

AN ETHICAL CRITICISM
OF
INDUSTRIAL ANIMAL FARMS

SEÇİL ARACI

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2010

AN ETHICAL CRITICISM
OF
INDUSTRIAL ANIMAL FARMS

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in Social Sciences
in partial satisfaction of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Philosophy

by
Seçil Aracı

Boğaziçi University

2010

Thesis Abstract

Seçil Aracı, “An Ethical Criticism of Industrial Animal Farms”

This thesis argues that it is impossible to defend the practices of industrial animal farms ethically depending on the principle of “do no harm”. “Do no harm” principle is accepted by many ethical theories and introduces the claim that unnecessary suffering is immoral.

In first chapter of my thesis, it is discussed that animals have the capacity to suffer and it is propounded that preventing this suffering is in the scope of moral arena. In second chapter, the harm caused by the practices of industrial animal farms are examined and it is argued that these practices harm three different groups; the animals, the workers and the consumers. In third chapter, the claim that the industrial animals are necessary for health and economic reasons is disproved and it is discussed that the suffering caused by these farms are unnecessary. Additionally, the negative consequences caused by these farms are presented. In the last chapter, the advantages and disadvantages of industrial animal farms are compared and it is concluded that these practices should be abandoned.

Finally, two solutions offered for abandoning these practices. The radical solution argues that our treatments of animals should be determined by considering animals’ interests and in this respect our perception of animals should change. Depending on this idea, it defends that we should abandon raising animals for food. The practical solution offers abandoning industrial methods and adopting organic and environment friendly solutions.

Tez Özeti

Seçil Aracı, “Sınaî Hayvan Çiftliklerinin Etik Eleştirisi”

Bu tez ‘zarar vermemek’ ilkesine dayanarak, sınaî hayvan çiftliklerinin uygulamalarını etik olarak savunmanın mümkün olmadığını iddia etmektedir. ‘Zarar vermemek’ ilkesi birçok etik teori tarafından kabul edilmektedir ve gereksiz acı çektirmenin ahlaki olmadığı savını öne sürer.

Tezin ilk bölümünde hayvanların da acı çekme kapasitesine sahip olduğu tartışılmakta ve bu acının önlenmesinin de ahlaki sınırlar içinde olduğu öne sürülmektedir. İkinci bölümde sınaî hayvan çiftliklerindeki uygulamaların neden olduğu zararlar incelenmekte ve bu uygulamaların üç farklı gruba, hayvanlara, çalışanlara ve tüketicilere zarar verdiği iddia edilmektedir. Üçüncü bölümde, sınaî hayvan çiftliklerinin sağlık için ve ekonomik nedenlerle gerekli olduğu iddiaları çürütülerek verilen zararın gereksiz olduğu tartışılmaktadır. Ayrıca bu çiftliklerin neden olduğu olumsuz sonuçlar ortaya konulmaktadır. Son bölümde sınaî hayvan çiftliklerindeki uygulamaların avantajları ve dezavantajları kıyaslanarak bu uygulamaların terk edilmesi gerektiği sonucuna ulaşılmaktadır.

Son olarak, bu uygulamaların terk edilmesi için iki çözüm önerilmektedir. Radikal çözüm, hayvanlara karşı davranışımızın onların çıkarları gözetilerek belirlenmesi gerektiğini ve bu bağlamda hayvanları algılayış şeklimizi değiştirmemiz gerektiğini iddia etmektedir. Bu düşünceye dayanarak yiyecek için hayvan yetiştirmeyi terk etmemiz gerektiğini savunmaktadır. Pratik çözüm, sınaî yöntemlerin terk edilmesini ve organik ve çevre dostu yöntemlerin benimsenmesini önermektedir.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my gratitude to Assist. Prof. Karanfil Soyhun for her priceless support, encouragement and guidance from which I have benefited and I will certainly benefit in the future as well. I also want thank to Prof. Berna Kılınç and Asist. Prof. Aliye Kovanlıkaya and Assist. Prof. Chryssi Sidiropoulou for their patience, help and for their constructive criticisms and comments.

I am indebted to my dear friend Aslı Zengin, who never left me alone during my life including the progress of my thesis, without her support and encouragement this project cannot be finished. I am grateful to my dear friends Güldalı Uğurlu and Şafak Timur for their invaluable help and efforts in editing my thesis, without their editing this project would be incomplete. I deeply appreciate the support and encouragement of my home-mate Oya Tezel, who believed in me even in times I did not believe in myself. I also want to thank to Dilek Şentürk, Emre Güney, Eren Bozbaş and Yiğitcan Savran for listening my complaints on hard times and encouraging me.

Special thanks must go to my parents; Muruvvet and Ismail Aracı for supporting me all through my life. Without their support, encouragement and patience I would never start this project. I feel very lucky and grateful for having my elder-sister Sevil Aracı, who has a great influence on me. My life would be meaningless without her and I could succeed on nothing. And finally, I want to thank to Can Soylu for being there with me all this time.

Dedicated to the all animals suffering
due to practices of human beings.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
Animals Suffer as Human Beings Do.....	2
CHAPTER 2: CURRENT POSITION IN INDUSTRIAL ANIMAL FARMS	7
A Close Look at the Situations of Animals in Industrial Animal Farms	8
A Close Look at the Situations of Workers in the Industrial Animal Farms	20
A Close Look at Conditions Which Affect Consumer Health	21
Turkey's Position in Industrial Animal Farming	24
CHAPTER 3: IS THE SUFFERING NECESSARY?	28
The Health Claim	28
The Criticism of Health Claim.....	29
The Economic Need Claim.....	33
The Criticism of the Economic Claim.....	34
The Consequences of Industrial Animal Farming.....	35
CHAPTER 4: WHAT SHOULD WE DO?.....	37
The Radical Solution.....	38
The Practical Solution.....	42
CHAPTER 5: CONCLUSIONS.....	43
REFERENCES	45

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

In this thesis, I will examine the current practices of industrial animal farms and argue that most of these practices violate some of the most basic principles of ethics, most importantly the principle of do no harm.¹ The reason behind my focus on industrial animal farms is twofold: as the statistics I provide will make it clear, the number of animals affected by these farms is far more than those affected by hunting, or scientific experiments. Moreover, the animals in these farms suffer severely throughout their lives, unlike those that are hunted; and I argue that the suffering caused by laboratory experiments can be morally justified in at least some of the experiments.²

Humans made use of animals throughout history; however, twentieth Century has brought about serious technological developments, and new demands. The development of industrial animal farms has often been celebrated as a big achievement for humans because they enable developed countries to produce cheap meat and animal products, hence even the poor of such countries can consume them. The practices of industrial animal farms went unchallenged for a long time because of two claims. The first one is the health claim; based on the idea that animal protein is necessary and highly beneficial for humans, it went unchallenged and was

¹ This is the principle introduces that we should not cause suffering/harm unless the result of the action creates a better condition than the previous one. Depending on this principle we can state that we should not cause unnecessary suffering/harm.

² I do not accept that all scientific experiments done on animals are justified, however, some could be. But, as the second chapter will make it clear, in the case of modern farms it is much more strenuous to justify their practices.

advocated by the medical community for at least 30 years or so. The second one is the economic need claim which states that these farms provide jobs for many people; hence, they provide economically important benefits.

I argue that neither of these two claims can provide sufficient grounds to defend the practices of industrial animal farms. In order to defend the claim that unnecessary suffering is wrong, I will first adopt the principle of do no harm. With the help of this moral principle, I shall introduce and examine two responses to the problem of industrial animal farms. I call the first “the radical solution”, and hopefully the human race will achieve it in the end: We should abandon raising animals for food industry and stop eating foods of animal origin. The second one is more applicable to change our attitudes immediately. We should abandon or seriously revise the practices of the industrial animal farming, adopt organic, environment friendly types of farming practices.³

Animals Suffer as Human Beings Do

Most of us agree that it is immoral to make someone suffer unless it is inevitably necessary for the subject or at least there is a crucial benefit to others which may justify the suffering of the subject.⁴ Here, necessary may mean that the subject of the suffering will be affected positively as a result of the incident. Hence, suffering

³One of the main criticisms which are brought against industrial animals farms is their negative effects to the environment. In organic and environment friendly practices of farming, animals are fed by organic foods; their hormones are not messed by chemicals. Moreover organic and environment friendly farms will not affect the environment negatively.

⁴ It may be difficult to specify this rather intuitive principle, but it is accepted as the main guiding principle of medical ethics. I will not discuss this principle in detail in this thesis but it is accepted by many ethical theories beginning with Aristotle’s wisdom. Ross also includes this principle in the list of *prima facie* obligations. This principle can be also accepted by Kantian and Utilitarian ethics. And finally moral psychologists such as Jonathan Haidth acknowledge this principle as a universal guideline.

through a surgery that will make you healthier can be thought as necessary. Banning smoking in public places can be thought as a crucial benefit for others although it may lead to severe psychological pain for the smokers.

