

McDonald's

(Continued from Page A1)

Washington, D.C. telephone of Pure Food Campaign Director Ted Howard. Howard, a long-time Rifkin associate and professional fund-raiser for different causes, was in New Orleans Thursday.

Cummings said Beyond Beef Campaign people and others were joining the Pure Food Campaign and he was using Howard's telephone.

The announcement of the protest initially was made March 31 in statements distributed to media during a Food and Drug Administration (FDA) hearing on bovine somatotropin (BST).

This week, Pure Food Campaign, which describes itself as "an international boycott of genetically engineered foods," updated its statement about its planned protest and leaflets distribution.

Pure Food Campaign has been calling for a protest of a number of McDonald's restaurants across North America because the industry giant won't join a group of businesses which are listed by Pure Food as declaring they won't accept milk or meat derived from cows treated with BST.

Although not approved yet by the FDA for commercial use as a supplement, of an by itself, BST is a naturally occurring protein hormone which is not functional except in cows where it is integral in stimulating milk production.

The proposed commercial use of BST resulted from the application of biotechnology to develop a relatively inexpensive source of

pure BST for supplemental injections into cows to stimulate additional milk production.

All expert dairy researcher testimony to date has effectively been that BST, should its safety be approved as appears imminent, will not see grand scale use as is projected by opposition groups and individuals.

The conclusion has been that BST would be used as a tool for herd management only when all other aspects of dairy cow management have been maximized.

Furthermore, the FDA has long approved the consumption of milk and meat derived from BST-treated cattle. In fact, supplemental BST has been in use for years now on certain farms approved for test trials.

In other words, not only is BST in all milk and meat, but milk and meat from cows treated with injections of additional BST has been in the consumers' food supply for years.

The FDA had long ago concluded that there is no possible way for BST — whether naturally made or biotechnologically produced — to be a danger to human health. In the human digestive system, proteins are broken down by enzymes, and BST does not stay in an active form.

Also, BST injected in humans has not produced any effects.

Commercial BST is produced through the raising of genetically altered bacteria which yield the protein hormone.

There is no difference between the types of BST whether it comes from a cow or if it produced by

bacteria. No chemical difference has been detected.

Further, even a check of BST levels in milk and meat can not determine whether it came from an animal that received BST injections.

According to the FDA, BST research has provided one of the most extensive and exhaustive studies of any material ever presented to the FDA for review. More than 1,000 studies have been done on the protein hormone.

To date, no review of Monsanto Corp.'s injectable BST product has resulted in anything but approval. Some concern was issued by the U.S. General Accounting Office, an investigative agency of the U.S. Congress.

The GAO requested the FDA to look into the possibility that antibiotics would be more likely to show up in dairy products because of the use of injectable BST.

The FDA's advisory committees concluded strongly that scenario was implausible.

Nevertheless, Pure Food Campaign has been calling for a ban of all meat and milk derived from cattle treated with supplemental BST.

Some have questioned the motives of the campaign. For example, in its literature, the non-profit activist group refers frequently to "BGH-free milk and meat" and only occasionally specifies that it means products derived from cattle receiving BST injections.

The group is also calling for special labeling of products resulting from cows treated with BST, though the only way to tell if meat

or milk resulted from a cow given BST injections is to check farmer records.

While McDonald's media spokespeople said they were not aware of the protest until contacted by *Lancaster Farming*, they said they were aware of Rifkin.

Rifkin, who authored a book which has been discredited by all respected academicians and professionals, has promoted his theories against eating meat.

"His theories are far-fetched, totally unsupportable and without merit," said Ann Connolly, McDonald's Corp. spokesperson.

"This is a publicity stunt designed to sell his book and promote his personal agenda, and the Beyond the Beef Campaign folks admit they're only using McDonald's to create publicity," she said.

Connolly said McDonald's uses only top brand name dairy and meat products, purchased from the same companies which also market their products directly to consumers.

McDonald's buys from companies such as Carnation and Foremost foods, "which are all governed by FDA standards," she said.

While McDonald's has dismissed Rifkin's attempts to stir consumer fears of its products as ridiculous, the Pure Food Campaign is also publicizing its 900-number on the leaflets.

Although Pure Food Campaign's 900-number is handled by MCI, a competitive telephone service company stated that its similar service should result in a profit of about \$13,000, based on receiving 5,000 phone calls. Start up costs for that service is \$250 and what-

ever expenses are necessary for advertisement.

