

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/236008418>

Are We Addicted to the Suffering of Animals? Animal Cruelty and the Catholic Moral Tradition - John Berkman

Chapter · January 2012

CITATION

1

READS

516

1 author:



John R Berkman

University of Toronto

60 PUBLICATIONS **82** CITATIONS

[SEE PROFILE](#)

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:



Non-Human Animals and Ethics [View project](#)

11

Are We Addicted to the Suffering of Animals? Animal Cruelty and the Catholic Moral Tradition

John Berkman

WE ARE ALL OPPOSED—AT least ostensibly—to mindless animal cruelty. Almost no one defended Michael Vick and his cohorts when they tortured and killed dogs for their dog fighting ring. Imagine Michael Vick had been selling a product—say dog-skin handbags from the “losing” dogs—that financially supported and enabled the continued torture of more dogs. We would not only *not* buy these dog-skin handbags, we would boycott the handbags and urge others not to buy them as well.

Michael Vick grew up in an American subculture where dog fighting was socially acceptable. What was introduced to him at age seven as a diversion and entertainment, became for him as an adult an addiction. At twenty-one, as soon as he became wealthy, he set up his Bad Newz Kennels near Surry, Virginia, and oversaw its operation for six years until he was arrested. For his financing and leadership in a particularly socially unacceptable form of animal cruelty, Michael Vick went from the pinnacle of success—the highest paid football player in America at the time—to bankruptcy and a twenty-three-month prison sentence. When Vick arrived in prison, he still didn’t think he had done anything wrong. Only while he was in prison did he come to see the cruelty of his dog fighting.

Since his release from prison, in talks to youth about his dog fighting, Vick readily admits that he was addicted to it, saying that he spent more time on his dog-fighting business than he did preparing to play football. For Vick, it took many months in prison to see the wrongfulness of his addiction to dog fighting.

Vick is by no means the only person who has failed to see his involvement in animal cruelty and the wrongfulness of it. In fact, Vick's Bad Newz Kennels was simply a drop in the animal cruelty bucket compared to that being perpetrated by his neighbor, Smithfield Foods.¹ Joe Luter III, CEO of Smithfield Foods from 1975–2006, created the world's largest (and most notorious) factory farming system for pigs. Reading an interview with Luter, you would not even know he is talking about live animals, much less intelligent and feeling creatures, as he refers to them only as "raw materials" for his business.² Clearly, Luter does not think he is doing anything wrong, much less engaging in boundless animal cruelty.

This essay argues that we are a lot more like Michael Vick and Joe Luter than we care to imagine. No, we're not highly paid football players and we won't go to jail or go bankrupt for our participation in animal cruelty. But like Michael Vick and Joe Luter, we participate in animal cruelty, and we are similarly raised in a way that we do not see its wrongfulness.

How do we participate in animal cruelty? By spending billions of dollars each year financially supporting an incredibly common and pervasive form of animal cruelty: factory farming, which involves raising pigs, cows, chickens, turkeys, and other animals in deplorable conditions. And, like Michael Vick, we financially support it in part because we have an addiction. More specifically, we are addicted to the taste of low-cost industrial meat. As a result, we refuse to see our financial support of large-scale cruelty to animals.

And yet, in the last fifty years, factory farming has become the dominant form of "raising" animals in America. If you buy chicken, pork, or

1. Less than twenty miles from Surry is Smithfield, Virginia, birthplace and headquarters of Smithfield Foods. Founded in 1936, Smithfield Foods was a small pig slaughtering and packaging company for fifty years. However, in the 1980s, Joseph Luter III embarked on a plan to expand Smithfield Foods into the raising and intensive confining of pigs. In doing so, Luter expanded and perfected factory farming with pigs, vaulting his company into the largest producer of pig meat in the world in less than twenty years.

2. See Miller, "Straight Talk from Smithfield's Joe Luter."

eggs from your local grocery store, the animals that make up this food have almost certainly been inflicted with gross suffering that in truth is nothing other than institutionalized cruelty on a vast scale.

Thinking of Michael Vick and Joe Luter reminded me of how almost thirty years ago, Bob Dylan sang the words, “Steal a little and they throw you in jail; steal a lot and they make you king.”³ Dylan could equally have said this about the factory farming industry. If you treat a few animals callously, whether it is training your dog for fighting or torturing a few cats, you can be cited for animal cruelty. However, if you cage millions of animals in small spaces where they can hardly move; mutilate them by cutting off their beaks, tails, and/or horns; brand them with hot irons; castrate them; genetically engineer their bodies; and breed them with techniques that result in a lifetime of severe pain, you are unlikely to ever get penalized. In a cruel twist of fate, those at the forefront of these enterprises, like Joe Luter, are often rewarded with significant wealth and influence. Corporations that typically run factory farms have become powerful enough to persuade many US state legislatures to explicitly exclude all farm animals from any kind of animal cruelty legislation. Even with government protection, factory farms typically operate under a cloak of secrecy. They are set up in remote places and surrounded with fences and barbed wire so that no outsiders can see what goes on. Recently, industry supporters have also convinced US state legislatures to pass laws against photographing or taking videos of the conditions in these places. And you wonder why you don’t know where your meat comes from and how it was produced?

In the face of these harrowing conditions and the industry’s attempts to hide their vast animal cruelty, this essay contends that factory farming is immoral. Furthermore, once we become aware of this wanton cruelty, we must refuse to participate in it, in part, by choosing not to buy or eat meat from factory-farmed animals. Factory-farmed meat is, if we are honest, “cruelty meat,” and it behooves us to find alternatives wherever possible.