Even though the principle is commonly accepted, its application seems to be restricted to humans. I argue that the principle applies to animals as well as humans. It is immoral to cause unnecessary harm to a baby, an old man, your mother or your pet, or an animal in food industry. Animals have not been considered as morally relevant subjects, for centuries they are seen as objects that are created for us. From an anthropocentric point of view it is deemed that every creature other than human beings is created for the use of human beings and thus we have right to dominate everything either living or non-living things. This idea leads to the view that non-human animals do not possess rights which results in exclusion of non-human animals from moral arena. And this constitutes the foundation to treat animals as if they are out of the scope of the principle of do no harm.

Stating that our responsibilities towards others are defined by our relationship to them, one can argue that our responsibility of not causing or preventing suffering depends on who the suffering subject is. For example, a child's parents are more responsible for caring the child than an unrelated person. This particular matter is important for me; because if the responsibility changes in this manner, it can be concluded that we are not responsible for animal's suffering since we are not related to them. But I think defining the term responsibility of caring according to the relationship to the subject cannot be applied to the responsibility of not causing or preventing suffering. An example may explain this more clearly. It is commonly accepted that parents are responsible for taking care of their child, but in terms of child abuse (we can think this as the incident that cause suffering) our relationship is

no way related with our responsibilities. Being parents or an unrelated person does not change the responsibility of not abusing; and the society becomes responsible to take action to prevent child abuse.

Our responsibility of not causing harm is not defined by who the subject is and our relationship to it; but it can be claimed that our responsibility can change according to the condition of the subject. For example, to cause suffering on a vulnerable subject can be more evil than a strong person, since he/she can resist your action⁵. However, this strengthens my argument rather than weakening it, since in most of our practices that I examine animals are vulnerable and not able to resist.

Throughout history, there were times that humans believed animals have no capacity to suffer; they justified their beliefs with different reasons such as; animals have no soul, God created animals for us to use, they are not rational, they have no feelings. Even Descartes who is called the father of modern philosophy argued that the animals are not different from machines and claimed that they can be separated into parts like a clock; the screams of animals in this process are identical with the mechanical creaks. This idea was used as a justification for many years for treating animals in any way human beings wanted.

I have difficulty to believe how people can argue that animals do not have any feelings, since I think this opinion can easily be confuted by just observing animals in their daily lives. Many people who have pets can tell you how they experience their feelings. But in order to support the idea that animals have capacity to feel pain, anxiety, fear and even happiness and love, I will make some quotations.

⁵ I believe that it is possible to make anybody vulnerable like a child, but I assume the subject is not made vulnerable in these conditions.

The claim that animals have no capacity to feel is often related with the argument that they have no consciousness or awareness. Consciousness and awareness can be seen as a necessary condition to have mental states. In examining animal awareness, David DeGrazia writes:

A human or an animal is aware at a particular time if he or she is having any subjective experiences at that time. Such experiences include all states of consciousness when we are awake and even those confused modes of thinking and feeling known as dream experiences. A closely related concept is that of sentience- the capacity to have feeling. Feelings, in turn, include both felt sensations, such as pain and nausea, and emotional states, such as fear and joy. All sentient beings have states of awareness. For example presumably all sentient animals can feel at least painful and pleasant sensations.

It is important to distinguish awareness from nociception. Nociception, the first event in a sequence that often involves pain, is the detection of potentially noxious, or tissue- damaging, stimuli by specialized neural end-organs –nociceptors- which fire impulses along axons (nerve fibres that serve as path ways.) Such stimuli include cutting, pressure, pricking, heat, cold, inflammation of tissues and muscle spasms. While nociception itself is not a state of awareness or consciousness, it often occurs together with such states, typically pain. With Bernard Rollin, one might think of nociception as ‘the machinery or plumbing of pain’, although atypical cases there can be nociception without pain –as when a severed spinal cord permits a paraplegic to retain a withdrawal reflex but prevents the occurrence of pain, or in an animal under general anesthesia (DeGrazia, 40-42).

In *Animal Liberation*, Peter Singer quotes from Richard Sarjeant who works on pain, in order to justify the fact that non-human animals feel pain as we do:

Every particle of factual evidence supports the contention that the higher mammalian vertebrates experience pain sensations at least as acute as our own. To say that they feel less because they are lower animals is an absurdity; it can easily be shown that many of their senses are far more acute than ours-- visual acuity in certain birds, hearing in most wild animals, and touch in others; these animals depend more than we do today on the sharpest possible awareness of a hostile environment. Apart from the complexity of the cerebral cortex (which does not directly perceive pain) their nervous systems are almost identical to ours and their reactions to pain remarkably similar, though lacking (so far as we know) the philosophical and moral overtones. The emotional element is all too evident, mainly in the form of fear and anger (qtd. in Singer, 14-15).

In virtue of the foregoing quotations, since we can securely assume that animals have capacity to feel pain and can suffer as human beings do; in order to defend industrial animal farming, one should assert; either there is no suffering in industrial animal farming, or there is suffering but it is not unnecessary. In the ongoing two chapters I will give evidence to prove that many animals suffer because of factory farming, and this suffering is unnecessary.

CHAPTER 2

CURRENT POSITION IN INDUSTRIAL ANIMAL FARMS

At commercials we see very happy cows rambling on green grass, free chickens living a happy life. Also in juvenile books and in any other media they are pictured as having a wonderful life, and we are told that they desire badly to become dinner at our tables. We barely see or read about how they live actually. Most of the people believe that it is a natural and not a very bad end for an animal to be killed for its meat after having a happy life. Even if we did not contemplate on this, we believe that the hens fed for their eggs and cows fed for their milk have no trouble, moreover it is a good thing for them since they are taken care by human beings as the pets are done. The picture that we have is far from the reality. On today's factory farms animals are squeezed into windowless sheds, wire cages, gestation crates. These animals live miserable lives in cruel conditions until the day they are loaded onto trucks bound for slaughter. In this chapter I will try to provide a close look into industrial animal farms and try to illustrate the reality behind marketing lies.

Farmed animal issues are closely investigated by many organizations such as Animal Place, Animal Welfare Institute, Animal Welfare Trust, Farm Sanctuary, The Glaser Progress Foundation, The Human Society of the United States, People for the Ethical Treatment of the Animals. In this chapter, I argue that industrial animal farms make harm to three different groups: animals, workers, and consumers. After giving exhaustive surveys on these three groups, we also examine the position of Turkey.

A Close Look at the Situations of Animals in Industrial Animal Farms

Industrial animal farms produce diverse types of food of animal origin. Poultry, meat, dairy and fish industries are the main constituents of this big market. Fur industry is another big market where the situation is slightly different since animals are killed not for food, but instead for fashion. However, suffering remains in fur industry. Below I give statistics and a detailed view of the practices in each industry.

Poultry Industry

Chickens are curious animals which are as intelligent as mammals like cats and dogs (Grimes). In fact, the intelligence and adaptability of chickens enable them to endure factory farming because, unlike most birds, baby chickens can survive without their mothers and without the comfort of a proper nest. Unfortunately, more than 9 billion chickens raised on factory farms each year in the U.S. never have the chance to do anything natural where they can use their intelligence and sociality (Pacelle).

Statistics about chicken meat and egg productions can be seen in Table 1 and Table 2.

