Anti-McDonald's McDavids beat Goliath (Wed 16 Feb)

WARM UPS

CHAT: Talk in pairs or groups about McDonald's / McLibel 2 / David and Goliath / Ellen Brokovitch / healthy hamburgers / Ronald McDonald / We're lovin' it...Change topic / partner frequently to energize the class.

McDONALD'S BRAINSTORM: Spend one minute writing down all of the different words you associate with McDonald's. Share your words with your partner / group and talk about them.

DAVID AND GOLIATH BRAINSTORM: Spend one minute writing down all of the different words or examples you associate with David and Goliath. Share your words with your partner / group and talk about them.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH McDONALD'S?; Talk about these opinions from the famous 'What's wrong with McDonald's leaflet with your partner:

- a. McDonald's try to cultivate an image of being a 'caring' and 'green' company.
- b. Children are lured in (dragging their parents behind them) with the promise of toys and other gimmicks.
- c. McDonald's promote their food as 'nutritious', but the reality is that it is junk food.
- d. Meat is the cause of the majority of food poisoning incidents.
- e. Workers in the fast food industry are paid low wages. McDonald's do not pay overtime rates even when employees work very long hours.
- f. Forests throughout the world vital for all life are being destroyed at an appalling rate.
- g. Every year McDonald's use thousands of tons of unnecessary packaging, most of which ends up littering our streets.
- h. The menus of the burger chains are based on the torture and murder of millions of animals.
- i. Staff turnover at McDonald's is high, making it virtually impossible for workers to unionize and fight for a better deal, which suits McDonald's who have always been opposed to Unions.
- j. Methane emitted by cattle reared for the beef industry is a major contributor to the 'global warming' crisis.
- k. McDonald's only interest is money, making profits from whoever and whatever they can.

THE LEAFLET: Talk about the "What's wrong with McDonald's?" campaign leaflet (http://www.mcspotlight.org/campaigns/current/mckids.html)

PRE READING EXERCISES

WORD SEARCH: Look in your dictionaries, or a search engine, to find collocates, other meanings, information, synonyms ... of the words 'court' and 'case'.

TRUE / FALSE: Predict from the headline whether these statements are true or false:

- a. Two British conservationists won a court case against McDonald's. T/F
- b. The two conservationists' nickname is the McLibel 2. T/F
- c. The McLibel 2 distributed leaflets in London entitled "What's wrong with McDonald's. T/F
- d. McDonald's sued the pair for libel, spending \$10 million on lawyers. T/F
- e. The McLibel 2 were imprisoned for seven years. T / F
- f. It was a huge public relations disaster for McDonald's. T/F
- g. McDonald's served unhealthy food, exploited children, were cruel to animals, and paid low wages. T / F
- h. It is now more difficult to publicly criticize powerful organizations. T/F

SYNONYM MATCH: Match the following synonyms from the article:

(a)	conservationists	prosecuted
(b)	campaigned	infamous
(c)	distributed	financial assistance
(d)	sued	circulated
(e)	legal aid	condemn
(f)	damages	examination
(g)	damn	compensation
(h)	notorious	crusaded

(i)

proceedings

(j) scrutiny actionPHRASE MATCH: Match the following phrases based on the article

(a)	a true case of	the pair for libel
(b)	immoral	launched legal proceedings
(c)	They distributed	responsible for animal cruelty
(d)	The hamburger chain sued	children
(e)	The pair never paid	operating practices

activists

(e) The pair never paid operating practices
(f) exploit David and Goliath

(g) culpably effect

(h) in breach of leaflets in the streets of London

(i) The two conservationists had the right to a fair trial

(j) detrimental a penny

DEFINITIONS: Students match the following words with the **most likely** definitions (Please think about the headline!):

(a) **David and Goliath** (n)

- (i) a hamburger restaurant chain
- (ii) a story about a small person defeating a giant

(b) libel laws (n)

- (i) laws that prevent one person / company saying damaging lies against another
- (ii) laws that require restaurants to sell healthy food

(c) immoral (adj)

- (i) something that everyone knows is bad and unethical
- (ii) the ability to live or be remembered forever

(d) **sued** (v)

- (i) a way of frying old burgers quickly to kill all bacteria
- (ii) took someone to court to win damages, compensation or recover a reputation

(e) damningly (adv)

- (i) to block a river's natural course to create more land for cows to graze
- (ii) very very very strongly condemned someone or something

(f) **nutritional** (adj)

- (i) having a positive number of elements which are good for our health
- (ii) to describe something you are 100% sure something will happen

(g) exploit (v)

- (i) to campaign against something in the streets, usually with leaflets
- (ii) take advantage of people weaker than yourself and use them to make money for yourself

(h) **notorious** (adj)

- (i) something that is very well known, but for negative or bad reasons.
- (ii) the style of speaking in a courtroom

(i) scrutiny (n)

- (i) a disease that originates from eating too many hamburgers
- (ii) very very close examination of something or someone

(j) **detrimental** (adj)

- (i) something that causes harm or injury to someone or something
- (ii) something that creates benefits to someone or something

GAP FILL

Anti-McDonald's McDavids beat Goliath (Wed 16 Feb)

