was seeking nothing more than “a respectable yield of favorable P.R.” This irresponsible and mischievous reporting does not help the Journal in its quest for credibility within the scientific and public communities.

Howard M. Frederick
Director, State Feed Control
American Feed Manufacturers Association
Arlington, VA 22209

The Journal apologizes for the misunderstanding noted in Dr. Frederick’s letter. However, our deadline for printing the first quarterly issue caught us between two critically important letters from Vo-lac, Ltd. The first letter (November 21, 1981) seemed to imply that Quantock had decided to begin U.S. trials of the group-pen system on its own. A later letter written on December 21 acknowledged the ambiguity and set the record straight. Unfortunately it arrived in our offices after the Journal had gone to print. We had recognized the ambiguity in the November letter and made repeated attempts to contact Provimi, at both Wisconsin and New Jersey offices, for an unequivocal response on whether or not Provimi would combine its resources with Quantock in the forthcoming group-pen trials. Regrettably, no one at either Provimi office would discuss the matter with us.

However, since that time we have learned more details about the study being conducted by Quantock and Provimi, as the new corporate entity, Quantock U.S.A. Both firms are represented in management: Jack Van Der Ploeg, Vice President of Provimi is serving as President, while Philip Paxman, President of Quantock, is Vice President of the combined venture. Quantock has sent over stockmen experienced in running a group-pen operation, and Provimi is providing the barns and other facilities. The initial trial began in mid-December in Wisconsin. Forty Holstein bulls were divided into two groups; one group was fed the standard formula manufactured by Provimi, whereas the other received the formula used in Quantock’s system. The only change made in the British system was the addition of a heater in the barn, since the temperatures in Beaver Dam, Wisconsin, with wind chill factors considered, sometimes reach -20°F. Results of the trial will not be made public until the calves have been slaughtered, and the quality of the carcasses carefully assessed — Ed.

Editorials

Is There Really a Market for Milk-Fed Veal?

Dana H. Murphy

In a two-part “Focus” article in this issue, we relate, first, the origins and subsequent growth of the milk-fed veal industry in Europe and the U.S. and, second, some recent research findings on several current and potential production systems for raising veal, in light of both economic and humane considerations. At the moment, it seems as if the group-pen system, clearly a far more humane method than the confinement crate, has won the day in the U.K. and may well become a major production system in the U.S. But one critical question remains: How many people really want milk-fed veal?

In his modern classic on the economics of consumption, The Affluent Society, John Kenneth Galbraith argues that, contrary to the supposition of traditional capitalism that the market functions so as to meet already established consumer demands, today’s corporations must first create the demand for new products, through advertising and other promotional efforts. In the case of white, or milk-fed veal, the traditional capitalist view of things seems to hold true on the Continent, where 6 to 8 million calves are raised each year to supply a population for whom this type of veal is a staple of the daily diet. But in the U.K. and U.S., the populace has had to be carefully “educated” about the virtues of pale veal.

In the U.K., Philip Paxman, head of Volac, Ltd., which was responsible for the switch to the group-pen system, commented on the market conditions relative to pale veal. He noted two important factors: (1) humane considerations — “I believe that belief in cruelty to veal is one of the few cherished institutions that has not been eroded with time,” and (2) a sense among consumers that pale meat simply isn’t healthy — “in this country, there has been no tradition and no demand for anemic flesh. The British housewife is very content with healthy pink meat.” Therefore, the boycott of confinement-raised veal that has been in force in England for about 20 years, and the increasing awareness within the British government that specific regulations against confinement-raised veal are necessary, have occurred within a particular kind of market, in which the small amount of veal that is consumed goes largely to the restaurant trade.

Provimi of Holland established their first U.S. beachhead in New Jersey in the early 1960’s and began to sell the milk-replacer/confinement system to U.S. farmers. But, by 1978, when management took stock of just how low the U.S. demand for white veal was, they were forced to counter with an aggressive marketing campaign, including advertising, cooking classes, distribution of booklets of recipes, and financing of a cookbook by Craig Claibourne. The emphasis was not so much on creating a mass market, as on establishing white veal as a prestige item, in the same general category as imported champagne and truffles. The effort has had some success. Since 1965, sales of white veal appear to have shown slow but steady growth in the U.S. Yet, it is hard to believe that the average American really cares what color his veal is. In spite of the intensive efforts to convince consumers that the “whiteness” of veal is indicative of its superiority, several tests of blindfolded volunteers have yielded only ambiguous results: most people simply cannot distinguish white veal from other types by taste alone. Thus, the milk-fed veal producers have created
an artificial market, based mainly on snob appeal.

It may be possible to advance arguments for the exploitation of animals in the name of long-established, basic human needs. But to exploit animals in order to produce a product for which very few people have expressed even the weakest of desires seems unambiguously wrong.

Animal Rights and "Religious Politics"

Dr. M.W. Fox

Animal rights philosophy and the animal welfare movement have recently been vehemently attacked by religious fundamentalist organizations and also by non-religious organizations with fundamentalist beliefs, such as the American Farm Bureau.

Fundamentalists have mounted a campaign against the teaching of evolutionary theory in schools, contending that their creationist view is more in line with what they believe to be the correct interpretation of the scriptures. The political motives behind this quasi-religious movement become clearer when their attacks on the environmental/conservation and humane movements are scrutinized. The claim that God has given man dominion over the rest of creation, with the implied belief that "dominion" means the freedom to dominate and exploit rather than merely function as a steward, is an obvious political ploy to undermine the tenets of sound conservation and environmental protection.

Likewise, it is claimed that man is superior to all creatures and is a special form of creation, created in the "image of God," and who, unlike animals, also has a soul. Thus, they argue, it is heretical to consider giving animals rights and to give them standing and recognition as objects of moral concern. Even the distinction between equal rights and equal and fair consideration is overlooked because they claim man is superior and can, therefore, in all good conscience, exploit animals as he chooses.

The political and economic implications of this blatant misrepresentation of Judeo-Christian teachings are obvious. Furthermore, this attitude absolves us of any guilt due to a sense of responsibility, giving us free license to exploit animals (and nature) without any twinge of conscience, thereby furnishing a pseudo-religious respectability to all forms of animal exploitation. It provides a self-serving, hubristic basis for placing economic values ahead of ethical values and concerns, in order to further self-interest and to justify the status quo of unconditional (and de-regulated) exploitation of animals and environment alike.

Such hubris conveniently ignores many biblical injunctions that man act compassionately toward all creatures and to serve as a steward of the earth's resources. Ecclesiastes (3:19), for example, states that "man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity" [to contend otherwise].

While fundamentalists admit that it is wrong to treat animals inhumanely, their reasons for this conclusion are human-centered rather than animal-centered. This represents a judgment that is not based upon a recognition that animals can suffer and have intrinsic worth, and that they have needs and rights that we should respect and uphold, but rather upon the simplistic belief that inhumane treatment is morally wrong. Such moralizing and human-centered ethics make it very convenient, then, in the absence of animal-centered values and