Table 1. Chicken Meat Production Statistics by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2005

World Rank	Country	Amount of chicken meat in metric tons
1	United States of America	16,030,000
2	Brazil	8,668,500
3	Mexico	2,220,520
4	India	1,901,406
5	United Kingdom	1,315,000
6	Spain	1,307,000
7	Indonesia	1,243,975
8	Japan	1,237,796
9	France	1,165,000
10	Russia	1,115,840

Table 2. Hen Eggs Production Statistics by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2005

World Rank	Country	Amount of eggs in metric tons
1	China	24,348,250
2	United States of America	5,329,600
3	India	2,492,000
4	Japan	2,465,000
5	Russia	2,054,000
6	Mexico	1,906,476
7	Brazil	1,560,000
8	France	1,045,000
9	Indonesia	876,000
10	Turkey	830,000

As it can be seen from the statistics, an incredibly big amount of chicken meat and eggs are produced on animal farms all around the world. Below is a summary of treatments that chickens encounter on those farms:

- Chickens raised for their flesh, called “broilers” by the chicken industry, spend their entire lives in dirty sheds with tens of thousands of other birds, where intense confinement causes outbreaks of disease. They are bred and forced to grow large so quickly that their legs and organs can’t tolerate, ending up with heart attacks, organ failure, and crippled legs (“Chicken Used for Food”).
- Chickens exploited for their eggs, called “laying hens” by the chicken industry, are squeezed in wire cages where they don’t even have enough space to spread a single wing. The cages are stacked on top of each other, and the excrement from chickens in the higher cages constantly falls on those below. The birds have part of their sensitive beaks cut off without any painkillers so that they won’t be able to peck and harm each other in a frustration caused by the unnatural confinement.⁶ A sudden decrease in food consumption is observed after this process, that scientist assume that the reason behind this decrease is the pain in beaks (“Chicken Used for Food”).
- In wire cages, in fact eggs are not laid; they are manufactured in a proper factory which their eggs are collected whenever the chickens blurt. Because naturally chickens do not lay eggs at a rate which would satisfy the market, their bodies are manipulated and forced to produce an abnormal number of eggs, which means more than 250 eggs per year. Gloomy electric lights are kept on for 16 or 17 hours a day, artificially stimulating the chickens' biological rhythms of

⁶ Poultry Research Institute advises trimming beak at the 6th week in order to prevent cannibalism.

reproduction (“What is an Egg Factory Like?”).

- Because the male chicks cannot lay eggs and are not bred for their flesh for the meat industry, they are killed. Every year, more than 100 million of these young birds are buried alive or tossed into bags to suffocate (“Chicken Used for Food”).
- Chickens are taken to the slaughterhouse in crates stacked on the backs of open trucks. On the way the birds are not protected from weather conditions, and some of them are expected to die before they reach the slaughterhouse. They freeze to death in winter, or die from heat stress and suffocation in summer. It is still cheaper for the industry to transport the birds in open crates without adequate protection, despite high mortality rates (“Factory Poultry Production”).
- Because chickens have no federal legal protection (birds are exempt from the Humane Methods of Slaughter Act which requires that animals should be stunned before they are slaughtered), most are still conscious when their throats are cut open and they are dipped in boiling water to remove the feathers (“Factory Poultry Production”).
- Forced molting is one of the most terrible practices in poultry industry. It deprives birds of food and water for up to three weeks as a way to stimulate egg-laying in hens whose bodies are already drawn (“What is an Egg Factory Like?”).
- Forced molting is a final move to exploit hens before they become "worthless" egg-laying machines, in which case they're slaughtered for low-grade meat (“What is an Egg Factory Like?”).

Meat Industry

Principal actors of worldwide meat industry are cattle (or cows), pigs and sheep. Cows are generally very intelligent animals that have good memories and can remember things for a long time. Scientists have found that cows have complex social interactions, developing friendships over time, even choosing their leaders based upon intelligence (Leake). They have complex emotions as well and even have the capacity to worry about future (Viegas). Similarly, pigs are very intelligent animals considered smarter than 3-year-old human children. It is surprising to learn that they dream, recognize their names, enjoy listening to music, playing with soccer balls, and getting massages like humans (qtd. in Castello, 94). Finally, sheep rank just below the pig, even at the same level with cattle in cleverness (Embar).

Before going into details of treatments to the meat industry animals on factory farms, in Table 3, Table 4 and Table 5 we give some statistics about the top countries that constitute immense meat production in the world.

Table 3. Cattle Meat Production Statistics by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2005

World Rank	Country	Amount of cattle meat in metric tons
1	United States of America	11,140,000
2	Brazil	7,778,574
3	Argentina	3,024,386
4	Australia	2,150,000
5	Russia	1,915,323
6	France	1,738,000
7	Mexico	1,630,000
8	Canada	1,590,000
9	India	1,493,008
10	Germany	1,230,000

Table 4. Pig Meat Production Statistics by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2005

World Rank	Country	Amount of pig meat in metric tons
1	United States of America	9,065,000
2	Germany	4,275,000
3	Spain	3,340,000
4	Brazil	3,110,370
5	Canada	2,329,800
6	France	2,259,000
7	Vietnam	2,098,782
8	Poland	1,915,000
9	Denmark	1,869,000
10	Netherlands	1,697,250

Table 5. Sheep Meat Production Statistics by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2005

World Rank	Country	Amount of sheep meat in metric tons
1	Australia	667,000
2	New Zealand	509,059
3	Iran	390,005
4	United Kingdom	314,000
5	Turkey	272,123
6	Syria	244,168
7	India	238,850
8	Spain	234,000
9	Sudan	182,000
10	Pakistan	166,000

While the statistics show that production of cattle and pork meat is far beyond the production of sheep meat, sheep meat industry still has a significant size with millions of sheep being killed each year. Below is the current situation of the practices in meat industry:

- Young cows are burned with hot irons (a very primitive way of branding), their testicles are ripped out of their scrotums (castration), and their horns are cut or burned off - all without painkillers (“Cows Used for Food”).
- Once cattle have grown big enough, they are sent to massive feedlots to be fattened for slaughter or to dairy farms, where they will be repeatedly made pregnant and separated from their babies until their bodies yield and they are sent to die (“Cows Used for Food”).
- Most beef cattle spend the last few months of their lives at feedlots, crowded by

the thousands where each is imprisoned in a very small space so that they cannot even turn around. The air is thick with harmful bacteria and particles, and the animals always face the risk for respiratory disease. Feedlot cattle are routinely implanted with growth-promoting hormones, and they are given unnatural rich diets designed to fatten them quickly (“Factory Beef Production”).

- Numerous cattle are put onto single trucks or trains and they are exposed to a journey of up to forty-eight hours during which they are deprived of water and food (Knowles). Consequently, all of them lose weight and many face dehydration. Moreover they confront the extremes of heat and cold, which makes some of them die before they are delivered to the slaughterhouse (“Factory Beef Production”).
- Prior to being hung up by their back legs and bled to death, cattle are supposed to be made unconscious, as enforced by the federal Humane Slaughter Act. This 'stunning' is usually done by a mechanical blow to the head. However, the procedure is unfortunately very imprecise, and inadequate stunning is common. As a result, conscious animals are often hung upside down, kicking and struggling, while a slaughterhouse worker makes another attempt to make them unconscious. Eventually, the animals will be "stuck" in the throat with a knife, and blood will gush from their bodies whether or not they are unconscious (“Factory Beef Production”).
- As in cattle’s case, similar issues like transportation conditions, forced impregnation, little space in cages and improper stunning also apply to the pigs (“Pigs Used for Food”).
- According to industry reports, 170,000 pigs die in transport each year, and an additional 420,000 are crippled by the time they are brought to the

slaughterhouse (Vansickle). Many are still fully conscious when they are immersed in boiling water for hair removal.

Dairy Industry

Cows produce milk for the same reason that humans do: to nourish their babies. Every year, the cows are artificially fertilized by the farmers in order to force the animals to continue giving milk. The babies are generally taken from their mothers within a day of being born - males are destined for veal crates, and females are sentenced to the same fate as their mothers: “milk production machines”. According to statistics 9 million cows live on dairy farms in the United States (United States Department of Agriculture, Milk). Furthermore, in Table 6 I give some statistics about the top countries that constitute milk production most in the world.

Table 6. Cow Milk Production Statistics by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, 2005

World Rank	Country	Amount of cow milk in metric tons
1	United States of America	80,150,000
2	India	38,500,000
3	Russia	30,600,000
4	Germany	27,600,000
5	France	25,282,000
6	China	24,530,080
7	Brazil	23,320,000
8	New Zealand	14,625,000
9	United Kingdom	14,577,000
10	Ukraine	13,484,500

Below is the current situation in the practices in dairy industry:

- With genetic manipulation and recent production technologies, it is common for modern dairy cows to produce 45 kilograms of milk a day — ten times more than they would produce naturally (“Factory Dairy Production”). Unavoidably, the cows' bodies are under constant stress.
- Mother cows on dairy farms can often be seen searching and calling for their calves even long after they have been separated. They have strong maternity feelings like humans and many other animals (“Factory Dairy Production”).
- A cow’s natural lifespan is 25 years, but cows used in dairy industry are killed after just four or five years (“Factory Dairy Production”). By the time they are killed, nearly 40 percent of dairy cows are crippled because of the filth, intensive confinement, and the strain of constantly being pregnant and giving milk (Roeber).

Fish and Fur Industry

The premises are different for fish and fur industry, but inevitably they also suffer.

Thus, I want to include also these two industries in my thesis.

Fish farming, also called “aquaculture”, has become a billion-dollar industry, and more than 30 percent of all sea animals consumed each year is now raised on these farms. The United Nations’ Food and Agriculture Organization reports that the fish industry is growing three times faster than land-based animal industry and fish farms will certainly become even more widespread as our natural fisheries get exhausted.