BNE: In a tru	e case of David and	d Goliath, two Br	itish	have wo	on a court case
in the Europe	an Court of Human	Rights against th	ne British go	vernment's	
laws. Helen S	Steel, 39 & Dave M	orris, 50, also kno	own as the N	IcLibel 2, campa	aigned in the
early 1990s a	gainst what they sa	w as McDonald's	s' immoral o	perating practice	es. They
	_ leaflets in the stre	eets of London _		_"What's wrong	g with
McDonald's	– Everything they d	lon't want you to	know". The	y were also awai	rded 35,000
euros (\$45,00	00) between them.				
entitled	distributed	conservation	vists	libel	
The hamburg	er chain sued the pa	air for libel, spend	ding \$10 mil	lion on lawyers.	The McLibel 2
had no money	y for legal represent	tation, and the Br	itish legal sy	stem did not at t	hat time allow
legal aid in li	bel cases. McDonal	d's won the case	and were av	varded \$70,000 i	n damages.
The pair neve	er a	penny of it. It wa	s a huge pub	olic relations disa	aster for
McDonald's.	The presiding judg	e	stated, "Mc	Donald's marketi	ing has
"pretended to	a positive nutrition	nal benefit which	their food (h	iigh in fat & salt	etc) did not
match"; that l	McDonald's "explo	it children" with t	their advertis	sing strategy; are	;
"	responsible for a	animal cruelty"; a	and "pay low	wages, helping	to
	_ wages in the cate				
damningly	depress	paid	culpably		
A McLibel 2	media release decla	ared that "the		and long running	g McLibel case
was in breach	of the right to a fai	ir trial and right to	o freedom o	f expression. The	e two
conservationi	sts had	legal proceed	lings against	the UK government	nent arguing
that the mara	thon 'McLibel trial'	which lasted 313	days - the le	ongest trial of an	y kind in
English legal	history - and UK li	bel laws,	the	European Conve	ntion on
Human Right	s Article 6 (right to	a fair trial) and A	Article 10 (ri	ght to freedom c	of expression)."
The McLibel	2 stated, "We hope	that this will res	ult in greate	public	and
criticism of p	owerful organizatio	ons whose practic	es have a de	trimental effect	on society and
the environm	ent				
scrutiny	notorious	launched	breacl	hed	

DISCUSSION:

- a. What do you think of this article?
- b. Do you like McDonald's?
- c. Is McDonald's a good or bad company?
- d. Do big companies ever lie?
- e. What other David and Goliath cases do you know?
- f. What do you think of the McLibel 2?
- g. What's wrong with McDonald's?
- h. What do you want to know about McDonald's?
- i. Do you believe the stories that often circulate about McDonald's burgers being made of dog meat, or horses feet...?
- j. Does the McDonald's Happy Set and free toy exploit children / parents?
- k. Which multi-national companies do you dislike / hate and why?
- 1. Are there any huge companies you respect?
- m. Do you think McDonald's is a good employer?
- n. McDonald's likes to think of itself as a caring company. Can you think of any good things it has done for the world (except pay its shareholders and executives lots and lots and lots of money)?
- o. Do people have the right to hand out leaflets criticizing a big (or small) company?
- p. If you became an activist, what company would you target and why?
- q. Have you seen the movie *Supersize Me* the one about the guy who eats McDonald's three times a day for a month and then has many health problems?
- r. Teacher / Student additional questions.

HOMEWORK

LETTER TO RONALD: Write a letter to Ronald McDonald asking him for his opinion on various matters.

"WHAT'S WRONG WITH COMPANY X?": Create your own article about a company you believe practices immoral operations. Be careful about leafleting and being taken to court!

INTERNET / WEB LINKS:

McDonald's dot com:

http://www.mcdonalds.com/

The McLibel trial:

http://www.mcspotlight.org/case/

McSpotlight – a web site that keeps an eye on McDs:

http://www.mcspotlight.org/

A list of URLs on the McLibel case:

http://www.spunk.org/library/food/mcdonlds/

A rant against the McLibel 2:

http://www.rru.com/~meo/rants/mcbozo.html

"What's wrong with McDonald's?" – the original leaflet.

http://www.mcspotlight.org/case/pretrial/factsheet.html

"What's wrong with McDonald's?" – a more up-to-date leaflet. http://www.mcspotlight.org/campaigns/translations/trans_uk.html

Take a peek at the wonderful movie Supersize Me:

http://www.supersizeme.com/

FULL TEXT

Anti-McDonald's McDavids beat Goliath (Wed 16 Feb)

BNE: In a true case of David and Goliath, two British **conservationists** have won a court case in the European Court of Human Rights against the British government's **libel** laws. Helen Steel, 39 & Dave Morris, 50, also known as the McLibel 2, campaigned in the early 1990s against what they saw as McDonald's' immoral operating practices. They **distributed** leaflets in the streets of London **entitled** "What's wrong with McDonald's – Everything they don't want you to know". They were also awarded 35,000 euros (\$45,000) between them.

The hamburger chain sued the pair for libel, spending \$10 million on lawyers. The McLibel 2 had no money for legal representation, and the British legal system did not at that time allow legal aid in libel cases. McDonald's won the case and were awarded \$70,000 in damages. The pair never **paid** a penny of it. It was a huge public relations disaster for McDonald's. The presiding judge **damningly** stated, "McDonald's marketing has "pretended to a positive nutritional benefit which their food (high in fat & salt etc) did not match"; that McDonald's "exploit children" with their advertising strategy; are "**culpably** responsible for animal cruelty"; and "pay low wages, helping to **depress** wages in the catering trade."

A McLibel 2 media release declared that "the **notorious** and long running McLibel case was in breach of the right to a fair trial and right to freedom of expression. The two conservationists had **launched** legal proceedings against the UK government arguing that the marathon 'McLibel trial' which lasted 313 days - the longest trial of any kind in English legal history - and UK libel laws, **breached** the European Convention on Human Rights Article 6 (right to a fair trial) and Article 10 (right to freedom of expression)." The McLibel 2 stated, "We hope that this will result in greater public **scrutiny** and criticism of powerful organizations whose practices have a detrimental effect on society and the environment