

# 批判後現代人類消費行為中工廠動物遭受不必要之苦難

高健毓\*

國立政治大學

## 摘要\*\*

即便工廠動物的生存權及生活環境已在全球受到矚目，仍然未明的議題是工廠動物如何因為後現代人類的消費飲食習慣而承受不必要之苦難，且因何在人類生活中被置於底層？自從一九七五年彼得·辛格提出動物解放概念以來，人類道德考量中的動物權一直不停辯論，主要原因有以下幾點。首先，動物有感知能力，他們也有能力受苦；第二，工廠動物是人類的附屬品；第三，討論動物倫理無疑挑戰人類作為物種金字塔頂端之論述。本文重新思考並重新定義動物與人類恆久以來之關係並試圖挑戰希伯來文明傳統中的論述，一貫將動物視為他者，在後現代消費模式中更是造就工廠裡的動物不必要的苦難。文章理論框架係採用堤摩西·佩琪瑞 (Timothy Pachirat) 的動物倫理觀念：《每十二秒》中的「距離」與「隱藏」來闡述動物因後現代人類飲食消費習慣而產生連動之關係。本文作者透過紀錄片《食品帝國》、彼得·沃爾勒本的《動物的內在生命：愛、悲愴、同情心—隱藏世界中的驚奇觀察》，以及諾貝爾文學獎得主南非作家柯慈的《動物的生命》來佐證並挑戰傳統人類至上的思維並帶出動物也會如人類一般受難，因此雖為非人物種也理應受到道德及同理心對待。最後，動物工廠裡的動物最終是否最終能得到解放而免於人類因飲食習慣加諸的痛苦而受害，我們不得而知，但可以肯定的是，動物的確具有如人一樣的情感感知能力，如恐懼、不安及創傷經驗。

**關鍵詞：**人類動物關係、動物福利、動物感知力、後現代人類消費、動物解放

---

\* 本文作者為國立政治大學英國語文學系博士研究生

\*\* 此篇文章為作者英國亞伯丁大學未出版碩士論文之部份內容並經由改寫後投稿。本文作者由衷感謝兩位匿名審查委員惠賜寶貴意見。

# Critiquing Farmhouse Animals' "Unnecessary Suffering" through Postmodern Human Consumption Behaviors

Peter Chien-Yu Kao\*

National Chengchi University

## Abstract\*\*

Despite the fact that farm animals' survival rights and living conditions have gradually attracted the public's attention worldwide, it remains unclear to most consumers and citizens exactly how and why those animals suffer unnecessarily through postmodern human consumption behaviors, methods, and practices. Within most modern industrialized societies, animals continue to be perceived as existing at the bottom of the chain of living beings. Since Peter Singer's 1975 book *Animal Liberation*, the issue of animal rights as a legitimate human moral consideration has been analyzed, probed, and debated. Some key topics in the ongoing discussions include such matters as animal sentience, cognition, and emotions; the ownership and stewardship of animals; and the moral and ethical consequences that acknowledgment of animal rights may have for human rights, freedom, and dignity. Aiming to rethink and redefine human and animal relations, this paper focuses on religious and cultural traditions that frame animals as *the Other*, and scrutinizes how the animals' unnecessary suffering has been caused by human consumption systems, practices, and behaviors. The concepts of distance, concealment, and "politics of sight" developed by Timothy Pachirat in his 2011 ethnographic study of industrialized slaughterhouses *Every Twelve Seconds* serve as useful tools to decode and deconstruct cultural representations of the processed animal. Further insights and strategies

---

\* Postgraduate, Department of English, National Chengchi University

\*\* This paper is part of the author's unpublished MA thesis, "The Making and Representing Farmhouse Animals' Unnecessary Suffering through Postmodern Human Consumption Behaviors" at U of Aberdeen, UK. The author is grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their insightful and invaluable comment and suggestion.

emerge in an examination of such works as director Robert Kenner's 2008 documentary film *Food, Inc.*; Peter Wohlleben's 2017 book *The Inner Life of Animals: Love, Grief, and Compassion—Surprising Observations of a Hidden World*; and J. M. Coetzee's 1999 novella *The Lives of Animals*. Ultimately, it remains unresolved whether animals could be fully and thoroughly liberated from pain and afforded more dignity when they are slaughtered for human consumption. However, increasing neuroscientific evidence confirms that farm animals share capacities for emotional experiences similar to those of humans. Those animals undergo fear and anxiety, and suffer trauma. Therefore, they deserve human moral sympathy and consideration.

**Key words:** Human–animal relations, animal welfare, animal sentience, postmodern human consumption behaviors, animal liberation

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1 Background & Literature Review

Speaking of farmhouse animals' "unnecessary suffering" (Singer 1975 & 1990; Coetzee 1999; Gruen 2015), Lori Gruen in *Entangled Sympathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals* acknowledges two things.

- (a). The idea of 'animal suffering' was much too general and broad. The general slogans of the animal movement didn't convey any of the depth of the experiences particular chickens, chimpanzees, cows, cats and others had— experiences that made their suffering specific for them, from their point of view.
- (b). It was hard to get other people to see what was wrong with causing animals to suffer just by telling them that animals suffer... (Gruen 2015 1)

The quotation indicates a dilemma about discussion on animal ethics. On the one hand, human beings cannot experience animals' "unnecessary suffering" as it is depicted by critics such as Peter Singer and Carol J. Adams. Men are not animals. And animals are not men, either. As Gruen implies, men cannot experience animals' suffering and neither do they need to experience those animals' suffering as the standpoint of sympathy and ethics held in this paper. Farmhouse animals' collective suffering have surpassed men's understanding because men and animals are different species. Therefore, men cannot experience the suffering as farmhouse animals do. Given that farmhouse animals' suffering be emphasized repetitiously, it seems to be ridiculous to men because those animals' unnecessary suffering cannot be experienced by men. And men might feel that those animals' unnecessary suffering does not need to be experienced because the suffering itself cannot be felt and experienced by men. On the other hand, it is taken for granted that farmhouse animals, for example, are raised as food sources for human consumption. People who stick to this position cannot understand why it is wrong to see that animals suffer at the moment when those animals are killed. And if animals are raised to be eaten, it is unnecessary to think of their suffering because they are eventually men's food sources.

Since human and animal relation debates were inaugurated in the last five decades<sup>1</sup> of the late twentieth and early twenty-first century, animals

---

<sup>1</sup> Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation: The Definitive Classic of the Animal Movement*.

have been regarded as the ones with their own subjectivity. They are born to be equipped with cognition and emotion. Animals, according to Singer, can be fearful, anxious and emotionally aroused. I think the postmodern thoughts— decoding and deconstructing inherent epistemology that frames the human as the self and the animal as the other— (Belcourt 2015; Coetzee 1999; Irvine 2004; Kelsey<sup>2</sup>; Pachirat 2013; Taylor 2007; Rowlands 1998 & 2009; Wolfe 2003) are important because on the one hand the thoughts serve as preparation for the re-consideration of different truths/worldviews concerning contemporary human and animal relation. And on the other, postmodern thoughts serve as a critical response to Giddens and Harvey and their proposal of the "consequence of modernity" in 1990. As Giddens and Harvey argue, we live in a fast-changing era in which time flees, distance shortens, and economic cost reduces. All have helped shape postmodern human consumption behaviors and the impacts from a factory's assembly line that makes those farmhouse animals into men's food source are extremely insufferable. Those farm animals, from birth to death, are raised to suffer. Billy-Ray Belcourt in "Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects: (Re)Locating Animality in Decolonial Thought" argued that "Critical Animal Studies (CAS) and mainstream animal activism have failed to center an analysis of settler colonialism and therefore operate within 'the givenness of the white-supremacist, settler state'" (Belcourt 1). Belcourt's argument is clear, but the present scene concerning animal ethics has changed with a propaganda that parallels farmhouse animals with racism victims not survivors. They are like those who were once colonized by the white settlers who treated the colonized like animals inhumanely. The concept, according to Belcourt, is western "white supremacy." Therefore, it is logical to investigate the extent to which postmodern human consumptions behavior can help interpret and rethink human and animal relationship as consumption behaviors emerge and develop in the current world. Moreover, Timothy Pachirat's *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight* (2013)<sup>3</sup> has been chosen as the theoretical framework of this paper. The major reasons are as follows.

---

New York: Harper Perennial Modern Classics, 1975 & 2009.

<sup>2</sup> John Dayle Kelsey's "Animal Colonialism— Illustrating Intersections between animal studies and settler colonial studies through Dine Horsemanship."

<sup>3</sup> Pachirat, Timothy. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and Politics of Sight*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2013. This monograph will be abbreviated as *Every Twelve Seconds* thereafter in this paper.

First, published in 2013, Pachirat's *Every Twelve Seconds* depicts farmhouse animals to be raised and slaughtered, the scene of which has constantly been overlooked and taken for granted because men cannot see how those animals are raised and killed for the purpose of human consumption. Its background fits human diet condition and consumption behaviors since the rise of modernity to postmodern era. Pachirat's depiction of farmhouse animals and the killing of them correspond to men's massive consumption behaviors that cause animals to "suffer unnecessarily" (Singer & Adams). Second, Pachirat's animal ethics concepts—"distance," and "concealment" in *Every Twelve Seconds*— can be regarded as a certain extension that clearly and specifically illustrates Singer's proposal: "animal liberation" since 1975. Third, Pachirat's "distance," and "concealment" have helped shape a contextual and conceptual foreground based on which animals' "unnecessary suffering" is exposed: how the animal's unnecessary suffering has been deriving from postmodern human consumption behaviors will be explored. Men's consumption behaviors that impact on farmhouse animals to be sent to slaughterhouses have traumatized and problematized the human-and-animal relationship. Therefore, after identifying the key problems, one can possibly understand the pain and suffering of farmhouse animals in a scale that is deemed unnecessary. "Eschewing traditional structure versus agency arguments lead[ing] inevitably to the intractable polar opposites that Latour (2004) names mononaturalism or multi-culturalism, has led to post-humanist<sup>4</sup> thinking to develop entirely new ways of conceiving human-animal relationships" (Rowlands 1998 & 2009; Taylor & Signal 2011 5). Pachirat's "distance," and "concealment" therefore can be regarded as deconstructive alternative affiliate to not only neo-liberal criticism but also post-humanist interpretation that helps rethink human and animal relations. To critique postmodern human consumption behaviors and challenge what has been held as long-standing the Hebrew Tradition, I adopt the Hebrew Tradition that has been passed down for more than two millenniums. The Hebrew Tradition has long held man at the top because the first patriarch of human species— Adam— is directly created by God with Providence over other species in *The Genesis*. The Hebrew Tradition has helped negate animals' subjectivity of feeling panic and fearful as men do. I adopt and propose three examples as models of

---

<sup>4</sup> Post-humanist thinking is identical to the argument in this thesis. Problematic binary oppositions should be challenged with human sympathy and moral considerations.

inter-textual analysis and references to critique and challenge the long-held myth: animals do not panic as the sentient and therefore they do not suffer at all.