Some facts about the practices in fish industry are given below:

- Fish on farms spend their entire lives in cramped, dirty enclosures, constantly bumping against each other without being able to swim. Many suffer from

parasitic infections, diseases, and weakening injuries. Conditions in some farms are so terrible that 40 percent of the fish may die before farmers kill and process them for food (“Aquafarming”).

- Many land-based aqua farms are indoors, so farmers control the amount of light that fish get (“Aquafarming”).
- The capacity of fish to feel pain and distress is given so little consideration that in some restaurants, fish are even eaten alive (“Factory Seafood Production”).
- Lobsters can make distinctions about their environments, have memories, and certainly their nerve system can produce pain. However, like the other animals also lobsters do not receive humane consideration. They are typically cooked alive by boiling. Ignorant treatments result in their death due to starvation, dehydration, heat, or fights with other lobsters (“Lobsters and Crabs”).

On the other hand considering fur industry, it is evident that hunting is an expensive way of producing fur. Hence, more than 50 million animals worldwide, including raccoon dogs, rabbits, foxes, mink, and chinchillas, are raised in cages and killed each year for their fur which is produced just for fashion while the fake ones or other types of winter clothes ensure the same functionality to keep people warm (“Infurmentation”).

Table 7 provides the number of animals required to manufacture a fur coat:

Table 7. Statistics about Fur Coat Production

Animal name	Number of animals needed to make a fur coat
Lynx	12-15
Wolf or coyote	10-15
Fox	15-20
Mink	60-80
Raccoon	27-30
Beaver	10-12
Squirrel	60-100

Some facts about the practices in fur industry are given below:

- Not only are cage-raised animals killed inhumanely, but they suffer from numerous physical and behavioral abnormalities induced by the stress of cramped cage conditions. After spending their short lives in such conditions, animals raised on fur farms are killed by cruel methods that ensure the preservation of the pelt, such as gassing, neck-breaking and anal electrocution. Their fur is taken out when they are still alive (“Infurmentation”).
- A 1998 investigation by The Humane Society of the United States (HSUS) revealed the international fur industry's big secret: the widespread slaughter of domestic dogs and cats for the manufacture of clothing. Investigators witnessed the slaughter of domestic dogs and cats in China and other Asian countries. Many of these animals are raised in cold and in unhealthy breeding places. Some are strays. Others are obviously pets who were most likely stolen. And the killing methods are terrifying. Dogs are hit with a club, skinned out and bled to death. Cats are often suffocated with wire ropes (“Infurmentation”).

- Since production of full fur clothes draws significant reaction of many organizations that support animal rights, recently the new trend is to produce fur decoration for clothes such as collars and glove linings where use of fur is limited to smaller details compared to a full cloth. Fur decoration is totally luxurious and responsible for the death of millions of animals each year. The number of animals killed for fur decoration is expected to supersede the number of animals killed for full-fur clothes (“Infurmentation”).

A Close Look at the Situations of Workers in the Industrial Animal Farms

Large scale factory farms tend to bypass the local economy of family farms, buying their inputs and marketing their products largely outside of the community.

Industrialized farming also refuses the traditional sense of community where people share values, interests and work. Far from creating healthy, sustainable employment, these places have a tendency to create unsafe, low-paying jobs (“Factory Farming Economy”). The research carried out in the United States reveals the violations of workers’ rights in industrial animal farms (Compa). Hard conditions that workers face in beef, pork and poultry industries can be itemized as follows:

- Working with a nonstop flow of animals and birds arriving on killing floors and live hanging areas is itself hazardous and an exhausting job. After slaughter, the dead bodies are thrown for evisceration on assembly lines as workers hurriedly saw and cut them at an incredible pace.
- Meatpacking has extraordinarily high rates of injury. Workers injured during this process may then be dismissed.
- Workers jeopardize their jobs when they exercise their rights to organize and

- bargain collectively in an attempt to improve their working conditions.
- Immigrant workers - an increasing percentage of the workforce in this industry - are even at more risk. The problem of language makes them unaware of their legal rights and of job hazards. Moreover, undocumented immigrant workers (they are many) are faced with dismissal if they seek to organize in trade unions.
 - Meat and poultry industry has also profound psychological effects on workers since it is morally disturbing to bring live animals to death in very bad factory conditions.

A Close Look at Conditions Which Affect Consumer Health

There are two main issues regarding the effect of the consumption of food of animal origin: the potential risks and diseases that arise due to the bad conditions in animal farms, and the harms of a carnivorous diet regardless of industrial realities.

Considering the first issue, as it is obvious from the previous sections, animal factory conditions are far from being sanitary. This inevitably ends up with low quality food products. Below is a list of possible situations that might occur due to the consumption of animal factory food:

- Humane Society of The United States in a report states that chickens, pigs, and cattle are fed by the U.S. meat industry with medically significant antibiotics in order to prevent diseases in stressful and unhygienic conditions in animal farms (“An HSUS Report”). A strong scientific consensus asserts that this practice raises antibiotic resistance in bacteria that is harmful for human health. Confronting with this public health threat, the European Union

has banned the non-therapeutic feeding of a number of antibiotics of human importance to farm animals. However, this practice is still legal in the United States.

- In the study dated 1996, DeWaal states that, two bacteria, Salmonella and Campylobacter, cause 80% of the illnesses and 75% of the deaths associated with meat and poultry products. They cost consumers nearly \$3.5 billion each year in the form of lost wages and medical expenses.⁷ Consumers also suffer from illnesses at different levels ranging from mild to severe that might result in death. Despite high rates of food poisoning from Salmonella and Campylobacter, the poultry industry continues processing practices that actually increase the percentage of contaminated products.⁸
- In recent years swine and avian flues have been rampant widely and have endangered human life in a serious manner. The fact sheet published by Farm Sanctuary states that such diseases are mainly due to the ignorant technological shortcuts in meat, poultry, and dairy and egg industries.
- Fish and shellfish often accumulate extremely high levels of toxins in their flesh (as much as 9 million times that of the water in which they live) such as PCB's, dioxins, mercury, lead, and arsenic, which can endanger consumer's health severely in many ways such as kidney damage and impaired mental development, cancer and even death ("Lobster Liberation").

⁷ The statistical information that is quoted from the study of DeWaal is cited from the following source: United States Department of Agriculture, "Pathogen Reduction; Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) Systems; Proposed Rule, 9 CFR Part 308, et al." *Federal Register* 60.23 (1995): 6781.

⁸ At 18 September 2010 newspapers reported that The Ministry of Agriculture denounced to Attorney General's Office of Gebze for the 164 thousand of salmonella and listeria contaminated burger that Burger King bought from TT Food Corporation. The newspapers also stated that it is suspected that the burgers are sold in the market ("Korkunc Suphe").

Considering the second issue, there have been different views of the healthiness of the food of animal origin. In medical research community there are many doctors stating that meat consumption is essential for human health. However, as it will be discussed in detail in Chapter 3, we suspect the correctness of this claim. It is possible to think that as Nestle claims, the food industry has a remarkable influence on our national nutrition policies⁹ (Nestle 1-5).

On the other hand, there are important authorities such as American Dietetic Association and Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine who advises a vegetarian diet for a healthy life (Craig and Mangels) (“The Protein Myth”). Vegetarian diets are lower in saturated fat and cholesterol, and have higher levels of dietary fiber, magnesium and potassium, vitamins C and E, folate, carotenoids, flavonoids and other phytochemicals. Moreover many statistics suggest that excessive animal protein intake is linked with osteoporosis, kidney disease, calcium stones in the urinary tract and some cancers. It is clear that vegetarians and vegans¹⁰ tend to have more optimal protein consumption than omnivores (Berning and Steen).

⁹ We know that the investigations on cancer were influenced by profit groups for a long time. Even if it does not enable us to conclude that all the assertions which support industry is influenced by profit groups, this experience at least provides us a reason not to accept any assertions made by medical community without thinking. This issue will be discussed in ‘The Criticism of Health Claim’ section.

¹⁰ There are different types of vegetarianism: Vegans are strict vegetarians who do not eat meat of any kind, eggs, dairy products, or even do not consume processed foods containing any animal-derived ingredients such as gelatin. Fruitarians eat only fresh fruits. The people who do not eat any type of flesh and eggs but consume milk called lacto vegetarians. The people who do not eat any type of flesh but consume egg called ovo vegetarians. The lacto-ovo vegetarians consume both milk and eggs, but not animal flesh. Pescatarians are those who refrain from eating all types of meat with the exception of fish. Flexitarians are those who mostly stick to a vegetarian diet but occasionally eat meat. Pollo-Vegetarians eat poultry, such as chicken, turkey, and duck but no other type of animal flesh and meat.

