

## Tekst 8

# Jamie's fowl sanctimony<sup>1)</sup>

**Zoe Williams**

- 1 The conditions of the working chicken in the UK are turning into what Americans call a hot-button issue. Jamie Oliver, in his Fowl Dinners, gassed a generation of boy chicks for us. Well, it wasn't him, exactly, it was the industry. But it's such a moral grey area, isn't it, reportage? Hugh Fearnley-Whittingstall, another famous chef, meanwhile, rammed home the realities by creating his own intensive chicken farm, which brought him to tears at one point, at the horror of it.
- 2 Two facts stand out, beyond the grim stories of chickens suffocating in sweltering vans. First, this is not new information. The traumas of battery chickens have been common knowledge for as long as people have been campaigning against foxhunting, for as long as schoolgirls have been shopping in The Body Shop. Second, the new wave of protest hasn't put any dent in sales – the big supermarkets were apparently bracing themselves for a downturn in the market after the broadcasts of Jamie and Hugh. In fact, daily sales of chicken have increased somewhat, up 7% on November's figures.
- 3 So, what are we supposed to make of this? That, even knowing all we know, we are too hardhearted and greedy to act upon it, and we find it incredibly easy to disassociate the hateful life of the creature from eating its meat? To put it even more simply, we are bad people, except those who are buying expensive free range chickens at £25 each, who are good people. Immediately, this statement annoys us. Yes, we all have to take responsibility for our consumer choices. But those choices are a lot more meaningful for some than for others. To someone with dependants, living on the average national income of £24.000, the difference between a three-quid broiler and a £10 organic bird is enormous.
- 4 To Jamie Oliver it is no difference at all, on account of how he is loaded. And why is he loaded? Because a) he makes quite a lot of money entertaining us by gassing boy chicks, and b) he hoovers up that much and more again by advertising for Sainsbury's, which has been one of the driving forces behind this cheap food since mass production began.
- 5 Or, at least, this is the kind of petty-minded line of argument a person might be driven to, standing accused of cruel consumer choices. It is, frankly, obnoxious to see a rich person demanding impoverishing consumer choices from a poorer person. These chefs consider themselves outside politics, because they're being straightforward – let's eat what came out of the ground naturally, what was raised in a happy way. Let's just do as nature intended, what could possibly be political about that?



- 6 They're right, it isn't political, in that it has no consistency of ideas. The fact is, ethics that come out of your wallet are not ethics. All these catchwords (fair trade, organic, free range, food miles etc.) that supposedly convey sensitivity to the environment, to animals, to the developing world are just new ways to buy your way into heaven. Anyone with a serious interest in this would be lobbying to tighten laws on animal cruelty. When we just preach to each other, it turns into the most undignified scramble – who can afford to be the most lovely? Well, you can, Jamie and Hugh. You've got loveliness to burn.

noot 1 sanctimony: schijnheiligheid

## Tekst 8 Jamie's fowl sanctimony

---

- 1p 27 "a hot-button issue" (alinea 1)  
Naar welke specifieke kwestie verwijst dit citaat?
- 1p 28 "Jamie ... us." (paragraph 1)  
What happened after the programme 'Jamie's Fowl Dinners' was broadcast according to paragraph 2?  
A Chicken products sold slightly better than before.  
B Jamie Oliver's popularity decreased enormously.  
C Supermarkets lost some of their customers.  
D Youngsters took up other animal rights issues as well.
- 1p 29 "Immediately, this statement annoys us." (alinea 3)  
Leg uit waar "this statement" naar verwijst door de volgende zin op je antwoordblad aan te vullen: *De bewering dat ...*
- 1p 30 How can the tone of paragraph 4 be characterised?  
A As admiring.  
B As disappointed.  
C As indifferent.  
D As indignant.  
E As matter-of-fact.
- 2p 31 Geef van elk van de volgende beweringen aan of deze wel of niet vast komt te staan op grond van de inhoud van de alinea's 4, 5 en 6.  
1 De aanschaf van organisch, natuurlijk geproduceerd voedsel is voor iedereen haalbaar.  
2 De overheid stelt onvoldoende geld beschikbaar om het lot van dieren te verbeteren.  
3 Er zijn betere manieren om dierenleed te bestrijden dan om van mensen te verlangen dat ze dure producten kopen.  
4 Jamie Oliver is rijk geworden onder andere door inkomsten die verband houden met de goedkope voedselindustrie.  
Noteer het nummer van elke bewering, gevolgd door "wel" of "niet".
- 1p 32 Which of the following is implied in "You've got loveliness to burn."? (last sentence)  
A Affection.  
B Cynicism.  
C Determination.  
D Jealousy.  
E Resignation.