As a documentary, *Food Inc.* presents first-hand scenarios of how animals suffer as a result of farmhouse working practices. Peter Wohlleben's <sup>5</sup> *The Inner Life of Animals: Love, Grief, and Compassion—Surprising Observations of a Hidden World* (2017) serves as evidence that animals do really feel panic, fear, and unrest as the sentient (Ahlhaus & Niesen; Andrews 2008 & 2016; Bekoff 2007 & 2013; Cochrane; DeMello & Williams, 2007; Friedrich; Garner 2011; Irvine 2007; Massaro & Tonutti 2013; Rowlands 1998 & 2009 and with counter-argument from Dawkins 2012; Rawls 1971 505; Scruton 1996, 1998 & 2000) at the moment as their life is threatened. J. M. Coetzee's *The Lives of Animals* (1999) is a novel that signifies how humans' current pattern of meat consumption might lead to a debate towards two camps: the hedonists with meat, and vegetarians without meat. My conclusion is based on a). what we have done since C. J. Adams and Peter Singer's call for animal liberation and b). how animals' unnecessary suffering imposed by humanity can be uplifted. I think Pachirat's thought is important because it fits animal's suffering in the postmodern era and serves as preparation for a re-consideration of different views, and so it is logical to investigate the extent to which it can interpret and help rethink human-animal relationships as postmodern human consumption behaviors develop in the current world.

In my introduction, I outline my research aims and questions about animal rights and liberation. Some literature reviews that advocate animal liberation is brought into focus. Next, I talk about Timothy Pachirat's animal ethics concepts: "distance," and "concealment" as a theoretical framework and interpretative method to elucidate my research objectives and start to elaborate on probable answers to research questions. In addition, in response to the theoretical framework, three fictional and non-fictional examples of the animal's "unnecessary suffering," the animal as the sentient and the animal's subjective cognition are elaborated as models to support my proposition of animal liberation. A certain making and representation of the animal's unnecessary suffering is presented in three models analyzed. As my scrutiny continues, I consider in the next section,

---

<sup>5</sup> The other non-fiction Writers such as John Lewis-Stempel, Brett Westwood & Stephen Moss also interrogate human and nonhuman relations in their prose writings.

Peter Singer's animal rights theory and his campaigns for animal liberation so as to present how the Hebrew Tradition has denied farmhouse animals' status with humans and negated the animals' subjectivity for life and survival. Descriptions of animal rights controversy cases by which I again utilize Pachirat's theory to justify the proposition will be discussed. Then, my conclusion will answer my research questions. As for Pachirat's "distance," and "concealment" in *Politics of Sight* on animal sufferings, his ideas have helped critique long-standing the Hebrew Tradition that has placed animals as human property and affiliates. Moreover, the focus of animals' "unnecessary suffering" serves as how we can rethink and redefine human-animal relations.

In this paper, postmodern human consumption behaviors are closely associated with farmhouse animals' "unnecessary suffering" (Singer 1975). Therefore, one might raise two questions. What does the phrase postmodern human consumption behaviors mean? And how do such consumption behaviors relate to farmhouse animals' "unnecessary suffering?" Postmodern human consumption behaviors mean the public's consumption behaviors are pertinent to the rise of multinational companies. And Tyson during the Great Depression is an example. As the third-generation tycoon of Tyson noted, "My grandfather had a truck and he thought how to transport live chickens from one place to another on a large scale; therefore, he came up with an idea by which a nation-wide assembly line for household stocks to be raised and the food processing line to be set up has emerged..." ("Our Story" Tyson).

In order to contextualize and conceptualize postmodern human consumption behaviors, one cannot avoid talking about the rise of modernity and "postmodern condition" to name the terms on Anthony Giddens' *Consequences of Modernity* and David Harvey's *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. I especially contest again these two terms— the rise of modernity and "postmodern conditions"— not as "disorienting," disjointed and "disruptive" (Giddens 1990; Harvey 1990; Gruen 2015) jargons, but as two linking and continuing formations in process. The rise of modernity emerged first, which is ensued by "postmodern consequences" in the past few decades. And it is difficult to define the "postmodern condition" in the realm of animal rights and ethics; however, one can infer from the historical, cultural, and political milieu back to the mid-70s as Peter Singer and Carol J. Adams started to call for attention to animal ethics. Since then, a certain political and cultural transformation of animals to be viewed differently has emerged. One interwoven aspect that directs the rise of modernity to postmodern consequences is the dissemination of "information" (Giddens 1990; Harvey 1990; Pachirat 2013) that has helped determine how we



view farmhouse animals as our food sources. The making and representing of farmhouse animals as food sources inevitably challenge modes of modernity.

Since then, animals have been associated with the barbarian, the uncivilized, and the uncultivated because they are regarded as undeveloped or underdeveloped species without the sentient mechanism compared with that of humankind. However, it is still unclear about how we understand that ontological insecurity within the realm of modernity that has long haunted human beings. In the next section, I will focus my discussion on the rise of modernity (since the 30s) and postmodern consequences concerning human consumption behaviors that are pertinent to a certain transformation of human and animal relationships.

## 1.2. Conceptualizing and Contextualizing Human Consumption Behaviors as and in Postmodern Conditions and Consequences

A. Fuat Firat & Alladi Venkatesh<sup>6</sup>, Marshall Berman<sup>7</sup>, Anthony Giddens<sup>8</sup>, David Harvey<sup>9</sup>, Mara Miele<sup>10</sup>, and Lori Gruen<sup>11</sup>, and Fredric Jameson<sup>12</sup>—all have presented a scenario in which twentieth-century consumer culture has drastically transformed into materialism that speeds up the making of products, the delivery of products, and marketing of products handed over to consumers.

A. Fuat Firat & Alladi Venkatesh in "Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption" began talking about a certain debate

---

<sup>6</sup> Firat, A. Fuat & Alladi Venkatesh. "Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption," *The Journal of Consumer Research* vol. 22, no. 3: 239-267, 1995.

<sup>7</sup> Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. London: Verso, 1983.

<sup>8</sup> Giddens, Anthony. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

<sup>9</sup> Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

<sup>10</sup> Miele, Mara. "The Taste of Happiness: Free-range Chicken," *Environment and Planning 43*: 2076-2090, 2011.

<sup>11</sup> Gruen, Lori. *Entangled Sympathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. New York: Lanterns Books, 2015.

<sup>12</sup> Jameson, Frederic. *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. New York: Verso, 1991.

between modernism and postmodernism through philosophical foundations. Then, they moved to critique modernism— "exposing... the modernist distinction between production and consumption and the privileging of production over consumption" (Firat & Venkatesh 1995 239). The discussion is followed by "demonstrating how postmodernism is concerned with reversing of the conditions of modernity and with a wide range of issues regarding the construction of the subject (i.e., the consumer)" (239). Important concerns have been illustrated. First, "the concern is philosophical, exploring the conceptualizations that would be appropriate regarding our notions of the consumer and consumption in a postmodern world" (239). In other words, the reality is there, but how we view and interpret the phenomenon needs further explanation. The second concern is related to "the development of appropriate epistemological positions that fully capture the postmodern consumer and postmodern consumption" (Firat & Venkatesh 1995 239). It means how we formulate our "epistemological position" based on our understanding of postmodern consumer and consumption conditions. The third concern, according to Firat and Venkatesh, is "epochal and emerges out of the realization that the world of consumption is changing dramatically and new possibilities are emerging that did not exist before" (239). Consumer and consumption conditions have transformed into an unprecedented mode.

Firat and Venkatesh are not alone in helping conceptualizing consumer and consumption. In terms of modernity and postmodern condition, Marshall Berman in 1983 *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity* observed that

to be modern is to live a life of paradox and contradiction. It is to be overpowered by the immense bureaucratic organizations that have the power to control and often to destroy all communities, values, lives; and yet to be undeterred in our determination to face these forces, to fight to change their world and make it our own.... (Berman 1983 13)

Berman's argument indicates the possibility of postmodern human conditions in every possible way. If put in the lens of consumer culture, people's behaviors are the representation of "paradox," and "contradiction." The consumption behaviors are with the representation of "paradox" and "contradiction" because on the one hand, the behaviors are the source of killing farmhouse animals for the production of food for humankind. The behaviors indicate human's absorption of nutrition. On the other, the behaviors signify the "unnecessary suffering" of farmhouse

animals, and more importantly return the meat as food source with chemical and hormone stimuli injected by humans. The behaviors instigate the rapid growth of farm house animals; in the meantime, the instigation of chemical and hormone injections in return brings back poisonous elements to humans.

Berman is not alone, critiquing the rise of modernity in the postmodern condition. Anthony Giddens in *The Consequence of Modernity* pointed out that "modernity" varies, but is associated with transitions from modernism to post-modernism, capitalism to post-capitalism, and industrial society to post-industrial society, etc (Giddens 1-2). We live with "institutional transformation." Giddens meant that "we are moving from a system based upon the manufacture of materials goods to one concerned more centrally with information" (Giddens 2). As I will illustrate Pachirat's "distance" and "concealment," Giddens' statement represents a certain modern exemplar to human beings concerning the relationship between animals and mankind. It is the misleading or hidden "information" that has long made consumers assume that they know what they eat, but they do not necessarily know the production process of meat products. The process is usually cruel and so are the treatments mankind enacts upon farmhouse animals that are killed in slaughterhouses. This common scene has become a token that standardizes men's consumption habits that make farmhouse animals suffer unnecessarily.

Meanwhile, David Harvey in *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* suggested "an intense phase of time-space compression that has had a disorienting and disruptive impact upon political-economic practices, the balance of class power, as well as upon cultural and social life" (Harvey 284). In terms of mankind's exploitation of farmhouse animals, Harvey's argument—"an intense phase of time-space compression"—indicates the speeding up of farmhouse animals raised and killed. The whole process of farmhouse animals being treated is quick in phase, which makes the public "disoriented," and "disruptive" in the stream of "cultural and social life" (284). Men are no longer able to identify that the massive-scale production of meat for daily consumption is through an "intense phase of time-space compression" (284).

Next, the phenomenon of the rise of modernity also calls for a positive change in farmhouse animals and corresponds to Mara Miele's proposal in 2011. "The Taste of Happiness: Free-range Chicken" points out the translation of "material politics" based on which men since the 30s have started to magnify their own maximized hedonism on meat consumption.

The debate between men's hedonism and men's sympathy<sup>13</sup> for farmhouse animals has been an ongoing issue. Therefore, the rise of modernity in a postmodern context, according to Mara Miele, has also become the process for men to rethink what we hold the proliferation of "cruelty free" that results in "happy [farm house] animals" (Miele 2076).

Lori Gruen in 2015 *Entangled Sympathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals* foregrounds two kinds of sympathetic sentiment of mankind to non-human species. As Gruen argued, "Empathy is a particular type of attention,... [is] of moral perception" (Gruen 1). "Empathy," according to Gruen goes along with "moral perception" that projects attention to/ on animals. As Gruen further illustrates, "moral perception" is not the same as ordinary sense perception"(1-5). The discrepancy between "moral perception" and "ordinary sense perception" lies in two fundamental but significant elements: "reflection," and "correction"<sup>14</sup> (1-5). "Reflection" might be understood as the public's self-awareness of seeing and observing farmhouse animals' "unnecessary suffering" while "correction" might refer to men's consumption behaviors that can be adapted and amended so as to alleviate animals' unbearably painful experience. One important key element raised by Gruen is the revelation of "information." The term is also similarly mentioned by Giddens, Harvey, Pachirat, Baudrillard, Jameson, and Harvey to explain a certain transformation of socio-cultural and socio-political transformation with the alignment of the rise of modernity and postmodern consequences.

Frederic Jameson in *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* proposed that

the postmodern looks for breaks, for events rather than new worlds, for the telltale instant after which it is no longer the same... for shifts and irrevocable changes in the representation of things and of the way they change. (4)

Like Berman, Giddens, and Harvey, Jameson has also helped elucidate the postmodern condition in which no new world goes around, but numerous events have emerged to intertwine. The events going on remain no longer the same. The cultural and political shifts pertinent to the events are invariably becoming a certain representation (Jameson 4).