Turkey's Position in Industrial Animal Farming

There are not enough studies that show the situation of factory farming in Turkey but I think it is not unreasonable to expect the situation of factory farming is more or less similar with other countries. From the data I will provide and the news in Turkish media, we can estimate that Turkey is in the middle of a transition and will change its farming methods in order to produce cheaper food. Today there are still classical farmers together with the factory farming. If we examine the sectors we can see that the poultry industry turned to factory farming following other countries' applications. In milk industry, the factories collect milk from small enterprises, but they use their own veterinarians to increase the amount of milk using the same techniques which are used in factory farming like feeding cows with grains, using hormones, separation of the juvenile from mother and impregnating the cow every year. Turkish slaughter houses do not differ from any other slaughter houses, they use assembly lines. Moreover for Islamic slaughtering, the cow should be conscious, so we can expect that the conditions are even worse in Turkey. There are also no studies that show the transportation conditions of animals to slaughterhouses but one can often see animals being transported on interurban roads which lead me to conclude that conditions are not better than the examples that I give in this chapter.

For evaluating the situation in Turkey, we should have a look at the statistics of animal products. While for cattle and sheep meat production, there is enough information provided for the years 2007-2009 by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK), for poultry and dairy industries I had to use the former statistics (years 2003-2005)

provided by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations due to the lack of national resources.

Table 8 and Table 9 provide statistics about the amount of chicken meat and eggs produced in Turkey. It is evident that there is a stable, excessive production for both foods, which also verifies that Turkey has totally switched to industrial animal farming in poultry industry. Moreover the regulations enforced by Poultry Research Institute (TAE) also reveal the practice of industrial animal farming in chicken meat and egg production.



Figure 1. Variation of Meadow Area (in million ha)(y-axis) in Turkey with Respect to the Years (x-axis)

On the other hand, there is an insignificant decrease in cattle and ovine meat production (Table 10 and Table 11), which might be explained on two grounds. First is the economical welfare of the people in Turkey is getting worse to afford increasing prices of meat. Second, it might be a transition period from small-size local farming of cattle and ovine to industrial farming. Figure 1 shows the continuous decrease in the total area of meadow for natural animal farming. This statistic also supports the transition period that there will not be enough field for natural farming of sheep and cow and eventually in near future industrial animal farming will be inevitable.

Table 8. Chicken Meat Production Statistics in Turkey by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Year	Amount of chicken meat in metric tons
2003	875,600
2004	880,795
2005	943,994

Table 9. Hen Eggs Production Statistics in Turkey by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Year	Amount of hen eggs in metric tons
2003	791,674
2004	770,000
2005	830,000

Table 10. Cattle Meat Production Statistics in Turkey by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK)

Year	Number of animals	Amount of cattle meat in metric tons
2007	2,013,523	433,952
2008	1,743,358	371,952
2009	1,506,930	326,293

Table 11. Ovine (Sheep and Goat) Meat Production Statistics in Turkey by Turkish Statistical Institute (TUIK)

Year	Number of animals	Amount of ovine meat in metric tons
2007	7,685,214	141,659
2008	6,184,028	110,491
2009	4,603,390	86,309

Table 12. Cow Milk Production Statistics in Turkey by Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Year	Amount of cow milk in metric tons
2003	9,514,318
2004	9,609,325
2005	9,500,000

In general neither for meat industry nor for dairy industry (Table 12) there are enough informative resources in Turkey. However the statements of TUSIAD and Yoruk support the claim that in meat and dairy industries we are in a transition phase for the fully industrial animal farms. In these resources Turkey is criticized for not following the international industrial animal farming standards imposed by World Trade Organization and European Union.

There are also studies that refer to the insufficient conditions in animal farms in Turkey. While Duru and Sahin refer to the bad practices in meat and poultry industry like the ones in international area, Ilgar focuses more on the geographical distribution of violations of animal rights in Turkey including fish and fur industry.

CHAPTER 3

IS THE SUFFERING NECESSARY?

Humans made use of animals throughout history; however, the twentieth century has brought about serious technological developments, and new demands. The development of industrial animal farms has often been celebrated as a big achievement for humans. For it enabled developed countries to produce cheap meat and animal products, hence their extensive consumption became possible even by the poor of such countries. The practices of industrial animal farms went unchallenged for a long time because of two claims;

- The health claim; that animal protein is necessary and highly beneficial for humans. This argument went unchallenged for at least 30 years or so by the medical community.
- The claim of economic need that such farms provide jobs for many people; hence, they are economically an important benefit.

I think if we prove these claims are not true, we can conclude the suffering caused by industrial animal farms is unnecessary. So let us examine these claims:

The Health Claim

Many people believe that eating animal originated food is the only way of getting protein. Protein is an essential component of the body. It is also essential for muscles and connective tissue nutrition, survival and repair of muscles and regulation of the human body's water balance. It maintains production of hormones and enzymes and it is the host for immune system to work properly. For many years medical

community also defended that animal protein is healthy and beneficial for human body, regardless of paying attention to the consumed amounts.

People often claim that you cannot take enough protein without consuming animal originated food. It is said that human body cannot synthesize all the amino acids which is needed; hence in order to not to live deficiency you have to take it by consuming animal flesh.

This argument also claims that vegetarian diet lacks vitamin B-12, which is highly essential for humans but cannot be synthesized by human body. Vitamin B-12, so called cobalamin, is a water soluble vitamin with a key role in the normal functioning of the brain and nerve system and for the formation of blood. Generally it is taken into body by meat, dairy products and egg consuming. This is the main reason behind the claim that vegan diet is unhealthy.

The Criticism of Health Claim

Is It Really Healthy?

For many years it is believed that consuming animal protein is necessary and highly beneficial for humans. But today medical community argues about diseases caused by consuming high amounts of animal protein. Although the entire medical community do not agree on vegetarian diet's being healthier, nowadays it is highly accepted that consuming high amounts of animal origin food is harmful rather than being beneficial. It is argued that many diseases that people suffer in developed countries such as heart disease, diabetes, obesity, strokes, and several types of cancer are related by consuming too much animal originated protein. Physicians Committee

for Responsible Medicine (PCRM) will air a provocative fast-food commercial during The Daily Show and local news broadcasts 16 September 2010 with the goal of drawing Washingtonians' attention to the city's high rates of heart disease deaths and its high density of fast-food restaurants (Honawar).

Each year medical authorities publish report on cholesterol, high blood pressure and osteoporosis. Over-consumption of dietary protein and animal oil are usually counted as a cause for those diseases. Most of the cardiologists advise low protein diets to their patients.

Not only heart diseases, but also osteoporosis is related to high protein diets. Excessive consumption of protein causes calcium to be taken from the bones and excreted in the urine in osteoporosis (Dawson-Hughes and Harris). Blood draws calcium from bones after consumption of big amount of protein. When a woman fed with a meal high in animal protein, in the next few hours, large quantities of calcium mineral is disposed by urine. After a meal rich in vegetable products, the quantity of the calcium mineral disposed by urine is smaller.

Cholesterol is the principal sterol synthesized by animals. Although cholesterol is an important and necessary molecule for animals, a high level of serum cholesterol is an indicator for diseases such as heart disease. Animal fats are complex mixtures of triglycerides, with lesser amounts of phospholipids and cholesterol. As a consequence, all foods containing animal fat contain cholesterol to varying extents (Christie). Major dietary sources of cholesterol include cheese, egg yolks, beef, pork, poultry and shrimp (United States Department of Agriculture, National). This is the reason that cardiologists advise their patients to consume a vegetable based diet.

The health claim that you need to consume animal flesh is also open to discussion. Some authorities assert that it is possible to synthesize all amino acids

with consuming crops and legumes at the same time. For example eating beans with rice or peanut with bread will be sufficient to synthesize amino acids you need. The health claim also blames vegetarian diet by lacking vitamin B-12. But this vitamin also can be taken without consuming meat, dairy products or eggs. Vitamin-B12 can be synthesized by the microalgae named spirulina. The algae are a large and diverse group of simple, typically autotrophic organisms, ranging from unicellular to multi-cellular forms and have no sophisticated nervous system, therefore they don't suffer. Spirulina has often been mentioned as source of vitamin B-12. Spirulina Pacifica is a spray-dried powder or tablet produced from the bacterial microalgae, Spirulina platensis. Spirulina has also been consumed for centuries as a major source of nutrition and protein by the Kanembu people who live along the shores of Lake Chad in Africa (Lorenz). The health claim that vegetarian diet lacks vitamin B-12 can be easily overcome by consuming Algae pills prepared under conditions of laboratories.