Pure Food Campaign enjoys tax-free, non-profit status.

Pure Food Campaign, now working in conjunction with other Rifkin organizations, is claiming that it will have 20,000 activists at McDonald's restaurants today distributing leaflets to one million customers. Last week, Pure Food Campaign had claimed that it would have more than 2,000 "activist teams" doing the work.

Generally, Pure Food can expect to receive about \$2.50 per phone call for those listening to its approximately 4-minute message.

If just 10 percent of those to be contacted today call the 900-number as directed, the group could pocket more than \$250,000 tax free.

In this week's statement, Pure Food Campaign states, "On April 17, the Pure Food Campaign is joining the Beyond Beef coalition in its Adopt-A-McDonald's campaign. McDonald's has been selected for the anti-BGH leafletting drive because it is among North America's largest users of milk, cheese, butter and dairy cow beef.

"Unless it pledges to be BGH-free, McDonald's could become one of the world's largest single restaurant sources of milk and meat from BGH-treated cows."

According to Cummings, a number of McDonald's restaurants in Pennsylvania have been targeted. He said protesters can be expected today at McDonald's in Butler, Elwood City, Huntingdon Valley, Newton, Exton, Erie, Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Harrisburg, West Chester and Lewisburg.



**GLENN'S
UDDERINGS**

By
Glenn A. Shirk

Lancaster Extension
Dairy Agent

SCC Linear Score vs. Weighted Count

The SCC levels for your herd are reported two different ways on your Raleigh DHIA Herd Summary Report and on your new Penna. DHIA Herd Summary Report II. One is the average linear score (or SCC code). This is a numeric average of the codes for all cows. The other is a weighted average of each cows raw cell count. The herd's average weighted cell count is affected by each cow's daily milk production. Thus, it should approximate your tank count.

When you compare the weighted raw count with the herd's average linear score you may discover that the raw count is outside the normal range expected for the herd's average linear score. This is not an error. Scores and cell count ranges appear in Table 1.

Table 1 Linear SCC Scores, Cell Count Ranges and Milk Losses

SCC Score	SCC Ranges (1,000's)	SCC Averages (1,000's)	Daily Milk Loss (lbs.)
0	0 - 17	13	
1	18 - 35	25	
2	36 - 71	50	
3	72 - 141	100	1.5
4	142 - 283	200	3.0
5	284 - 565	400	4.5
6	566 - 1130	800	6.0
7	1131 - 2262	1600	7.5
8	2263 - 4523	3200	9.0
9	4524 - 9999	6400	10.5

The reason for the perceived discrepancy is that the linear score is a numeric

average and the weighted cell count, as its name implies, is a weighted average. The illustrations in Tables 2 and 3 show how the weighted count, and its relationship to average linear scores, change depending upon which cows are infected - the high producers or the low producers.

Table 2 High Producers Most Severely Infected

Cow I.D.	SCC Score	SCC Count (1,000's)	Daily Milk	Weighted SCC (1,000's)
A	3	100	x 40	= 4,000
B	7	1,600	x 80	= 128,000
Totals	10		120	132,000
Divisor	2			120
Averages	5			1,100

Table 3 Low Producers Most Severely Infected

Cow I.D.	SCC Score	SCC Count (1,000's)	Daily Milk	Weighted SCC (1,000's)
A	7	1,600	x 40	= 64,000
B	3	100	x 80	= 8,000
Totals	10		120	72,000
Divisor	2			120
Averages	5			600

Note that the average linear score is the same (5) in Tables 2 and 3, but the weighted SCC is quite different, 1,100,000 compared to 600,000!

You will also note that the weighted SCC count in both tables is outside the range expected for a linear score of 5, as seen in Table 1 (284,000 - 565,000). This is due to the fact that each time the score increases by 1, the cell count doubles. An increase from code 3 to code 4 increases cell counts by only 100,000, but an increase from code 6 to code 7 increases cell counts by 800,000! So, if you have a number of cows with counts considerably higher than herd average, you can expect the weighted cell count to be higher than what the average linear score might lead you to think.

What SCC levels should you aim for? A 200,000 count or less is a reasonable and attainable goal. At this level you are not losing too much production — perhaps 1.5-3.0 pounds as indicated in Table 1. You will probably qualify for some quality premium payments, and you will have less vet and culling expenses. It's worth striving for.

Penn State Cooperative Extension is an affirmative action, equal opportunity, educational institution.