---

<sup>13</sup> For example, in J. M. Coetzee's *The Lives of Animals*, whether mankind's consumption on meat should/ can be replaced by eating more vegetables creates intense atmosphere in a household.

<sup>14</sup> The terms appear in chapter two of *Entangled Sympathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*.

The representation of farmhouse animals as sentient beings calls for the public's attention to thinking it necessary to deliver men's "moral perception" (Gruen 2015 Ch. 2) because farmhouse animals feel panic and fearful with their lives threatened. Therefore, regarded as the sentient (Ahlhaus & Niesen; Andrews 2008 & 2016; Bekoff, 2007 & 2013; Cochrane; DeMello & Williams 2007; Friedrich; Garner 2011; Irvine 2007; Massaro & Tonutti 2013; Rowlands, 1998 & 2009 and with counter-argument from Dawkins 2012; Rawls 1971 505; Scruton 1996, 1998 & 2000), the animal has their own subjectivity; yet, they are treated inhumanely before, during and after they are sent to slaughterhouses. Before farmhouse animals are sent to slaughterhouses, they live in a tiny space at farm factories in which they cannot even turn around and have enough living space for their life (EU, UK & USA statistics; Rowlands 1998 & 2009; Singer 1975 & 1990; Wilkie 2005 & 2010). During the time when farmhouse animals are sent to slaughterhouses, they are rudely and inhumanely treated: chickens, for example, are violently snatched and *thrown* to the cages being delivered to slaughterhouses by Latino factory workers (Food Inc.). After being sent to the slaughterhouses, the animal is processed and dealt with by *machines* on the animal processing assembly lines. Then, I will show how postmodern theories with Food Inc., Peter Wohlleben, and J. M. Coetzee—all connect with and respond to Peter Singer's critique against long-standing the Hebrew Tradition.

Animals can definitely suffer not only because they can sense, feel, and experience as men do, but also because they are exploited by men as part of food sources. Farmhouse animals suffer because of the ways by which they have been treated, colonized, and dominated through every means of human consumption behaviors (Pachirat 2013; Palmer 2006; Schlosser 2001; Singer 1975, 1990 & 2009; Wilkie 2005 & 2010). Therefore, I think that they should be endowed with voices from humans. The decolonization discussion of making animals free should be put into the lens of discussion. And, according to J. M. Coetzee, Elizabeth Costello, the narrator of *The Lives of Animals*, lectures at Appleton College and compares how postmodern human consumption behaviors have transformed into bloody scenes comparable to the Nazi massacre of those with different origins and ethnic backgrounds

Then I chose to propose the following argument: Animals have long been held as the inferior to men and they are taken for granted to be exploited by men for long because they reveal and characterize with how long-standing the Hebrew Tradition has formed for centuries to the problematic human and animal relations. Peter Singer, and Pachirat's

Politics of Sight concerning animals' unnecessary suffering chosen in this paper will go against those problematic positions. My methodology will encompass in part detailing textual analysis of three models in which farmhouse animals suffer, the animal as the sentient, and the postmodern diet battle between meat and green food consumption.

There are three reasons why I chose Timothy Pachirat's Politics of Sight as the postmodern theory to analyze the animal's suffering caused by postmodern human consumption behaviors. First, it was not until around WWII that farmhouse animals were slain on a massive scale in order to meet human daily consumption needs. Second, campaigns that call for animal liberation emerged around 1975, which falls into the postmodern discussion arena.<sup>15</sup> Finally, Pachirat's Politics of Sight helps shape what Singer mentioned in his lectures given at Yale - a better and sustainable diet that benefits both humans and animals. As for fictional and non-fictional narratives concerning rethinking human and animal relations, David Herman in his 2016 *Creatural Fictions* mentions that "Developing innovative approaches to the study of fictional<sup>16</sup> [and non-fictional]<sup>17</sup> narratives that feature nonhuman beings, particularly in their interactions with human..., has the potential to bridge cultural and scientific understandings of humans' ties with and responsibilities to broader biotic communities" (Herman 2). Simmons and Armstrong's 2007 *Knowing Animals* and Tyler and Rossini's *Animal Encounters* indicate that "there is both an interest in and need for, new and innovative ways to approach our relationships with animals" (Taylor & Signal 5)(Rowlands 1998 & 2009; Simmons & Armstrong 2007; Warren 2014 & 2015). Since Herman, Simmons, and Armstrong acknowledge the need for a new approach in helping rethink human and animal relations, this thesis suggests that farm animals raised as food sources for humanity should be talked about in this postmodern arena in terms of dialogues among politics, sociology, bioethics discourse, philosophy, etc (Herman 2016; Rowlands 1998 & 2009; Simmons & Armstrong 2007; Taylor & Signal 2011; Warren 2014 & 2015).

---

<sup>15</sup> As for modernity and postmodern conditions, see David Harvey's 1990 *The Condition of Post-Modernity* published by Blackwell.

<sup>16</sup> J. M. Coetzee's 1999 *The Lives of Animal* is chosen as the making and representation of human and animals relations in this paper.

<sup>17</sup> Food Inc. as documentary and animal's life records is chosen as non-fictional narratives.

## 2. Theoretical Framework: Timothy Pachirat's Politics of Sight: "Distance," and "Concealment"<sup>18</sup> as Postmodern Condition

One might raise a question: Why is Pachirat's theories and criticism, but not, for example, "Marxism?" Katherine Perlo in 2002 "Marxism and the Underdog" in *Society & Animals* points out that "Marxism" is oppositional to capitalism, which is constructed through the intersection of human history, society, and economics. And its emergence is to uplift the human suffering from economic and political exploitation from capitalistic expansion and development. However, the animal was apparently not included and therefore excluded from the discussion arena because the animal was, if put into that historical context of the emergence of Marxism, not the sentient and they could not be regarded as non-human species suffering from exploitation. Therefore, the animal, from Marxist viewpoints<sup>19</sup>, was an outsider to moral concern and sympathy considerations.

Humans are a species of animal and dominate the top of the Life Chain. However, the attitude adopted by humans to other animals, particularly those animals regarded as domesticated is slavery-based. The case of Food Inc. illustrates chickens domesticated in a tiny space in farm factories are marked with numbers. They are more like colonized species in the late 18th and 19th centuries because they are savages "needing to be labeled" with numbers. Chickens live in dirty farmhouses with no ventilation. Chickens are like colonized natives, treated with arrogance and condescension by the colonizers with no consideration given to them as living animals. They live in poor surroundings. Germs and bacteria threaten their lives (Avian Flu) which may spread to humans. During colonial periods, the colonized often suffer from germs and bacteria of T. B. because of their poor living conditions. Hygiene, therefore, becomes a serious problem. One way that humans have imposed harm on chickens is by injecting them with chemical hormones. Chickens without hormonal injections need at least three months to reach maturity, however, chickens

---

<sup>18</sup> As for further discussion of "sight," and "observation" that are embedded in environmental politics and animal ethics, refer to Chien-Yu Peter Kao's journal paper titled "Observation and Gaze in Ren-Xiu Xu's Environmental Ethics." This article will be published in Nov, 2023.

<sup>19</sup> See J. Baird Callicott's 1980 "Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair" from *Environmental Ethics*.

reach maturity within six weeks of being injected with stimuli of chemical hormone (Food Inc.). Moreover, chickens and other domesticated animals are fed with genetically modified (GM) crops in the EU, as Stiftung notes, DNA within chickens has been distorted and changed in a negative way (Regan 1992, 1996 & 2000; Rowlands 1998 & 2009; Schlosser 2001; Stiftung 2014). Chickens' life cycle has been shortened and distorted. Chemical hormones that instigate the rapid growth of chickens are later transmitted to the human body. Moreover, living in the farmhouse, chickens cannot stand in each tiny unit because their chest grows too big for them to stand. Most of the domesticated chickens in farm factories topple down. When chickens are sent to slaughterhouses, they are also treated inhumanely.

About chickens being injected with growth hormones, the negative transformation does not merely happen to the chicken's body, they are transmitted to humans. This means humans not only eat chicken meat but also consume chemicals that cannot be digested and eliminated as well. As humans age their immune system becomes less effective due mainly to chemical residue so that cancer rates are very likely to increase. In addition, workers at farmhouses are mostly non-local citizens, hired to work at farmhouses at midnight to snatch those caged chickens sent to slaughterhouses. And the scene is more terrifying because each chicken is hung on the machine to be killed. Relevant treatment from farmhouses and slaughterhouses happens as well to other domesticated animals like cattle and pigs.

In terms of how killing animals signifies genocide of men as the annihilation of tribal identity, as Tasha Hubbard asserted, "The slaughter of animals, specifically the plains buffalo, is part and parcel of the genocide of American Indian people. Hubbard defines nationality and sovereignty as concepts that include both humans and nonhuman animals writing, 'being a people is not a domain exclusive to humans.' Nations and groups are formed by the connections that people make with lands and animals, and one cannot exist without the other" (Kelsey 50). The relational connections between humans and animals exist, and being a human is "not a domain exclusive to humans." Therefore, humans and animals are interdependent as discourse not only responding to Natural Science but also to the relevant discourse of human-animal relations as subjection and subservience in terms of nationality and sovereignty.

Since the publication of *Animal Liberation*, more and more news, events, essays, and monographs that concern animals' suffering and the affirmation of animal cognition have been published in the last decades of



the 20th century. In particular, relevant materials regarding how animals are sacrificed for the sake of postmodern human consumption behaviors are popular. The bloody scene depicts how animals are killed for being made as products of meat for human consumption. The scene has been carefully illustrated with a certain ideology with visual projection and narrative discourse. The haunting image of animals being killed horrifically in humans' vision provokes sympathy towards a certain reflection of whether animals should be treated in such a more humane way as their final moment approaches.

As noted in previous sections, chickens for example are treated badly before and during the time they grow into maturity and as they are sent to slaughterhouses. A similar scene is also applicable to cattle as large mammals. Therefore, such a newly emerging notion as "Politics of Sight" introduces to modern readers the terrible sense by which "distance," and "concealment" (Pachirat) evolving the operation of slaughterhouses are examined. For example, in his *Every Twelve Seconds Industrial Slaughter and the Politics of Sight* published by Yale UP in 2013, Timothy Pachirat expresses his deep concern about "how distance and concealment [of sporadic slaughterhouse] operate as mechanisms of power [relation between humans and animals] in modern society" (3). Pachirat's mindset is to invite readers to reflect upon whether it is likely for "us to eat meat without the killers or the killing [so horrendously], without even — insofar as the smell, the manure, and the other components of organic life are concerned — the animals themselves" (3). Pachirat began his Politics of Sight with a real event taking place nearby a slaughterhouse in the U.S. According to front page news in *Omaha World Herald*, Pachirat depicted a scene in which six cattle in Omaha, Nebraska escaped from the holding pen of an industrialized slaughterhouse. The fourth cow, which made a run for the parking lot near St Francis of Assisi Catholic Church, was recaptured and transported back to the slaughterhouse. The fifth cow trotted down a main boulevard to the railroad yards. And the sixth cow, accompanied by the fifth, turned into an alleyway leading to another slaughterhouse which was blocked. Both were pursued by the police and cornered against a chain-link fence. Upon failing to corner both cows against the chain-link fence, the police shot the sixth cow. The bloody scene haunts us. "The cow ran a few steps, then fell, bellowing and struggling to rise while the police fired on it again" (2). The shooting lasted for ten minutes and took place during the time when slaughterhouse workers ventured outside for fresh air, sunshine, and cigarettes. "Many of the workers witnessed the killing of the animal firsthand" (2).