We Are Abusing the Industrialization

Even if medical authorities do not agree to abandon food of animal origin we can say that we consume too much comparing the amounts that we take before industrialization of farms. Humans lived well for a long time with much less intake of these proteins till the industrialization. It is very difficult to find proper statistics on how much animal protein was taken many years ago, but I think we can assume that it was less than today since it was impossible to produce too much food of animal in classical farming methods. For example, one chicken lays eggs every other day in natural conditions, and it was impossible to raise chickens in very crowded

coopes, since they hurt each other when the cope became too crowded.¹¹ The industrialization enabled to raise chicken in crowded cages with the solution of trimming, and increased the number of eggs laid per day by messing their hormones. The amount of dairy products and meat were also less than the amount which is produced today. These amounts are increased with similar methods. These methods are briefly mentioned in Chapter 2. So we can conclude that the developed countries with the high consumption of food of animal origin are obviously abusing the industrialization process with consuming more than they need.

The Food Produced by This Method is not Healthy

The food that is produced by intensive methods is not healthy. The hormones of animals are manipulated and it is highly possible the chemicals will affect the consumer. The farmers use antibiotics routinely in order to prevent diseases in these very crowded and unhealthy situations. The consumer of the products also takes these antibiotics which were taken by the animal. Another problem with these products is they are produced by animals in stress, it is also argued that when we consume these products we get the chemicals formed due to stress. Someone can say their lifetime stress will not affect the meat when they are slaughtered, but the slaughter houses are also cause of stress. The animals hear the screams of other animals, smell the blood, and get stress right before they are slaughtered. So it is not absurd to think that we consume the chemicals produced due the stress while

¹¹ This is a result of their limited memory, in natural habitat they have a pecking order; one chicken has the ability to remember the order of 30 chickens. When the number in one cope is transcended, chaos emerges. And they hurt each other through fights.

consuming meat. Vegetarians often mention that they become more peaceful when they quit eating meat; I think not consuming stressed food can be a reason behind this transformation.

The Vegetarian Cultures

We can give many examples from historical figures that had lived a long and healthy life as a vegetarian; Leonardo Da Vinci, Tolstoy and Einstein are some of them. But of course such examples cannot provide enough evidence for any general claim; however, vegetarianism is very common in some cultures, such as Hindus and they seem to have long and healthy lives. Although pure vegetarianism's health benefits is still debated by nutritionist, I think in the light of all the dangers of industrially produced animal food, and the examples of the cultures such as Hindus make it reasonable to hold that a vegetarian lifestyle is a healthy one.

The Economic Need Claim

One of the main arguments presented in defending industrial farms is; they are necessary; hence they provide jobs for many people; economically they are an important benefit source. It is a reality that today many people's job is somehow connected to these industries. If we abandon this type of production, this will affect many people.

The Criticism of the Economic Claim

It is true that there are many people working in this sector. However, it is possible to say that the majority of these people actually work in food preparation sector. What kind of food they prepare would not affect whether they lose their jobs or not. The humans will still need to eat other things instead of meat, which needs to be produced and prepared for consumption even we abandon intensive production of animal farming. If we adopt organic and environment friendly farming methods, we will need more people to take care of animals than the people work in industrial farms.

I do not think abandoning industrial farms will create an unsolvable problem in terms of unemployment, since we can transact people's job to produce and prepare other types of food. But even if abandoning farms will be harmful for some people who work in this sector, we can assume that the damage will be for one time; which is better than a continuous harm which is examined in chapter two: Suffering of animals, and the damage against people who works in this sector without any protection. As it is mentioned in Chapter 2, the working conditions of the workers are very dangerous and adverse from many aspects.

Furthermore I think it is impossible to defend ethically a type of sector by saying that it provides jobs for many people. To give a radical example, white slave trade or drug business also enable many people to gain money through kidnapping, illegal transportation and selling of women or producing, transporting and selling drugs. But I think most of us will not defend these sectors on the basis that they

produce employment. The defender of the industrial animal farms may still argue that these examples are not appropriate since in aforementioned sectors, people are forced to do things without their freewill, and also people are harmed by these sectors. But similarly, in the industrial animal farms animals forced and manipulated to do things without their consent and both animals and people harmed by the practices of these sectors. The only thing that differentiates the situation is that the subject suffers from the practices mostly is animals, not humans. But as I argued earlier, as long as there is suffering, there is no sufficient reason to exclude animals from moral arena. Hence, I argue that the industrial animal farming cannot be defended ethically, with the claim of economic benefits.

The Consequences of Industrial Animal Farming

Although it is not the issue of this thesis, I want to mention briefly some consequences and side effects of intensive animal farming, since they constitute strongly proper reasons to quit current farming methods:

- 70 percent of planted grains all over the world are used to raise animals. We can solve the hunger problem if we use grains for human instead of animals (“Animals Used for Food”).
- Using animals as food is an extremely uneconomic way of using sources since it takes up to 16 pounds of grain to produce just 1 pound of edible animal flesh. Although in modern farming animals are not let to even move in order to make them to gain more weight, some energy is used by basal metabolism. Also the parts that we cannot use such as vessels, bones, nerves form a very big portion which is wasted (“Factory Farming”).

- 15.500 liter water is used to produce 1 kg of beef (“Factory Farming”).
- The cost of raising animals for consumption is highly destructive for our world. The animal farms are the most important reason of global warming as they producing 18 percent of greenhouse gases (Meat the Truth). It is even more destructive than automotive industry.
- The rain forests are damaged in order to grow crops for farm factories.
- Farm factories pollute air and water for many miles in every direction, often spreading contamination and diseases to people who live and work nearby (“Factory Farming”).

CHAPTER 4

WHAT SHOULD WE DO?

In previous chapters we examined the cruel conditions in animal farms and the necessity of these farms for humans. To conclude briefly, the only advantage of industrial animal farms is mass production. It provides more profit for the producer and offers many jobs, while the consumers can buy higher amounts of cheaper products. However these advantages bring along many problems: Industrial animal farms damage animals, workers and consumers. Animals in factory farms live under cruel conditions throughout their lives. The conditions are extremely hard for workers as well that are employed in these farms and slaughterhouses. The food that is produced is of low quality, causing diseases like avian flu, swine flu, salmonella etc. Excessive consumption of these products also induces health problems such as heart diseases, cholesterol, etc. Besides, while people in developed countries consume excessive amount of meat, in other parts of the world people struggle with hunger. It is not a rational way to use world's limited sources in that way. And lastly, these industries are very harmful for environment; they pollute the world, the fresh waterways, which is very dangerous for future generations.

I think this examination provides us the necessary information to decide whether these practices in intensive methods of farming violate the principle of 'do no harm'. From the above mentioned views we can conclude that practices of the industrial animal farming could not be defended ethically. Thus I offer two solutions to solve this problem:

The radical solution: We should abandon raising animals for food industry and stop eating foods from animal origin.

The practical solution: We should abandon or seriously revise the practices of the industrial animal farming, adopt organic, environment friendly types of farming practices.

The Radical Solution

As I argued earlier there are many ethical and prudential reasons to refuse consumption of industrial farm animal products. But the radical solution goes beyond determining what we eat depending on where it comes from or how it is raised. I called this solution radical, because it requires a radical change both in our conception and our attitudes. I do think it is both possible and easy, if we begin to think animal as a ‘being-in-itself’ rather than a thing which exist for our use. By ‘being-in-itself’, I mean a being that have its own desires and goals that are independent of other beings. As discussed in previous chapters, the animals that we raise for their flesh and products are social creatures, which are aware of their life at a certain degree. Maybe they cannot do philosophy but they have many cognitive skills. I think their awareness of themselves is worth considering to not treating them as objects. This would imply not using them, unless it clearly is in the best interest of the animal to be used in this manner. As I will argue below, most of the ways we treat animals are not in the best interest of them.

I think consuming animal originated food is partly a result of humans’ alienation from animals. In primeval period humans were eating other tribes’ flesh hence they were aliens to them¹². If we recognize animals as living things, which are

¹² People also practiced endocannibalism which means that they ate their recently dead ancestors; I do not claim this results from alienation; it is a ritual practiced to honor them. However, I think our

similar to us, our perception of their flesh and their products will change. When we change our approach, we will let them to live their own lives, not treat them as objects. As our ancestors who abandoned cannibalism, we will also abandon using and eating animals. It is a cultural and wrong habit to raise animals for using and killing them for their meat, and as other habits it can be changed when our perceptions change.

