinated into our culture that even in the face of millenniums of safe consumption and tons of scientific evidence to the contrary, we still cling to it, even when advocating meat-eating. It has to be the largest brain-washing ever perpetrated on the human race.

But what if I were to tell you that human beings are the only mammal on earth that have adopted low-fat nutrition? All other animals enjoy nutrition that is rich in fat – and not just any fat, but saturated fat. I learned the hard way how

saturated fat production in the colon is very important in maintaining the health of the colonic walls. This saturated fat is created from plant fiber and not from ingested animal products.

Though all but around ten inches of my small intestines were removed, about two feet of colon had been spared. I was left with the rectum, sigmoid and a few inches of descending colon. The illustration below displays all of the intestines I had left before my transplant.



Because of the nervous complexities of the rectum, doctors are unable to transplant that section of the colon. Individuals that lose their rectum due to Crohn's, UC or cancer cannot have a colon transplanted and must live out the remainder of their lives with an [ileostomy](#) or "[J](#)" [pouch](#)". So it was important that the doctors save my native rectum, so I could receive a colon with the rest of the transplanted intestines.

This was no small task. The existing colon parts were no longer connected, so there was no material passing through them anymore. Everything I ate passed out through a stoma made from the jejunum. Because the colon was not being used, it became inflamed and started to bleed. I was suffering from an affliction called "[Diversion Colitis](#)" and was losing so much blood as a result, that I required a transfusion every two weeks. It was very painful.

Indigestible fiber within the stool is devoured by the bacteria of the colon, who then produce a short chain fatty acid (SCFA) called "[butyrate](#)" ([butyric acid](#)) as a by-product. In the human colon, the butyrate is absorbed by the cells of the colon lining and used for food. Butyrate is very important for colon health, and without it, the colon becomes

inflamed and ultimately ulcerated.

So, how is all of this relevant to the fact that all mammals maintain health via a high fat diet? First, let us take a look at a non-ruminant vegetarian mammal like the western lowland gorilla. Their diet is made up mostly of leafy green vegetables, some fruit and small amount of insects. Their food is low in fat and available carbohydrates with varied protein, but very high in indigestible fiber. The gorilla's macro nutrient per 100 grams of dry matter intake would look something like this:



Fat:	0.5 grams
Protein:	11.8 grams
Available carbs:	7.7 grams
Indigestible fiber:	74 grams

This puts the caloric intake of available macronutrients at about:

Fat:	5.9%
Protein:	57.0%
Available carbs:	37.1%

From this we would conclude that the gorilla enjoys a high protein, moderate carbohydrate, and low fat diet. But remember what we learned from the diversion colitis and how the colonic bacteria convert dietary fiber to butyrate; a saturated fat. Because the gorilla has a much larger ratio of colon than does the human, fiber is converted to SCFA, changing the macronutrient absorption to an energy ratio of:

	(kcal) per 100g	% age
Fat:	4.9	2.5%
Protein:	47.1	24.3%
Available carbs:	30.6	15.8%
SCFA from fiber:	111.0	57.7%

Giving the gorilla a total intake of:

Fat:	59.8%
Protein:	24.4%
Available carbs:	15.8%

The gorilla has six times the absorption available from the colon than does the human, which also means they have many times the amount of bacteria available for digestion of plant cellulose. The high fiber in the gorilla diet is fermented by the colonic bacteria, yielding short chained fatty acids (SCFA). In other words, the indigestible carbohydrates are converted to saturated fat and absorbed into the blood. A human eating a similar diet would just end up crapping most of it out, receiving little benefit.


The gorilla can obtain about 65% of their energy from their hind-gut, whereas the human only receives about 10% from the colon. The butyrate created in the human colon is mostly used locally by the cells of the intestinal lining and only a very insignificant amount is absorbed. This is why a human can live without a colon and an ape can't. (see my post "[The Planet That Went Ape!](#)" for more on ape vs. human gut ratio)

Much like carnivorous and other omnivorous animals, humans must receive fatty acids through diet. When we eat a low-fat diet, we are not simulating the gorilla or chimpanzee diet, we are receiving a diet low in fat and very high in available carbohydrates. The chimp and gorilla are receiving many times the dietary fat from their gut bacteria than we do on the same diet. This is most likely the reason why gorillas fed meat in captivity suffer from [hypercholesterolemia](#) and die. Because they can convert fiber to high amounts of saturated fat, any extra fat in their diet creates an overload of serum lipids.