The news spread quickly among the slaughterhouse employees the next day during the lunch break. The event was fueled by a graphic retelling by a quality control worker dispatched by slaughterhouse managers to observe events and to photograph the loss and damage caused to the walls left by the police gunfire. According to what slaughterhouse workers recollected, "'they shot it, like, ten times,' she said, her face livid with indignation, and her words sparked a heated lunch-table discussion about the 'injustice of the shooting' and the ineptitude of the police'" (2). Such notions of "distance," and "concealment" concerning how slaughterhouses operate routinely depicted by Pachirat at this point start to surge as heated table discussion among slaughterhouse employees went on.

At the same time, Pachirat shares with readers his first-hand experience as he approaches the slaughterhouse in Omaha, Nebraska. As Pachirat drove south to the place where the killing took place, he expresses to his readers how his five senses were roused in a convulsively repulsed way as a direct neurotic response: "as I approached it [the slaughterhouse] a putrid odor, at once sharp and layered, seeps through the metal, rubber, and glass of my car, nestles in the cotton threads of my clothing, and forces a physical reaction that builds in my stomach and mouth before erupting acidly into my throat" (2-3). The smell that instigates men's cognitive response is straightforward. Meat products are manufactured in such a way that hygiene and ventilation are hardly taken into consideration. Pachirat asserts that

an empty assertion of bureaucratic power over the unruliness of smell, it is one among numerous symptoms of the ongoing conflict between the messiness of mass killing and a society's — our society's — demand for a cheap, steady supply of physically and morally sterile meat fabricated under socially invisible conditions. Shit and smell: anomalous dangers to be reported to the authorities in an era in which meat comes into our homes antiseptically packaged in cellophane wrappings. (3)

### **3. Methods: Three Models: Food Inc., *The Inner Life of Animals*, & *The Lives of Animals* Responding to Tyson Food Company**

As a response to animals' status through liberal materialism, Pachirat's Politics of Sight presents how humans have exploited animals for the sake

of eating and consumption habits. The following three examples, one as documentary, another is a book with observations from Nature and the other is a novel. All regard, reappraise, and represent animals particularly those as domesticated as subjects with a certain subjectivity. From the documentary of Food Inc., people have learned that some giant companies like Tyson Food Inc.<sup>20</sup> is a multinational food company in the US. Tyson Food is also the second largest food processor and marketing company in the world. Before we move to the scene in which animal suffering, particularly that of chicken, pigs, and cattle we need to go back to the historical context by which a certain understanding towards why human consumption and the process of producing food from killing birds and livestock has become so horrendous and transformed in a negative way. John W. Tyson founded Tyson Food Inc. around 1931 during the Great Depression after his family moved to Springdale in Arkansas. He later found a great opportunity by which all feathered and squawking chickens were sent to large markets in the Midwest for a great profit. How to profit from those chickens by raising them for the purpose of mass market became a problem for Tyson. The answer seems obvious. At one single time, thousands of chickens are raised in farm factories with chickens' number in size and their growth rate becomes much faster. One can observe in this case that the cost of raising chickens considerably decreases, meat products from the assembly line of farm factories become cheaper, and tycoons and companies make more profit as production costs decrease, and time efficiency heightens when meat products are made.

This model of postmodern human consumption behaviors has dramatically transformed the food industry and food politics. In societies of the Postmodern Era, assembly is forged. Tycoons of multinational companies sign contracts with Midwest local chicken farmers and ranchers to raise chickens. Simultaneously, those farmers and ranchers purchase "skills," and "equipment" from multinational companies in order to ensure those farm factory animals grow bigger and faster. Usually, those farmers and ranchers need to get mortgages from local banks. The living condition of domesticated animals invariably proves poor with bad ventilation and annoying odor. Livestock is treated inhumanely. Careless treatments of domesticated animals at farmhouses are observable. Domesticated animals are caged without much living space. They are manipulated by humans in a way identical to that of the outlandish people being colonized

---

<sup>20</sup> 'Tyson Foods Inc.' <<https://www.tysonfoods.com/>>

and regarded as *the Other* in modern colonial discourse. Their subjectivity is negated. Their existence is merely to satisfy, as Adams asserts, masculine preference as the choice of food. Animals suffer because humans have them colonized and dominated by every means of human consumption behavior activities (Adams 1970; Pachirat 2013; Singer 1975; Wilkie 2005 & 2010). Moreover, according to J. M. Coetzee, Elizabeth Costello, the narrator of *The Lives of Animals*, who lectured at Appleton College and compared how postmodern human consumption behaviors have transformed into bloody scenes comparable to the Nazi's massacre of humans with different origins and ethnic backgrounds.

The objection to liberating animals from postmodern human consumption behaviors normally rests upon an assumption: animals do not suffer; therefore, they do not need liberation. The following cases as the representation of animal suffering will help present the scenes. *The Inner Life of Animals: Love, Grief, and Compassion—Surprising Observations of a Hidden World* (2017) by Peter Wohlleben subverts the long-standing Western traditions by admitting animals' subjectivity. Animals feel panic and fear when their life is threatened. So, they have their own subjectivity; yet, they are treated inhumanely before, during, and after they are sent to slaughterhouses. Before they are sent to slaughterhouses, those animals live in a tiny space at farm factories in which they cannot even turn around (Singer). During the time when they are sent to the slaughterhouse, those animals are badly treated: chickens, for example, are thrown to the cages being delivered to slaughterhouses. After being sent to the slaughterhouse, animals are processed and dealt with by machines.

Around two to three decades after Adams's *Sexual Politics of Meat* and Peter Singer's Animal Liberation campaigns, essays, books, nonfiction<sup>21</sup>,

---

<sup>21</sup> Peter Wohlleben has written some nonfiction monographs portraying human-animals/ Nature relations, including *The Inner Life of Animals: Love, Grief, and Compassion—Surprising Observations of a Hidden World* (2017), *The Hidden Life of Trees* (2017), *The Secret Network of Nature: The Delicate Balance of All Living Things* (2018), and *The Weather Detective : Rediscovering Nature's Secret Signs* (2018). The author of this paper bases part of the argument on *The Inner Life of Animals: Surprising Observations of a Hidden World* (2017) as a part of real-case evidence in terms of animals' subjectivity as the foreground that prepares for the later discussion of animals' suffering. The other relevant topical series concerning human-animals/ nature relations include: *The Running Hare: The Secret Life of Farmland* (2017), *The Secret Life of the Owl* (2017), *The Glorious Life of the Oak* (2018), *The Wood: The Life & Times of Cockshutt Wood* (2018), and *Still Water: The Deep Life of the Pond* (2019)—all are written by John Lewis-Stempel, and *Wonderland: A Year of Britain's Wildlife, Day by Day* (2017) written by Brett Westwood & Stephen Moss.

news<sup>22</sup>, social media<sup>23</sup>, academic centers<sup>24</sup>, research journals,<sup>25</sup> and worldwide associations<sup>26</sup> concerning critiquing/ rethinking the human-animal relationship linking with animals' inner life have come out to unsettle and provoke the relations between men and animals. Peter Simonson in "Social Noise and Segmented Rhythms" argues that "the shift from news-oriented events like animal laboratory raids to celebrity-based promotion led directly to the rapid growth of PETA in the late 1980s and early 1990s" (Simonson 399-420). Kathryn Olson & Thomas Goodnight's 1994 "Entanglements of Consumption" analyzed animal rights activists over the debate whether purchasing and wearing fur is cruel (Goodale & Black 2). Some sounding and pioneering scientific evidence has appeared to vindicate the fact that animals like human beings are equipped with nerves and nervous systems pertinent to sense and emotional reactions to the surroundings and environment in which they grow up. The persuasive findings have also begun to formulate a newly formed forum that invites multiple and diversified criticisms affirming animals' "abilities and integrities" (Taylor & Signal xix).

In light of human's encounter with animals' inner life, Peter Wohlleben's<sup>27</sup> *The Inner Life of Animals: Surprising Observations of a Hidden World* is a pioneering deconstructive observation of human-animal relationships. In his book, Wohlleben justifies animals' *subjectivity*, and the subjectivity deems animals to be in the category of being regarded as moral beings. Singer points out a great variety of examples that animals live and react in a similar way just like that of humans, to illustrate horses feel shame, and deer grieve. Animals' emotional reaction is derived from inner

---

<sup>22</sup> *The Guardian* reported and described Peter Wohlleben's *The Inner Life of Animals* as "...a revolution in how we regard other species" (Oct, 2017, *The Guardian*).

<sup>23</sup> *Food Inc.* is a documentary in which how human eating and consumption behaviors are inter-connectedly presented with animal suffering.

<sup>24</sup> Academic centers comprises NYU Animal Studies, Center for Animals Law Studies, Center for Human Animals Studies (CFHAS), and LMC Animal Studies.

<sup>25</sup> Some academic and research journals have appeared, consisting of *Animal Studies Journal*, and *Journal of Animal Ecology*.

<sup>26</sup> Worldwide academic associations bring together scholars, encompassing Australasian Animal Studies Association, and Finnish Society for Human-Animal Studies.

<sup>27</sup> Peter Wohlleben was born in Bonn, Germany. He studied forestry and spent over twenty years as a civil servant in the forestry commission. Wohlleben later gave up his job because he decided to put his ideas of ecology into practices and is currently running an eco-friendly municipal piece of woodland in Wershofen. He gave lectures, held seminars, and published books in the past few years on the subjects of animal emotion and of protecting animals and our ecosystem.

body organs. Various inner and outer mechanisms function. The signifier of something that is alive and emotional is very close to a human's inner neuro-structure and psychological mechanism. Ravens call their friends by names, mice regret bad choices. Butterflies choose the best place for their offspring to live and grow up, and goats discipline their kids. Much to human surprise is the case of the squirrel. Wohlleben once observed a squirrel that hid his food in another den quite a distance from the den where he lived in order to deceive his companion squirrels on the space issue of food storage. The above mentioned cases are not alone in confirming Peter Wohlleben's observations on animals' direct emotions and behaviors.

Those who have spoken up for animal liberation propose the following challenging facets to highlight the core value of *Animal Liberation*. First, "Equal consideration: If a being suffers, there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration. No matter what the nature of the being, the principle of equality requires that its suffering be counted equally with the like suffering — in so far as rough comparisons can be made — of any other being" (*Animal Liberation* Ch 1). Second, "Speciesism (Ryder 2010)... is a prejudice or attitude of bias towards the interests of members of one's own species and against those of members of other species" (*Animal Liberation* Ch 1). Third, "Animals Species that does not belong to human species is not in itself a good reason of being given less consideration" (*Animal Liberation*, Singer). Fourth, according to Roger Scruton on killing animals, "There is a real distinction, for a human being, between timely and untimely death. To be 'cut short' before one's time is a waste- even a tragedy...No such thoughts apply to domestic cattle. To be killed at thirty months is not intrinsically more tragic than to be killed at forty, fifty, or sixty" (88).