To support the claim that our perception of animals is socially determined and it will influence how they are treated; we can highlight the fact that same animals are treated differently in different societies. For example, in Turkish culture many people think eating meat of chicken, cows or sheep is very normal; while eating a cat or a dog is considered as disgusting and even vandalism.¹³ We consider cats and dogs as pets; it implies that they are seen as family members usually, but in some cultures they are delicacies. This is a good indicator that what we see as ‘meat’ that is to say eatable is defined by our culture and the perception of animals in that culture.

The cognitive abilities of animals that we define as pets or as ‘eatable’ are very similar to each other. Even sometimes the cognitive abilities of the animal considered as ‘eatable’ is more than the one considered as ‘pet’, as in the case of pigs and dogs. Hence, above mentioned example also shows us the decision of defining ‘eatable’ does not depend on cognitive abilities. It is also a contrary example for the argument that we have the right to use them as source since they lack cognitive abilities.

practice of eating animals is more similar to eating other tribes since we do not wait until they die but we kill them.

¹³At 09 February 2010, newspapers reported that a woman was taken into custody because of drowning three cats and drinking their blood after they died (Anter). In comment section, many readers claim that this woman is insane and vandal. Some readers claim that it is not different from sacrifice a sheep, other respond that “It cannot be compared to sacrifice animals since the sacrificed ones are created for us to eat but cats are not”(Tunka) (Grunberg).

I think it is important to realize that our perception and treatment of animals are defined by culture, rather than their cognitive abilities for two reasons:

Firstly, it weakens our justification for dominating animals since our domination on animals is usually related to the idea that we have more complex cognitive ability than the animals. The claim that we are more complex beings is true, but our different treatment to the animals which have similar cognitive abilities shows that our treatment is not related to cognitive abilities.

Secondly, it enables us to realize our perceptions are probably imposed by the culture, which leads us to think that they are accepted without questioning, since it is usually the case with the ideas that are imposed by culture. When we realize this fact, it also weakens credibility of the justification of our domination on animals. This can be an inception for altering our perception which will lead altering our treatments. Similar to abolition of slavery and recognition of women rights, we can expect that human tyranny on non-human animals can be abated.

We can avoid some of the pitfalls mentioned in earlier chapters by adopting mostly vegetarian diet with small consumption of animal products collected from humane, organic, non-industrial farms. But, it is clear that a full vegetarian diet has no pitfalls, and much to be argued for. Firstly, in whatever condition that animals are raised, it is highly probable they will feel pain while they are killed to be eaten. In addition to this, as stated in Chapter 2, many of the animals that we eat are social creatures; and I think it is not unreasonable to think that the other animals live with the animal we killed feel the absence of the it. One can argue that the animal is not immortal and it will eventually die, even if we do not interfere. It is true that an animal is not immortal, but even in organic farms animals let to be live very little portion of their expected life.

This criticism also applies to using their milk and eggs. Even though I do not think it is as evil as to kill an animal, I think there is still harm to animals since they are exploited and caged. And when their productivity decreases they are killed to be eaten which lead me to think that in current practices we use them merely as a means and we treat them as if we have right to treat them whatever way we want.

Another reason to support radical solution is that such a radical change would enable us to use our limited sources more efficiently. Even if we use organic and classical methods of farming it will be always a waste of limited sources. We can solve many problems of world such as hunger problem, and environmental problems by switching to a vegetarian diet.

A final point in defense of the radical solution is not an ethical one. Many people use habit, or taste as a main reason for refusing to switch a vegetarian diet. I think the issue of habit, or taste is highly exaggerated in this respect. Unlike smoking, there does not seem to be much in animal protein that is addictive, and the sense of taste is very modifiable. In fact we can observe this very easily. Many people who like tea with sugar, for some reason (to lose weight or diabetes) try to drink it without sugar. In a few first tries, it is very hard to drink it without sugar. But sometime later, when they try, they find out they do not like it with sugar anymore; moreover many of them cannot have it with sugar anymore. It is a very simple example of altering the sense of taste, but it is similar with other savors, like salt, like meat. When you give it up for some time, you will never miss it, as it had been tea with sugar. Moreover, when your taste has adopted, you will not find it delicious.

The Practical Solution

I called this as practical solution, because, although I believe that our attitudes towards animals can change, I know that it will not happen in one night. This is a solution that I offer to improve conditions of animals used in food industry, till human beings achieve the conditions of radical solution.

We should abandon or seriously revise the practices of the modern animal farming, adopt organic, environment friendly types of farming practices. In this way we will provide peaceful and natural conditions for animals. The products that we produced will be healthier. We can also provide more secure conditions for the workers in this sector. They will not be in high risk of injury or under big stress. The prices will be probably higher but if there is an organization that excludes third party resellers in between, it may still be cheap and people will have their own small farms and will work more happily compared to factory conditions in which they own nothing but they just sell their labor. Adopting organic and environment friendly types of farming practices it will also help to prevent or decrease the effects of some of the negative consequences caused by industrial animal farms which are stated in Chapter 3.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis; I argue that the practices of the industrial animal farms cannot be defended ethically because they contradict with “do no harm” principle, which is one of the basic principles of many ethical theories. The examples of practices and the numbers of animals which are affected by these practices are presented to show how the animals, workers in industries and the consumers who buy products of these industries are harmed. I also present some data showing the negative consequences of industrial animal farms in order to illustrate the possible positive effects of abandoning these methods of farming as solution to the world’s important problems such as global warming, clean water shortage and hunger problem. Contrary to it is argued, the industrial animal farms are necessary for neither health nor economic reasons. Hence, it will be beneficiary for humanity to end this type of food production.

The statistics presented shows there are several countries which adopt industrial animal farms in order to produce more products in a cheaper way. The countries which continue to use the classical farming methods are forced to adopt industrial methods either by universal agents such as World Trade Organization or invisible actors such as market pressure which use high prices as a tool. Turkey is also in a period of transmission. This study tries to understand why we should not adopt industrial animal farms.

In this thesis, I offer two solutions to solve the problems which are caused by industrial farms. I prefer the radical solution which offers abandoning raising animals for food, for many reasons. Firstly, I think that this is the only way for abolishment

of humans' tyranny on non-human animals. I believe that the abolishment is possible as the abolishment of slavery and it will be the next step of liberation movements. I rely on human beings' perception of animals will change, and the animals will be accepted as "being-in-itself" rather than objects or tools designed for human beings' usage. The second reason for preferring the radical solution is the positive consequences which will occur by abandoning industrial animal farms, which are stated above. Finally, I think it will also enable to live more peaceful and healthy lives, as vegetarians claim they have after quitting eating meat. As it is stated in the thesis, the practical solution is an only temporary solution which is offered to reduce the suffering of animals and harms caused by industrial animal farms till the conditions for radical solution are achieved. This thesis is to be seen as a contribution to struggle of achieving the radical solution and recognition of animal rights.

REFERENCES

- “An HSUS Report: Human Health Implications of Non-Therapeutic Antibiotic Use in Animal Agriculture.” *The Humane Society of United States*. n.d. Web. 18 Aug. 2010. <<http://www.humanesociety.org/assets/pdfs/farm/HSUS-Human-Health-Report-on-Antibiotics-in-Animal-Agriculture.pdf>>
- “Animals Used for Food.” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 12 Aug. 2010. <<http://www.goveg.com/factoryFarming.asp>>
- “Aquafarming.” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 1 Sept. 2010 <<http://www.fishinghurts.com/FishFarms.asp>>
- “Chicken Used for Food”, *PETA*. n.d. Web. 2 May 2010. <http://www.goveg.com/factoryFarming_chickens.asp>
- “Cows Used For Food.” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 14 May 2010 <http://www.goveg.com/factoryFarming_cows.asp>
- “Dog and Cat Victims of the Fur Trade.” *The Humane Society of United States*. n.d. Web. 16 Aug. 2010 <http://www.hsus.org/furfree/dogs_cats>
- “Economy.” *Farm Sanctuary* .n.d. Web. 3 June 2010 <<http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/economy>>
- “Factory Beef Production.” *Farm Sanctuary* .n.d. Web. 20 Aug. 2010 <<http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/beef>>
- “Factory Dairy Production.” *Farm Sanctuary* .n.d. Web. 23 May 2010 <<http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/dairy>>
- “Factory Farming.” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 1 Sept. 2010 <<http://www.goveg.com/factoryFarming.asp>>
- “Factory Farming Economy” *Farm Sanctuary* .n.d. Web. 28 May 2010 <<http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/economy>>
- “Factory Poultry Production.”, *Farm Sanctuary* .n.d. Web. 5 May 2010 <<http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/poultry>>
- “Factory Seafood Production.” *Farm Sanctuary* .n.d. Web. 10 Aug.2010 <<http://www.farmsanctuary.org/issues/factoryfarming/fish>>
- “Facts about the Fur Trade.” *Infurmination*. n.d. Web. 16 Aug. 2010 <<http://www.infurmination.com/facts.php>>
- “Korkunc Suphe: Salmonella Viruslu Etler Piyasada mi?” *Radikal*, 19 Sept. 2010: n. pag. Web. 19 Sept. 2010. <<http://www.radikal.com.tr/Radikal.aspx?aType=RadikalDetay&ArticleID=1019580&Date=19.09.2010&CategoryID=80>>