(Chimpanzees are more omnivorous than gorillas and do better than gorillas when fed meat in captivity).

But what about the other herbivores? Besides having multiple chambered stomachs, ruminants have one very large stomach chamber reserved for plant fermentation. This stomach is

called the [rumen](#), hence the name ruminant.



4 Chamber Stomach of a Ruminant

©RoarOfWolverine.com

Ruminant's stomachs house bacteria only found in the colon of a human. These bacteria readily convert indigestible carbohydrates into short chained fatty acids, which are absorbed into the bloodstream of the ruminant animal (goats, sheep, cattle, deer, etc.). At the blood serum level, these animals are receiving a butt-load of saturated fat. If ruminant animals did not require high amounts of saturated fat, we would not find so much of it in their milk. Their offspring does not have the bacteria necessary for the fiber conversion to SCFA when born, so like us, they need it from their diet. Once they have eaten grass for a period, they plant and begin to culture the bacteria necessary to make their own fat from fiber. *(The human stomach remain sterile because of the high acidity. Ruminant animals have little to no acid in their stomachs)*

Once the young ruminant animal has established a healthy bacterial culture, they no longer need dietary fat, but are still receiving the same high level of fat as they were when nursing. Where do you think all that saturated fat found in their milk and meat comes from? Because they can manufacture such a large portion of fat from the fiber in their diet, any dietary fat would create a fat overload. This is probably why

a ruminant animal shows no interest in meat or other fatty foods even when available.

Ever notice the way people tend to begin to salivate with one whiff of a pot roast or the smell of steaks on the grill? You don't see the same [Pavlov's dog](#) reaction to broccoli boiling from a human and cabbage cooking smells like the bathroom at a Taco Bell. Though they are completely healthy foods they are hardly as appetite stimulating. No herbivore would react in such a manner to the smell of meat cooking, but do show the same level of excitement towards fresh grass.

We are constantly being told that the food that doesn't excite us is what's best for us. Anything that tastes good must be bad for us. If we were an herbivorous species, we wouldn't have to threaten children to eat their vegetables. I raise cattle and have yet to see a mother cow threaten to withhold her calf's dessert until he finishes that acre of grass.

Their offspring immediately have a strong urge to eat grass on their own. Telling us that our vegetables are the healthiest thing on our plate begins as a mental reinforcement to get children to eat the one thing on their plate they desire least. The conditioning becomes so strong, many cannot let go of it even into adulthood. This has even created a major bias in nutritional research.

Everyone wants to debate the issue based on questionable studies and theories of biochemical reactions of macronutrients and human hormones and it all becomes complicated and sounds very impressive. History has taught us that if you want to sell a bogus idea, make it sound real complex. It would seem logical that our ancestors knew nothing of biochemistry. Just like the ruminant calf, they sought after whatever tasted good and was available. We evolved to get the most out of the foods our ancestors ate.



The day we added Hunter to Gatherer

Our fore-bearers began eating meat, maybe because they noticed that carnivores had more free time on their hands, whereas herbivores spent their entire existence eating and taking a dump. Maybe they were just drawn more to the smell and taste of meat. Maybe herbivores just pissed them off, (as vegans usually do) so they wanted to kill and eat them. Either way, this adaptation allowed their brains

to grow, their colons to shorten and made them less dependent on digestive bacterium.

Humans began making this trade-off over a million years ago.

We surrendered the herbivore's energy gobbling hind gut that house the bacteria which manufacture the much-needed SCFA from plant fiber, so we could have a larger brain and be adaptable to different environments. The only drawback was, we were forever committed to receive our fat from external sources.

Now that our brains have grown to an intellect that can jump to erroneous conclusions based on complex, confusing and contradictory scientific observations, our health as a species has deteriorated ever since.

We are the only species trying to live healthy on a low-fat diet. Our ancestors taught us how to eat healthy. Our instincts tell us what to eat. Your grandmother knew what to eat. But we have become so much smarter than them that our intellect overrides our sense of smell and taste, and we scoff at our predecessor's lean, robust bodies and healthy hearts.

We brag at how much healthier our low-fat diets are than the high fat affair of our idiot grandparents and ignore the fact that we have become morbidly obese as a result of the much

higher intake of carbohydrates. In other words, "Professing ourselves to be wise, we became fools".