Siobhan O'Sullivan, for example, proposes that "if animal protection theorists wish to advocate positively on behalf of animals, without offending those who subscribe to a mainstream liberal point of view, a way forward is to address inconsistencies between different types of animals, and not challenge inconsistencies between humans and animals" (O'Sullivan 1). O'Sullivan's main argument lies in why we treat different animals differently in a way taken for granted that some are supposedly exempt from sufferings imposed by humans while others are not. The gap in a way presents and projects out human selection towards what kind of animals should not be suffering while the other kinds of animals should be because humans eat them and they are part of human consumption behavior for daily living. According to O'Sullivan, sympathy for animals

does not rely on the classifications of animals by which humans show moral consideration towards some particular animals with the other animals excluded from the whole arena. Instead, moral consideration should apply to all animals. Animal (Rights) Representation in J. M. Coetzee's *The Lives of Animals* (1999).<sup>28</sup>

Stuart Hall in his *Representation* argued that "representation connects meaning and language to culture" (Hall 15). The power and influence through either oral or written language to be configured as the entity with meaning in cultural production is consolidated. Hall further noted that "Representation means using language to say something meaningful about, or to represent it, the world meaningfully, to other people" (Hall 15). Representation, in other words, is meaningful because of its language affiliated with the process of the appearance of representation.

As for Norma [wife of John Bernard and daughter-in-law of Elizabeth Costello], she has never hesitated to tell him (John) that his mother's books are overrated, that her opinions on animals, animal consciousness, and ethical relations with animals are jejune and sentimental" (Coetzee 115). In *The Lives of Animals*, Coetzee introduces to readers Norma whose perspective towards animal ethics falls into the mainstream voice that has refuted vegetarianism and animal liberation because both her opinions and behavior in preparing dinner for the family can be interlinked.

Hostilities are renewed almost at once. Norma has prepared a light supper. His mother notices that only three places have been set. "Aren't the children eating with us?" she asks. "No," says Norma, "they are eating in the playroom." "Why?" The question is not necessary, since she knows the answer. The children are eating separately because Elizabeth does not like to see meat on the table, while Norma refuses to change the children's diet to suit what she calls "your mother's delicate sensibility." "Why?" asks Elizabeth Costello a second time. Norma flashes him an angry glance. He sighs. "Mother" he says. "The children are having chicken for supper, that's the only reason." "Oh," she says, "I see." (Coetzee 114)

In *Lives of the Animals*, certain conflicts and confrontations in the postmodern household family not only rest upon the intense relation between the mother-in-law and daughter-in-law but also lie in the notion

---

<sup>28</sup> It is part of the Tanner Lectures on Human Values and was delivered at Princeton University on Oct 15-16, 1997.

between meat-consumed hedonists and vegetarianism since the 1990s. As for its deeper meaning, the issue demonstrates how much human cruelty has been imposed on animals, especially for those used as human food. The supper scene is not alone according to the narrative that highlights Mrs. Costello's perspectives on animal rights. Costello is invited to lecture at Appleton College where her son, John, serves. During her public speech, Costello compares how postmodern human consumption behaviors have exploited animals and caused their sufferings with how people were sent to the Treblinka concentration camps of the Third Reich to be killed between 1942 and 1945. Humans' having slain domesticated animals bears parallels with Nazi's having the Jewish people poisoned in concentration camps as deeds of massacre (Coetzee 117). Animals do not share the same genealogy with humans and neither do Jewish people with the German. Both scenarios seem irrelevant — one with the relationship between animals and humans and the other is the Nazi and the Jewish people, but the mutual notion based on the inference of different kinships and genealogical classifications is eminently clear. The metaphoric figure of speech is compelling. "We have only one death of our own: we can comprehend the deaths of others only one at a time..., but we cannot count to a million deaths" (Coetzee 117). By analogy, humans have their deaths only one at a time, they can comprehend each death of animals slain, but they cannot count to a trillion deaths based on their consumption behaviors and transformative growth in the mass food industry<sup>29</sup>. One could not help but reflect deeply upon a certain accusation made by Costello. Humans "[as] beings created in the image of God, like beasts, they had themselves become beasts" (Coetzee 119). According to *Genesis*, beasts on the earth were made according to the image of men by God. Humans and animals are from the same origin and live in the same kingdom because of God's mercy. Costello as Coetzee's narrator emphatically emphasizes the unbearable horrors of animal suffering. Farmhouses and slaughterhouses are the places where animals are squeezed into a tiny unit from their birth. As pointed out, the scenario of drug-testing laboratories, abattoirs, and factory farms prevails.

We have faced such a critical challenge that reduces and negates animals from the "modernist/ postmodern heritage"<sup>30</sup> (Taylor & Signal xix)

---

<sup>29</sup> Transformative growth in mass food industry has been evidenced and exemplified in Tyson Food Inc.'s case.

<sup>30</sup> According to Harvey, some traits of postmodernist heritage can be seen from a range of characteristics. Time and space compression, for example, is one of the significant



that leads us to think about "'animals' as implicitly 'different' from us" (Taylor & Signal xix). Hence, a series of arguments that turn over the assumption that animals differ from us should be critically scrutinized in order to restart thinking about human-animal relationships. It is important because the dual bias or dichotomy concepts in terms of the human-animal relationship are always construed on a "take-it-for-granted" (Taylor & Signal xix) basis. Taylor and Signal pointed out that the "take-it-for-granted" mindset mainly lies in human's complacent self-determined will that has distorted, reduced, and negated animals' inner subjectivity.

In order to understand what the current scenario of animal suffering is and why animals' suffering is taken for granted, Peter Singer<sup>31</sup> interrogates the Western tradition and examines how the animal liberation movement has progressed up to the first decade of the 21st century. Singer's *Animal Liberation* was published in 1975. He first proposed three series of philosophical questions: (a) Is painlessly killing animals wrong? Even if they will be replaced by other animals living good lives? (b) What are the experiences of animals alike? How do we weigh the pleasures and pains of chimpanzees, pigs, dogs, cows, chickens, and fish against those of normal humans?, and (c) Should we try to reduce the suffering of wild animals? Or is there any intrinsic value in nature that counts against our interference?

Since then animal ethics and animal rights debate have emerged as the cornerstone of speaking up for animals freed from unnecessary suffering. In 2017, Singer was interviewed by Dr Katrien Devolder (U of Oxford) on Practical Ethical Channel and expressed his ideas towards those who have been against vegetarianism. The interview title is "Peter Singer Tackles the Best Objections to Vegetarianism." Moreover, invited by Rotman Institute of Philosophy in 2015, Peter Singer<sup>32</sup> gave a series of lectures titled "Animal Liberation, Forty Years On," at Princeton University and the University of Melbourne. He gave a speech on "Animal Liberation: Past,

---

traits, which the author thinks closely links with animals suffering and a huge change of human consumption behavior. The author later will elaborate how time/ space compression leads to the transformation of human consumption behavior, which has caused a great harm to animals.

<sup>31</sup> Peter Singer is Prof of Bioethics at Princeton University and Prof at the Center for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at The University of Melbourne.

<sup>32</sup> Founded in 2008, the Institute has devoted to exploring philosophical angles arising within science, biology, physics, cognitive neuroscience, and medical science so as to inform scientific practices, and guide relevant scientific researchers for the promotion of human welfare. "Rotman Institute of Philosophy" <<http://www.rotman.uwo.ca/about/>>

Present and Future" at Victor Grifols i Lucas Foundation, Barcelona on Jun 26, 2014. In 2013, Singer lectured in the Examination Schools at the University of Oxford, and the lecture topic was "Eating Ethically Lecture." Singer in 2009 had a public talk on "The Ethics of What We Eat," talking about the food we eat, where it comes from and how it is produced. In these lectures, Singer mainly critiqued long-standing Western civilization that predestines humans born as the superior agent to all non-human species.

#### 4. Critiquing the Hebrew Tradition

The Hebrew Tradition as part of long-standing Western traditions and ideological schema has coincidentally excluded the animal as non-human species from moral consideration and human sympathy because animals are invariably classified as rocks, plants, and soil (Blackstone 1974; Brophy 1965; Feinberg 1974; Haworth 1978; Kunstler 1992; Left 2004 in *Guardian*; Leopold 1949; Morris & Fox 1978; Passmore 1975; Regan 1975; Schlosser 2001 & 2006; Weber 2009). Under the lens of self-and-other relations, nonhuman agents easily fall into binary opposition and cultural/ material dualism (e.g. human vs. animals & culture vs. nature)(Robinson 2003 & 2016). This kind of duality always and almost reduces and negates animals' subjectivity as though it does not exist or exists in the air. However, the whole human history subsequently changed as Descartes argued, "I *feel*; therefore, I am."<sup>33</sup> The feelings and sentiments of humans started to reflect and react to the surroundings and environment in a way that gradually connected humans and numerous *others*. Yet, it is not enough and it is still human-centered and still "anthropocentrism" (Taylor & Signal xix).

Yet, as in postmodern society, humans witness how the transformation of post-modernity directly has caused farmhouse animals' "unnecessary suffering." Under the lens of post-modernity and globalization, people often talk about subjectivity and what it might be or how it is presented. I am extremely fascinated with the shift from collective human intellectual enlightenment to individual animal species' self-subjectivity. The transformation to the emphasis on animals' individual self-autonomy and self-subjectivity signifies the human inner *self*, which is very intimate and confidential. It is *not fixed* as any of the scientific findings. If humans' self-autonomy and self-subjectivity really exist/ co-exist, then the author cannot help but ask, "What about animals?"

---

<sup>33</sup> Lorenzini, Daniele. "Philosophical Discourse Ascetic Practice: On Foucault's Reading of Descartes' Meditations" *Theory, Culture & Society* vol, 40, no. 1-2 (2021).

I regard my paper as a defense and extension of "animals' unnecessary sufferings" (Singer). However, more research, which goes against the argument: animals do not necessarily feel and perceive life-threatening danger that ensues, has shown (Bekoff 2007 & 2013; Friedrich; DeMello & Williams 2007; Irvine 2007; Ahlhaus & Niesen; Cochrane; Panzera 2013; Garner 2011, Massaro & Tonutti 2013, and with counter-argument from Dawkins 2012; Oderberg 2000; Structon 1992, 1996 & 2000) and the other sociologists & political theorists). Michele Panzera in "Sickness and Abnormal Behaviors as Indicators of Animal Suffering" examines the incorporated outcome of animals' inner sensory system and other neural inputs both from their body and the environment. Panzera affirms that "...for an animal to be able to perceive states that we believe would reflect its welfare, the animal must be alive and conscious, and it must also be sentient" (Panzera 23).

As Singer pointed out in the Hebrew tradition, "And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness; and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the fowl of the air, and over the earth, and over the every creeping thing that creepth upon the earth" (Genesis). Humans were created according to God's image; therefore, no other nonhuman species is high above humans. The view of Hebrew culture refers to a hierarchy that stratifies with the Universe. Animals are placed in a lower rank because of their less rationality and humans are in above all the non-animal species because humans are more rational. Non-human species live dependently on the human species for survival.

Animals as men's subjects are not only mentioned in ancient Hebrew and Greek traditions but also they are regarded as inferior to men and should surrender to men according to Christian theology. According to the concept of "animal colonialism," the colonial schema rests mainly upon the relation between *the self*, and *the other*. The colonizer is the self-regulating, institutionalizing, and exerting his power and dominance. The other is those being colonized in a way that makes the animal obedient. The colonizer always gives decrees and makes the colonized obey them in a way based on the colonizers' limited and prejudiced understanding towards those being colonized because it is to the colonizers that the colonized are non-human; therefore whether the colonized like the animal will suffer is not the issue.