- “Lobsters and Crabs Used for Food.” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 15 Aug. 2010 <<http://www.lobsterlib.com/lobstersfeelpain.html>>
- “Lobster Liberation” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 15 Aug. 2010 <<http://www.lobsterlib.org/dangerous.html>>
- “Pigs Used For Food.” *PETA*. n.d. Web. 17 May 2010 <http://www.goveg.com/factoryFarming_pigs.asp>
- “The Protein Myth.” *Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine*. n.d. Web. 67jk 12 Aug. 2010 <http://www.pcrm.org/health/veginfo/vsk/protein_myth.html>
- “Turkiye’de Tarım ve Gıda: Gelismeler, Politikalar ve Oneriler.” *TUSIAD*, Istanbul. May 2008.
- “What is an Egg Factory Like?” *Compassionate Action for Animals*. n.d. Web. 2 Sept. 2010. <<http://www.exploreveg.org/feat/bbc/research/background.html>>
- Anter, Yasar. “Kedi Kesen Kadın Bodrum Disina Cikarildi.” *Hurriyet* 9 Feb. 2010: n. pag. Web. 16 Sept. 2010 <<http://www.hurriyet.com.tr/gundem/13740138.asp>>
- Berning, J.N., and S.N. Steen. *Nutrition for Sport and Exercise*. Aspen Publishers, 1998.
- Castelo, Carmen Velayos. *Animal to Human Transplantation: An Unconventional Case of Moral Anthropocentrism: Educación en bioética: donación y trasplante de órganos*. Ed. Ma Teresa Lopez de la Vieja. Spain: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca, 2008. 91-98
- Christie, William. *Lipid Analysis: Isolation, Separation, Identification, and Structural Analysis of Lipids*. Scotland: Oily Press, 2003.
- Compa, Lance A. *Blood, Sweat, and Fear: Workers' Rights in US Meat and Poultry Plants*. New York: Human Rights Watch (2004): n. pag. Web: 7 May 2010. <<http://www.hrw.org/en/node/11869/section/5>>
- Craig, W. J. and A. R. Mangels. “Position of the American Dietetic Association: Vegetarian Diets.” *Journal of American Dietetic Association*, Andrews University, Berrien Springs, MI, USA. 109.7(2009): 1266-82. NCBI. Web. <<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19562864>>
- Dawson-Hughes, Bess and Susan S. Harris, “Calcium Intake Influences the Association of Protein Intake with Rates of Bone Loss in Elderly Men and Women.” *American Society for Clinical Nutrition*. 74.4 (2002):773-779.
- DeGrazia, David. *Animal Rights: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.

- DeWaal, Caroline Smith. "The Human Cost of Inadequate Regulation of the Poultry Industry." *Food Safety Program*, 1996.
- Duru, Metin and Ahmet Şahin, "Türkiye'de Sağlıklı ve Güvenli Hayvansal Üretimin Gerekliliği", *Hayvansal Üretim* 45. 1 (2004): 36-41. Web. <http://www.zooteknikderneği.org/dergi/icerik/makale/2004_45_1_36-41.pdf>
- Embar, Wanda. "Sheep". Vegan Peace Home. n.d. Web. 1 September 2010 <http://www.veganpeace.com/animal_facts/Sheep.htm>
- Grimes, William. "If Chickens Are So Smart, Why Aren't They Eating Us?" *New York Times*. 12 Jan. 2003: n. pag. Web: 1 Sept. 2010 <<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/01/12/weekinreview/if-chickens-are-so-smart-why-aren-t-they-eating-us.html>>
- Grunberg, Achmed. "Kedi Kesen Kadın Bodrum Disina Cikarildi." 9 Feb. 2010 <http://yorum.milliyet.com.tr/yorumlar.aspx?HaberKod=S_1196884> Online posting.
- Gunaydin, Gokhan. "Koyun Yetistiriciliginin Ekonomi Politigi." *Uludag Universitesi Ziraat Fakultesi Dergisi*, 23.2 (2009):15-32. Web: 1 Apr. 2010. <<http://kutuphane.uludag.edu.tr/PDF/ziraat/2009-23%282%29/M2.pdf>>
- Honawar, Vaishali. "Provocative Commercial Targets McDonald's High-Fat Rate." PCRM News and Media Center. 14 Sept. 2010. Web. 15 Sept. 2010. <http://www.pcrm.org/news/commercial_targets_mcdonalds_high-fat_fare_100914.html>
- Ilgar, Rustu. "Türkiye'de Hayvan Hakları İhlallerine Coğrafi Acidan Bakis." *Cukurova Universitesi Enstitu Dergisi*. 16.1 (2007): 347-360. Web: 5 Apr. 2010. <<http://sosyalbilimler.cu.edu.tr/dergi/dosyalar/2007.16.1.415.pdf>>
- Knowles, T. G. *et al.*, "Effects on Cattle of Transportation by Road for up to 31 Hours." *Veterinary Record* 145 (1999): 575-582
- Leake, Jonathan. "Cows Hold Grudges, Say Scientists," *The Australian*, 28 Feb. 2005. Web. 6 May 2010 <<http://www.all-creatures.org/adow/cam-ff-20050228.html>>
- Lorenz, R. Todd. "Spirulina Pacifica as a Source of Cobalamin Vitamin B-12." *Spirulina Pacifica Technical Bulletin* 52 (12 Jan 1999): n. pag. Web. 11 May 2010. <<http://www.cyanotech.com/pdfs/spirulina/spbul52.PDF>>
- Meat The Truth. Dir. Karen Soeter, Gertjan Zwanikken. Nicolaas G. pierson Foundation. 2008. DVD
- Nestle, Marion. *Food Politics: How the Food Industry Influences Nutrition and Health*. California: University of California Press, 2002.

- Pacelle, Wayne. "Mercy, Mercy: Chickens Deserve Same Humane End as Pigs and Cattle." *Humane Society of the United States*. 2005. Web: 21 July 2010. <https://wadmin3.getactive.com/preview!www.hsus.org/legislation_laws/wayne_pacelle_the_animal_advocate/mercy_mercy_chickens_deserve_the_same_humane_end_as_cattle_and_hogs.html?authToken=b91f0a118ff8d2ea47c9efba2e3f86bc52a75e85>
- Roeber, D.L. *et al.*, "National Market Cow and Bull Beef Quality Audit—1999: A Survey of Producer-Related Defects in Market Cows and Bulls," *Journal of Animal Science*, 79.3 (2001): 658-665. Web: 14 Apr. 2010. <<http://jas.fass.org/cgi/reprint/79/3/658>>
- Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. New York: Ecco, 2002.
- Tunka, Alp. "Kedi Kesen Kadın Bodrum Disina Cikarildi." 9 Feb. 2010 <http://yorum.milliyet.com.tr/yorumlar.aspx?HaberKod=S_1196884> Online posting.
- United States Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Research Service. "USDA National Nutrient Database for Standard Reference, Release 15." By Nutrient Data Laboratory (U.S.) Beltsville, Md. 2002. Web. 3 May 2010. <<http://www.nal.usda.gov/fnic/foodcomp/Data/SR15/sr15.html>>
- United States Department of Agriculture. National Agriculture Statistics Service. "Milk Production" By Mike Miller. Washington D.C. 20 Oct. 2009. Web. 3 Aug. 2010. <<http://usda.mannlib.cornell.edu/usda/nass/MilkProd/2000s/2009/MilkProd-10-20-2009.pdf>>
- Vansickle, Joe. "Quality Assurance Program Launched." *National Hog Farmer*, 15 Feb. 2002. Web: 14 June 2010 <http://nationalhogfarmer.com/mag/farming_quality_assurance_program>
- Viegas, Jennifer. "Study: Cows Excel At Selecting Leaders" *Animal Planet News*. 22 Dec. 2005: n. pag. Web. 23 July 2010. <<http://animal.discovery.com/news/briefs/20051219/cowleader.html>>
- Yoruk, Murat. "AB Uyum Surecinde Turkiye Sut Sektoru." *TUSIAD*, June 2007. Web. 12 Aug. 2010. <<http://www.iso.org.tr/tr/documents/mkraporlar/muratyoruk.pdf>>