However, the Hebrew Tradition cannot explain the counter statement of religion in the 20th century: God never existed. This is imperative and important because if there is no God at all as 20th-century writers (Emily Dickinson, Earnest Hemingway, James Joyce, Virginia Woolf, etc...)

questioned Christian theology, men were not created by God; therefore, men do not justify their idiosyncrasy or political correctness by saying that the animal was created under their image, so men are dominant over the animal. Besides, God is invariably depicted as merciful and benevolent. If so, how can God witness the farm animals' suffering without giving his hand to uplift the pain? Therefore, critics and researchers like Roger Scruton and Richard Dawkins might be wrong because Scruton links moral competence with theology while Dawkins begins his theories from the perspective of an evolutionary biologist. Their concepts might therefore be problematic.

In *Food Inc.*, chickens are confined and treated inhumanely. Their basic right to gain wider space before they are sent to the slaughterhouse has long been deprived. At the moment when those chickens are about to be sent to slaughterhouses, they are maltreated, being snatched and thrown to the truck from the farm factories. The brutal scene is also the representation of the Hebrew tradition to separate the colonizer as the giver and the colonized as the taker in terms of religious ideology. Reaffirming the supreme power endorsed by God to men and men could therefore make all non-human animals subordinate to human dominance has long been held. This Christian tradition was passed down as justification for the postmodern era in which men seem to be ordained by God as supreme and privileged.

## 5. Oppositional Voices from Other Academics

Those who have been against animal liberation propose three oppositional dimensions. First, Roger Scruton proposed that "humans have an incomparably higher moral status than animals," (Scruton 1996 & 1998 7-8). As Scruton mentioned, Peter Singer, Tom Regan, Richard Ryder, and other animal rights proponents— all have placed too much emphasis on the feature of "humans [who] share with other animals— notably, on the capacity for suffering. It therefore causes them (Singer, Regan, and Ryder) to overlook the distinction between moral beings (to whom their argument is addressed) and the rest of nature. Since traditional morality is based on this distinction. It cannot be revised by arguments which so blithely ignore it" (Scruton 8). One can infer from what Scruton mentions the invisible boundary between humans and animals. Indeed, Scruton draws on a line from traditional morality, which is based on the boundary of moral capacity between humans and other animals. According to Scruton, even though animals might suffer, animals are still different from men due to the moral

boundary between the two species.

Scruton further challenges the norm of animal rights and gives us a proposition. It might be out of the question, as Scruton argues, that humans have a higher moral status than that of farmhouse animals; however, it does not mean that men could persecute animals and make them suffer in a way that goes beyond morality and sympathy. The point does not rest upon whether we should consider uplifting unnecessary suffering from animals. The real point is when and how we think that we are supposed to exert our moral capacity on animals (Scruton). What Scruton argues does not necessarily and justifiably refute Singer, Regan, and Ryder because all three do not deny the human basic need to eat farmhouse animals for nutrition. What Singer, Regan, Ryder, and the other animal rights advocates urgently call for the public's attention is *the way* we exploit those farmhouse animals raised for human consumption rather than merely whether the animal can suffer. In other words, humans should proceed further to try to uplift the way that directly or indirectly makes the farm animals suffer unnecessarily.

Moreover, what Scruton emphasizes is morally good or wrong when we talk about animals as sentient beings. He attempts to build the boundary again between humans and animals, the oppositional divide that has been regarded as problematic by postmodern critics and academics. As shown in this paper, postmodern critics such as Pachirat intends to break the boundary because humans are inherently privileged by long-standing Western traditions always living in a comfortable zone with their complacency built upon "othering the animal" (or othering everything that is a non-human agent) and "centering the self" (Miller 93; Trungpa 125; Berry 93). Scruton provides further explanations about why he thinks that postmodern criticism might turn out to be problematic as well. "...The philosophical discussion about our duties to animals has recently been conducted at a level which gives no real grounds for any conclusion — certainly no grounds for the quite radical conclusion drawn by Singer, Regan and Ryder" (Scruton 8). "... If we are to know what is right with it and what is wrong, we must explore the roots of moral thinking and try to discover exactly how it is, ..., that questions of right and wrong could be decided" (Scruton 8).

However, what troubles postmodern critics and academics as advocates of animal ethics and rights mainly lies in problematic political ideology that idiosyncratically justifies the boundary between the morally right or wrong. Therefore, the animal is often placed at the margin because their status under the lens of moral examination has frequently been

considered to be morally wrong. If the boundary between "morally right" and "morally wrong" parallels Pachirat's concepts of "distance" and "concealment," postmodern human consumption behavior that has long exploited farmhouse animals might all be justifiably correct as what Scruton terms the "morally right."

And if Pachirat's concept of farmhouse animals' unnecessary suffering that has been distanced and concealed is "morally wrong," humans' idiosyncrasy to dominance over animals will become unlimited in a way that is identical to sexism and racism. This corresponds to Singer's argument against i.e. postmodern human consumption behaviors that align with long-standing Western traditions. Therefore, Singer's proposal corresponds to Scruton's concept of "morally right" and "morally wrong." Costello's lecture at Appleton College on Coetzee's *The Lives of Animals*, under Scruton's proposal, transforms to be nonsense talking about animal welfare exempt from humans' cruel superimposition. If the boundary of "morally right" and "morally wrong" is justified and the animals' subjectivity is quite often negated and reduced, animals' unnecessary suffering is not worthy of being mentioned. Therefore, the animal species will always be placed as the Other to the human. Second, "Animals are items of property." In other words, it is taken for granted that animals belong to humans who enjoy ownership over non-human species. If so, in the case mentioned above by Pachirat, the policeman who shot the escaped cow was not to blame because his conduct was not relevant to "morally right" or "morally wrong."

Third, "Comparisons between humans and animals are offensive to humans" (Singer). This statement only exists for sure when the human suffers from life-threatening superimposition. Moreover, this assertion idiosyncratically projects out human's sense of superiority that always places the animal as *the Other* by claiming humans' anthropocentrism in terms of human and animal relations. Those farmhouse animals are inflicted with unnecessary suffering merely to satisfy the craving for evermore exotic food encouraged by the sophisticated marketing techniques of food producers. As Pachirat is concerned, none of the living beings can feel superior in a way to deprive the other living beings by killing them in horrendous way in order to fulfill one's political superiority. The action proves insufferable just like sexism and racism exerted respectively since the ancient times and two World Wars.

In terms of racism and sexism, those being labeled as *the other* were frequently understood as the inferior unable to be *cultivated* and reasonably treated. Of course, if farm animals are regarded as those that

can be *cultivated*, that would go too far and beyond the argument; however, the boundary that should be emphasized between the human and animal is one that prioritizes human moral concern rather than moral concern for the animal. Scruton's argument, according to postmodern critics' view, is identical to Nazis' racial logics exemplified with a "logical problem" when "their scientists proved the superiority of the Aryan race over the Jewish race by which the Jewish was depicted simultaneously as weakening and threatening to the German people" (Burke 191-220).

More relevant discourses concerning humans' absolute dominance over animals have prevailed. Singer points out that people support black and women's rights because they are equal to white and men in "intelligence," and in "abilities," "capacity for leadership, rationality, ... Humans and nonhumans obviously are not equal in these respects. Since injustice demands only that we treat equals equally, unequal treatment of humans and nonhumans cannot be an injustice" (Singer 1). However, this argument, though tempting, is very problematic. It might turn out to be the statement responding to dogmatic belief: "blacks and women really are just as intelligent, and able...as whites and males and no more" (Singer 1).

Fourth, despite the fact that humans and animals share discrepancies in terms of genetics, talking about the equality shared between both does not rely on IQ or intelligence capacity, but depends on "moral equality" (Singer 1). And what Singer terms the universally acknowledged "moral equality" helps shape the inconsistencies of the analogous paradigm between humans and animals. I find that the "moral quality" proposed by Singer applies to rethinking how postmodern human consumption behaviors have transformed animals' unnecessary sufferings. *Food Inc.* is a documentary in which the US meat industry has been vividly recorded and presented. The documentary raises two issues/ dimensions that are worth noting. One is the hygiene problem that accompanies mass food consumption threatening human health. This part mainly focuses on, for example, genetically modified goods like corn. Genetically modified corn dominates the current capital market. Customers can see from labels ingredients made of genetically modified corn. The unsettling point for human health condition rests mainly upon the scientific evidence shown. The more genetically modified goods humans eat, the more likely it is humans get cancer. Corn genes have been modified so that corn is likely to transform human DNA and advance the growth of malignant tumors grown in the human body.

Finally, John Rawls, one of the most influential liberal theorists of the twentieth century, famously excluded non-human animals from his justice

principle. He wrote "Thus equal justice is owed to those who have the capacity to take part in and to act in accordance with the public understanding of the initial situation" (O'Sullivan 2; Rawls 505). Moreover, "those who can give justice are owed justice" (O'Sullivan 2; Rawls 510). Garner in 2005, however, contends that "the mainstream liberal practice of excluding animals from the justice principle, meaning animals occupy the realm of moral pluralism, leaves animals vulnerable to cruel treatment because the state may be unwilling to intervene to protect their interests" (O'Sullivan 2).

## 6. Conclusion

How can we understand contemporary critiques of the industrialization of food consumption through the lens of theories of human-animal relations? By answering this research question raised at the very beginning of this paper, I argue that current critiques of the industrialization of food consumption through the lens of human-animal relations are based on a certain response to long-standing the Hebrew Tradition and ideologies that constantly regard animals as the Other, and human the Self. The Hebrew Tradition and ideologies under the discussion of Animal Politics are problematic and need to be re-examined. My paper aims to challenge the problematized human-animal relations through postmodern human consumption behaviors.

Therefore, I propose Pachirat's concepts, and three models to rethink and redefine the inherently unstable ideologies and traditions that have long been negating animals' subjectivity and autonomous beings (regarding farmhouse animals as non-sentient beings). Timothy Pachirat's Politics of Sight reveals that men as routine consumers of meat products often ignore the operation of slaughterhouses by pointing out two important features that closely link with sight and observation: "distance" and "concealment". With these two features, consumers are distanced from the facts of how domesticated animals are treated and how animals are raised.

As noted above, Pachirat's Politics of Sight raised in this paper responds, challenges, and revolts against the long-standing Hebrew Tradition and inherent normative tendencies to reduce animals' subjectivity in order to secure human comfort zone as a valid justification for postmodern human consumption behaviors. In *Genesis*, men were then created in God's image making all other species subservient to men.

The UK, EU, and USA, for example, have launched a call for farm factory



animals' liberation, and a ban on sow stalls for pigs, veal calf stalls for cattle, and standard laying hen cages for avian species in the late twentieth- and early twenty-first century. Probable solutions illustrate how humans with sympathy — regarding and acknowledging animals as sentient beings— help uplift farm factory animals' suffering by changing what and how we eat, and getting to know the way meat products are made. Garnett and *Eating Patterns for Health and Environmental Sustainability* published by the Association of UK Dietitians — both express and explain to us what and how we can have more sustainable consumption patterns. Despite the fact that we might not be able to directly pave the way to help uplift farmhouse animals' painful and anxious experiences, at least we can try to alleviate the unnecessary suffering of farmhouse animals.

Finally, Lori Gruen points out that "moral perception" differentiates from "ordinary sense perception." "Moral perception" is embodied in men's self-reflection that is "sensitive responsiveness" to "a wide array of information" (Gruen). It "requires an exercise of judgment: to determine what information is available, what additional information might be required, and whether the information that one acquires is relevant" (Gruen). The whole process as a "moral perception exercises" is calm, attentive, and responsive to think, act, and respond without any reckless moral judgment. What Gruen means is that consumers with "moral perception" can identify sources of meat, put moral concern into daily practices, and cultivate the perception that uplifts farmhouse animals' unnecessary suffering. The difference between "moral perception" and "ordinary sense perception" lies in the re-consideration of regarding farmhouse animals as sentient. They feel panicked, fearful, and horrific in slaughterhouses. They are equipped with emotion and five senses just like humans. Finally, one point that Gruen emphasizes and implicates is men's capability of *knowing*, "*seeing*,"<sup>34</sup> and therefore *understanding* how farmhouse animals suffer unnecessarily. In advance, men would decide to help uplift farmhouse animals' suffering by delivering moral concern despite the fact that we are different species, but share similar five senses and emotions.

---

<sup>34</sup> As for an important concept of "seeing," refer to Peter CY Kao's "Observation and Gaze in Ren-Xiu Xu's Environmental Ethics," *Journal of Chinese Trend and Forward* vol. 19, no. 2 (Dec, 2023).

## Bibliography

- Abbate, E. Cheryl. "Nonhuman Animal Ethics: Deontology and Animals," *Animal Ethics & Philosophy*.  
<https://nonhumananimaethics.wordpress.com/how-to-help/>.  
 Accessed on 10 May 2019.
- . *Neither Man nor Beast: Feminism and the Defense of Animals*.  
 Continuum, 1994.
- . "Woman-Battering and Harm to Animals." *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*, edited by Carol J. Adams and Josephine Donovan. Duke UP, 1995.
- Adams, Carol J., and Josephine Donovan. *Animals and Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations/ Edited by Carol J. Adams and Josephine Donovan*. Duke UP, 1995.
- Adorni, Eleonora. "Canons of Animal Aesthetics: A Report on the Exhibition Beaute Animale, Grang Palais, Paris, France, Mar 21-Jul 16, 2012" *Relations*, vol.1, no.1, pp. 69-71.
- Allen, Colin, and Michael Trestman. "Animal Consciousness," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 1995 & 2016.  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/consciousness-animal/>.  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- Andreozzi, Matteo. "Relationships Over Entities," *Relations*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2013, pp. 7-10.
- Andrews, Kristin. "Animal Cognition," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2008 & 2016,  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cognition-animal/>.  
 Accessed on 30 Mar 2019.
- . "Animal Cognition," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/cognition-animal/>.  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- . "Animal Rights," *Western's Encyclopedia of American Law*.  
<https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences-and-law/sociology-and-social-reform/social-reform/animal-rights-movement>.  
 Accessed on 8 May 2019.
- . "Animal Rights," *BBC*, 2014,  
[http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/animals/rights/rights\\_1.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/animals/rights/rights_1.shtml).  
 Accessed on 20 Mar 2019.
- Arluke, Arnold, and Clinton Sanders. *Regarding Animals*. Temple UP, 1996.
- Beckoff, Marc. "Animal Consciousness and Science Matter: Anthropomorphism Not Anti-Science." *Psychology Today*, 2013,

- pp. 61-8.
- . *Minding Animals: Awareness, Emotions and Heart*. Oxford UP, 2002.
- Bekoff, Marc, and Jessica Pierce. *Wild Justice: The Moral Lives of Animals*. U of Chicago P, 2009.
- Belcourt, Billy-Ray. "Animal Bodies, Colonial Subjects: (Re)Locating Animality in Decolonial Thought," *Societies*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2015, pp. 1-11.
- Bennison, Rod. "Commendation of the Special Edition of Relations Dedicated to The Emotional Lives of Animals," *Relations*, vol. 1, no.1, pp. 11-2, 2013.
- Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. Verso, 1983.
- Brophy, Brigid. "The Rights of Animals," *Sunday Times*, 1965  
[http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/animals/rights/rights\\_1.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/animals/rights/rights_1.shtml).  
Accessed on 30 Jul 2019.
- Brown, Jonathan. "Export of Live Veal Calves to Resume despite Protests," *Independent*, 6 Mar 2006.  
Accessed on 30 Mar 2019.
- Butcher, Samuel H., translator. *The Poetics of Aristotle*, by Aristotle, Macmillan, 1902.
- Bykvist, Krister. *Utilitarianism: A Guide for the Perplexed*. Continuum, 2009.
- Callicott, Baird J. "Animal Liberation: A Triangular Affair," *Environmental Ethics*, vol. 2, issue. 4, 1980, pp. 311-38.
- Cavell, Stanley, et al. *Philosophy and Animal Life*. Columbia UP, 2008.
- Cazaux, Geertrui. "Beauty and the Beast: Animal Abuse from a Non-speciesist Criminological Perspective." *Crime, Law & Social Change*, vol. 31, no. 2, pp. 105-26, 1999.
- Clark, Stephen R. L. *The Moral Status of Animals*. Oxford UP, 1975.
- Cobbe, Frances Power. "The Consciousness of Dogs," *Sociological Origins*, vol. 3, no.1, 1872, pp. 19-26.
- Cochrane, Alasdair, et al. "Animal Ethics and the Political." *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 2016, pp. 1-24.
- Coetzee, John M. *The Lives of Animals*. Princeton UP, 1999.
- Crisp, Roger, *The Cosmos of Duty: Henry Sidgwick's Methods of Ethics*. Oxford UP, 2015.
- Cudworth, Erika. *Social Lives with Other Animals: Tales of Sex, Death and Love*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Dibb, Sue, and Ian Fitzpatrick. *Let's Talk about Meat: Changing Dietary Behavior for the 21st Century*, 2014, <https://www.eating->

- better.org/uploads/Documents/LetsTalkAboutMeat.
- Doggett, Tyler. "Moral Vegetarianism," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2018,  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/vegetarianism/>.  
Accessed on 20 Jul 2019.
- "Ethics Guide: Eating Animals," *BBC*, 2014,  
[http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/animals/using/eating\\_1.shtml](http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/animals/using/eating_1.shtml).  
Accessed on 15 Apr 2019
- "Farm Animal Sanctuaries Educate The Public." *VegFund*,  
<https://vegfund.org/>.  
Accessed on 8 May 2019.
- Feinberg, Joel, "Human Duties and Animal Rights." *On the Fifth Day*, edited by Richard Knowles Morris and Michael W. Fox. Acropolis Books, 1978.
- . "The Rights of Animals and Unborn Generations," *Philosophy and Environmental Crisis*, edited by William T. Blackstone. University of Georgia Press, 1974.
- Firat, A. Fuat. "The Consumer in Postmodernity." *Advances in Consumer Research*, vol. 18, 1991, pp. 70-.
- Firat, A. Fuat, and Alladi Venkatesh. "Liberatory Postmodernism and the Reenchantment of Consumption." *The Journal of Consumer Research* vol. 22, no. 3, 1995, pp. 239-67.
- Fontenay, De Elisabeth. *Without Offending Humans: A Critique of Animal Rights*, translated by Will Bishop, U of Minnesota P, 2012.
- Fox, Michael. "Animal Liberation: A Critique," *Ethics*, vol. 88, no. 2, 1978, pp. 106-18.
- Francione, L. Gary & Robert Garner. *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* Columbia UP, 2010.
- Garner, Robert. "Animals and Democratic Theories: Beyond an Anthropogenic Account." *Contemporary Political Theory*, 2016, pp. 1-30.
- . "In Defense of Animal Sentience: A Critique of Cochrane's Liberty Thesis." *Political Studies*, vol. 59, 2011, pp. 175-87.
- Giddens, Anthony. *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Polity Press, 1991.
- . *The Consequences of Modernity*. Polity Press, 1990.
- Goodale, Greg, and Jason Edward Black. *Arguments about Animal Ethics*. Rowman & Littlefield, 2010.
- Gruen, Loir. "The Moral Status of Animals," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2003 & 2017,

- <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/moral-animal/>.  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- . *Entangled Sympathy: An Alternative Ethic for Our Relationships with Animals*. Lanterns Books, 2015.
- Hall, Stuart. *Representation*. Sage, 1996.
- Harrison, Ruth. *Animal Machines*. Stuart, 1964.
- Harvey, David. *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Inquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*. Blackwell, 1990.
- Hatfield, Gary. "Descartes, Rene," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2008 & 2014, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes/>.  
 Accessed on 21 May 2019.
- Haworth, Laurence. "Rights, Wrongs and Animals." *Ethics* 88, 95-105, 1978.
- Herman, David. *Creatural Fictions*. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
- Hile, Kevin. *Animal Rights*. Chelsea House Publishers, 2004.
- "H.O.P.E. What You Eat Matters," *H.O.P.E. Project*, 6 June 2018, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FprMvJYnD44>.  
 Accessed on 30 Jul 2019.
- Horta, Oscar. "What is Speciesism?" *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, vol. 23, no. 3, 2010, pp. 243-66.
- Irvine, Leslie. *If You Tame Me: Understanding Our Connection with Animals*. Temple UP, 2004.
- . "The Question of Animal Selves: Implications for Sociological Knowledge and Practice." *Qualitative Sociology Review*, vol.3, no. 1, pp. 5-22, 2007.
- Jameson, Frederic. *Postmodernism or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Verso, 1991.
- Kuhse, Helga, et al., editors. *Bioethics: An Anthology*. Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- Lafollette, Hugh, and Niall Shanks. "The Origin of Speciesism." *Philosophy*, vol. 71, no. 275, 1996, pp. 41-61.
- Laskowski, Nicolas. "Epistemic Modesty in Ethics." *Philosophical Studies*, vol.175, no. 7, 2018, pp. 1577-96.
- Latour, Bruno. "A Plea for Earthly Sciences." *New Social Connections: Sociology's Subjects and Objects*, edited by J. Burnett, S. Jeffers, G. Thomas. Basingstoke, 2010, pp. 72-84.
- . *The Politics of Nature: How to Bridge the Sciences into Democracy*. Harvard UP, 2004.
- Left, Sarah. "Animal Rights: A Guide to the Movement." *The Guardian*, 21 July 2004,

- <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2004/jul/21/animalwelfare.world>.  
Accessed on 10 May 2019.
- Leuven, Joost and Tatjana Visak. "Ryder's Painism and His Criticism of Utilitarianism." *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, vol. 26, no. 2, 203, pp. 409-19.
- Lo, Yeuk-Sze. "Disenchantment and New Animalism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2002 & 2015, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-environmental/#DisNewAni>.  
Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- Lorenzini, Daniele. "Philosophical Discourse Ascetic Practice: On Foucault's Reading of Descartes' Meditations." *Theory, Culture & Society* vol. 40, no. 1-2, 2023, pp. 139-59.
- Martineau, Harriet. "Dogs: Unauthorized, Unclaimed, Vagabond." *Sociological Origins*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2003, pp. 7-9.
- Massaro, Alma, and Sabrina Tonutti. "The Emotional Lives of Animals: A Comparison between Researchers and Disciplines." *Relations*, vol. 1, no. 1, 2013, pp. 17-20.
- Mead, George Herbert. "Concerning Animal Perception." *Psychology Review* 14, 1907, pp. 383-90.
- Mendieta, Eduardo. "Philosophy of Liberation." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2016, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/liberation/>.  
Accessed on 7 May 2019.
- Miele, Mara. "The Taste of Happiness: Free-range Chicken." *Environment and Planning*, vol. 43, no. 9, 2011, pp. 2076-90.
- Mill, Charles. "'Ideal Theory' as Ideology." *Hypatia* vol. 20, no. 3, 2005, pp. 165-84.
- Mitchell, Les, "Moral Disengagement and Support for Nonhuman Animal Farming." *Society & Animals*, vol. 19, no.1, 2011, pp. 38-58.
- Mulhall, Stephen. *The Wounded Animal: J. M. Coetzee and the Difficulty of Reality in Literature and Philosophy*. Princeton UP, 2009.
- Murphy, Mark. "The Natural Law Tradition in Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2002 & 2019, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/natural-law-ethics/>.  
Accessed on 1 Jul 2019.
- Nibert, David. *Animal Rights, Human Rights: Entanglements of Oppression and Liberation*. Rowan and Littlefield, 2002.
- Njus, Elliot. "Oregon Horse Appeals Dismissal of Lawsuit Against Former

- Owner," *The Oregonian/Oregon Live*. 23 Jan 2019.  
[https://www.oregonlive.com/news/2019/01/oregon-horse-appeals-dismissal-of-lawsuit-against-former-owner.html?fbclid=IwAR0FuH-Er5dYfdQT5H6nlhOUgPrBI\\_3Q3k4IAuCFyODEiIXENnOjb35Au0](https://www.oregonlive.com/news/2019/01/oregon-horse-appeals-dismissal-of-lawsuit-against-former-owner.html?fbclid=IwAR0FuH-Er5dYfdQT5H6nlhOUgPrBI_3Q3k4IAuCFyODEiIXENnOjb35Au0).  
 Accessed on 8 May 2019.
- Oderberg, David. *Applied Ethics: A Non-Consequentialist Approach*, Blackwell Publishers, 2000.
- O'Sullivan, Siobhan. "Advocating for Animals Equally from Within a Liberal Paradigm." *Environmental Politics*, vol. 16, no. 1, 2007, pp. 1-14.
- "Our Story." Tyson, <https://www.tysonfoods.com/who-we-are/our-story>.  
 Accessed on 24 Apr 2019.
- Pachirat, Timothy. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. Yale UP, 2013.
- Palmer, Clare, "Killing Animals in Animal Shelters." *Killing Animals*, edited by The Animal Studies Group. U of Illinois P, 2006, pp. 170-87.
- Panzer, Michele, "Sickness and Abnormal Behaviors as Indicators of Animal Suffering." *Inside the Emotional Lives of Non-human Animals*, vol. 1, no.1, 2013, pp. 23-31
- Pasnau, Robert. "Divine Illusion." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 1999 & 2015, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/illumination/>.  
 Accessed on 5 Apr 2019.
- Passmore, John. "The Treatment of Animals." *Journal of the History of Ideas*, vol. 36, no.2, 1975, pp. 196-218.
- Phillips, David. *Sidgwickian Ethics*. Oxford UP, 2011.
- Phillis, Hugh. "Introduction to Ethics." *Applied Ethics*, 2014  
<https://scholarblogs.emory.edu/millsonph115/2014/11/16/the-animal-liberation-movement-peter-singer/>.  
 Accessed on 10 May 2019.
- Regan, Tom. "Animal Rights, Human Wrongs." *Environmental Ethics*, vol. 2, no.2, 1980, pp. 99-120.
- . "Exploring the Idea of Animal Rights." *Animal Rights: A Symposium*, edited by David Patterson and Richard D. Ryder. Centaur, 1979.
- . "Human Duties and Animal Rights." *On the Fifth Day*, edited by Richard Knowles Morris and Michael W. Fox. Acropolis Books, 1978.
- . *The Case for Animal Rights*. U of California P, 1983.
- . "The Moral Basis of Vegetarianism," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 5, no. 2, 1975, pp. 181-214.
- Reyes, Alina. *The Butcher*. Minerva, 1992.
- Robinson, Howard. "Dualism." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2003

- & 2016, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dualism/>.  
Accessed on 26 Apr 2019.
- Ross, Andrew, editor. *Universal Abandon?* U of Minnesota P, 1988.
- Rowlands, Mark. *Animal Rights: Moral Theory and Practice*. Palgrave Macmillan, 1998 & 2009.
- Rutherford, Donald. "Descartes' Ethics." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2003 & 2017,  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/descartes-ethics/>.  
Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- Ryder, D. Richard. "Painism versus Utilitarianism." *Think*, vol. 8, no. 21, 2009, pp. 85-9.
- . "Speciesism Again: The Original Leaflet." *Critical Society*, vol. 2, 2010, pp. 1-2.
- . *Speciesism, Painism, and Happiness: A Morality for the 21st Century*. Imprint Academic, 2011.
- . *Victims of Science: The Use of Animals in Research*. National Anti-Vivisection Society, 1975 & 1983.
- Sanders, Clinton R. "Actions Speaker Louder than Words: Close Relationships between Humans and Nonhuman Animals." *Symbolic Interaction*, vol. 26, no. 3, 2003, pp. 405-26.
- Sapontzis, Steve F. "Speciesism," *Between the Species*, 1998, vol.4, iss. 2, article 4.
- . "Speciesism, Painism, and Morality Speciesism, Panism and Happiness: A Morality for the Twenty-First Century Ryder Richard D." *Journal of Animal Ethics* vol.4, no. 1, 2014, pp. 95-102.
- Schultz, Barton. "Sidgwick, Henry." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2004 & 2019, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/sidgwick/>.  
Accessed on 2 Aug 2019.
- Scruton, Roger. *Animal Rights or Wrongs*. Continuum, 1996 & 2000.
- . "The Conscientious Carnivore." *Food For Thought*, edited by Steve Sapontzis, Prometheus, 2004, pp. 81-91.
- Sherry, J. Clifford. *Animal Rights: A Reference Book*. ABC-CLIO, 2009.
- Simmons, Laurence, and Philip Armstrong. *Knowing Animals*. Brill Academic Publishers, 2007.
- Simonson, Peter. "Social Noise and Segmented Rhythms: News, Entertainment, and Celebrity in the Crusade for Animal Rights," *The Communication Review* vol. 4, no. 3, 2001, pp. 399-420.
- Singer, Peter. *Animal Liberation*. Harper Collins, 1975 & 1990.
- . "Animal Liberation: Forty Years On." *Lecture at Rotman Institute of*



- Philosophy*, 2015,  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=z0lN6d1CP9A&t=1436s>.  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- . "Animal Liberation: Past, Present, and Future." *Lecture at Victor Grifols i Lucas Foundation, Barcelona*, 2014,  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=syop78Em5dE>.
- . "The Fable of the Fox and the Unliberated Animals." *Ethics* vol. 88, 1978, pp. 119-20.
- . "Eating Ethically Lecture." *Lecture at Voices from Oxford, UK*, 2013,  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_LJgOP8VS48](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_LJgOP8VS48).  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- . "On Vegetarianism." *Oxford Uehiro: Center for Practical Ethics*, 2017,  
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PLl3vEGU49Q>.  
 Accessed on 8 May 2019.
- . "The Ethics of What We Eat." *Lecture at Williams College*, 2009,  
[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UHzwqf\\_JkrA](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UHzwqf_JkrA).  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- Skelton, Anthony, "The Cosmos of Duty: Henry Sidgwick's Methods of Ethics." *Notre Dame Philosophical Reviews*, 2016.  
 Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.
- Spooner, M. J. "Ryder, RD-Painism: A Modern Morality," *Philosophical Book*, vol.43, no. 3, 2002, pp. 238-9.
- Stallwood, Kim. "Animals Are Our Relations," *Relations*, 2013, pp. 13-5.
- Stephen Mulhall. *The Wounded Animal: J. M. Coetzee and the Difficulty of Reality in Literature and Philosophy*. Princeton UP, 2009.
- Stevenson, P., "Report: The Welfare of Pigs, Cattle and Sheep at Slaughter, Compassion for World Farming." *Compassion in World Farming, UK*, 1993. <https://www.ciwf.org.uk>.  
 Accessed on 15 Jun 2019.
- Stiftung, Boll Heinrich. *Meat Atlas: Facts and Figures about the Animals We Eat*. Boll Heinrich Foundation, 2014.
- Taylor, Nik. *Humans, Animals, and Society: An Introduction to Human-Animal Studies*. Lantern, 2013.
- . "Never an it: Inter-subjectivity and the Creation of Personhood in an Animal Shelter." *Qualitative Sociology Review* vol. 3, no. 1, 2007, pp. 59-73.
- . "Human-Animal Studies: A Challenge to Social Boundaries?" *Proteus: A Journal of Ideas*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2007, pp. 1-5.
- Nik, Taylor, and Tania Signal, editors. *Theorizing Animals: Re-thinking Humanimal Relations*. Brill, 2011.

- Tyler, Tom, and Manuela Rossini, editors. *Animal Encounters*. Brill, 2009.
- The Association of UK Dietitians, editors. *Eating Patterns for Health and Environmental Sustainability: A Reference Guide for Dietitians*. [https://www.bda.uk.com/professional/resources/obd\\_ref\\_guide.pdf](https://www.bda.uk.com/professional/resources/obd_ref_guide.pdf).  
Accessed on 20 May 2019.
- "The Inner Life of Animals by Peter Wohlleben Review – A Revolution in How We Regard Other Species," *The Guardian*, 20 Oct 2017, <https://www.theguardian.com/books/2017/oct/20/inner-life-animals-peter-wohlleben-review>.  
Accessed on 8 Jun 2019.
- "The Scientist: Exploring Life, Inspiring Innovation." *The Scientist: Exploring Life, Inspiring Innovation*. <https://www.the-scientist.com/letter/animal-rights-debate-60971>.  
Accessed on 8 May 2019.
- Varner, Gary. "Speciesism and Reverse Speciesism." *Ethics, Policy and Environment* vol. 14, no. 2, 2011, pp. 171-3.
- Visak, Tatjana, and Robert Garner, editors. *The Ethics of Killing Animals*. Oxford UP, 2015.
- Warren, Mary Anne, "Difficulties With the Strong Animal Rights Position." *Between the Species* vol.2, no. 4, 1987, pp. 401-07.
- Warren, J. Karen. "Feminist Environmental Philosophy." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2014 & 2015, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-environmental/>.  
Accessed on 30 May 2019.
- Weber, Karl, editor. *Food, Inc.: How Industrial Food is Making Us Sicker, Fatter, and Poorer — An What You Can Do about It*. Participant Media, 2009.
- Weber, Max. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. Free Press. 1947.
- Wells, Thomas. "The Incoherence of Peter Singer's Utilitarian Argument for Vegetarianism," *ABC Religion & Ethics*, 2016, <https://www.abc.net.au/religion/the-incoherence-of-peter-singers-utilitarian-argument-for-vegeta/10096418>.  
Accessed on 15 Jun 2019.
- Wenar, Leif. "Rawls, John." *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2008 & 2017, <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/rawls/>.  
Accessed on 15 May 2019.
- Wilkie, Rhoda, and David Inglis. *Animals and Society 5 vols*. Routledge,

2007.

Wohlleben, Peter. "Peter Wohlleben." *Author Homepage*, 2018,  
<https://www.peter-wohlleben.de/?set-culture=en>.  
Accessed on 15 Apr 2019.

---. *The Inner Life of Animals: Surprising Observations of a Hidden World*.  
Bodley Head, 2017.

Wolfe, Cary. *Animal Rites: American Culture, the Discourse of Species and  
Posthumanist Theory*. U of Chicago P, 2003.

## Address for correspondence

Peter Chien-Yu Kao  
Department of English  
National Chengchi University  
No.64, Sec. 2, ZhiNan Rd.  
Wenshan Dist.  
11605 Taipei City  
Taiwan

appleskykid666@gmail.com

Submitted Date: April 11, 2023

Accepted Date: October 10, 2023