The first half of the essay begins the argument by describing the history and character of factory farms in America, making it clear that animal cruelty is as necessary in North American factory farming as animal

3. From “Sweetheart Like You” (*Infidels*, 1983).

cruelty is necessary in dog fighting. In the second half of the essay, I will develop the argument as to why all of us—especially Christians—ought not to participate in this widespread and mindless cruelty to animals. Turning to an argument that has historically been a part of Christian social teaching, especially in the Catholic tradition, I will argue that supporting factory farming by buying and/or consuming its products is a form of what the Catholic moral tradition has called “cooperation with wrongdoing,” which no morally serious person ought to do. Christians have a particular obligation not to cooperate with the wrong of factory farming, not only out of respect for God’s laws, but also because such participation, once recognized and understood, corrodes their character and undermines their ability to criticize or resist other kinds of evils. To be clear, the point of this particular chapter is not to oppose meat-eating *per se*. My objection here is not with the Inuit who eat seals as their primary (or only) food source, nor with aboriginals who hunt and kill wild boars for the same reason. Rather, my objection here is to wanton cruelty and to Christian acceptance of, and collusion with, enterprises that engage in that kind of action, whether the perpetrator is Michael Vick or Joe Luter.

What Is Factory Farming, and How Are Factory-Farmed Animals Actually Treated?

So, what is factory farming? To answer this, we also need to ask two other questions: How are factory-farmed animals actually treated, and when did this system come about? In order to keep my argument narrow and focused, I will discuss the factory farming of pigs only, since among the various farm animals (*a*) they are the most consistently factory-farmed after poultry—more than 95 percent of pigs in America alone are on factory farms; (*b*) they are very harshly treated; and (*c*) they are the most social, loyal, and intelligent (evidently more intelligent than dogs, for example) of factory-farmed animals. As such, factory-farmed pigs arguably suffer the most from their harsh treatment, and along with poultry probably receive the cruelest treatment.

A factory farm, also known as an Animal Feeding Operation (AFO), a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO), or an Industrial Farm Animal Production (IFAP), is a highly intensified system for rais-

ing animals for meat, dairy, or egg production. The basic philosophy is to turn the farm into a mechanized system that needs as little labor and skill as possible to produce the greatest quantity of meat for the lowest cost. Typically, this means a large-scale economy: “Get big or get out” has been the mantra of farming for decades. What is perhaps hard to believe and thus important to note, is that in the logic of factory farms, the welfare of animals receives *no* intrinsic consideration. The only reason to halt or lessen cruel treatment of animals is if the degree of mistreatment leads to an increase in cost of the end product. If the pigs are stuffed so close together that some are regularly smothered, just toss the dead ones into a dumpster. If disease breaks out, give them antibiotics to stave off the illness until the upcoming slaughter. If a pregnant sow has a broken leg, leave her in here pain until the piglets are born, then kill her because mending her leg is not cost effective. Are the pigs so crowded, hungry, and stressed that they start chewing on each other’s tails? Dock their tails and grind down their teeth—without using anesthetics.⁴ Worried that a sow might smother her piglets when she rolls over in her sleep because her space is too small? Rather than give her more space, make her completely immobile by putting her in a metal crate for months, perhaps even strap her down to the floor; that way she cannot roll over at all. Although giving more room to her and her piglets would reduce their suffering, such a move adds to costs and cuts into profits. Such is the inexorable logic of the industrial production system when applied to intelligent mammals who have emotions, habits, desires, and needs, and yet who are nevertheless made to suffer *ad nauseum* in this system.

The situation actually worsens when it comes to slaughtering factory-farmed pigs. Even though pigs can live from ten to eighteen years, and do not reach maturity till they are three or four years old, most pigs sent to slaughter are only six months old. They are still piglets. But selective breeding and intensified feeding cause them to grow faster than their bones naturally allow. This fast growth causes enormous stress on a pig’s body. But waiting even three years is not economically desirable for large corporations.

4. “Docking” is clipping a pig’s tail to make it highly sensitive, because if a pig allows its tail to be chewed, the pig is likely to get infected and sick and thus must be killed.

Although slaughterhouse conditions differ, we can get a clear picture of the production line logic in which “economically required” modes of transport to slaughter and “disassembly line” speeds lead inexorably to massive cruelty. To transport them to the slaughterhouse, pigs are often beaten to force them into a severely overcrowded trailer. Some fall and suffocate when others are crammed in on top of them. Even though the journey may be hundreds of miles, the pigs typically receive no food or water. These journeys often have temperature extremes. In the summer, since pigs cannot sweat, many die from heat exhaustion. In the winter, many freeze to death, or more often their bodies are frozen to parts of the unheated trucks. One transporter notes that “in the wintertime there are always hogs stuck to the sides and floors of the trucks. [Slaughterhouse workers] go in there with wires or knives and just cut or pry the hogs loose. The skin pulls right off. These hogs were alive when we did this.”⁵ According to a 2006 industry report, more than one million pigs die every year in these transport trucks.⁶ Another industry report notes that as many as 10 percent of pigs arriving at US packing plants are “downers,” which means that they are so ill or injured that they are unable to stand and walk on their own.⁷ These sick and injured pigs will be kicked or struck with electric prods to get them to move, and if that fails, drivers will grab their legs with winches to pull them, often pulling their legs right off in the process.

As awful as the transportation conditions may be, the pigs that die in transport may be the fortunate ones. When they arrive at the slaughterhouse, the unloading is often a witness to the sustained cruelty inherent in these pigs’ short lives. Having been kept basically immobile for their entire lives and fed a drug-riddled diet to make their bodies grow faster than their bone structure can handle, their legs and respiratory systems are so weak or deformed that in most cases they cannot walk very far. When they come off the truck, they can see more open space in the herding pens than they ever have. Those that can run for the first time, mistaking the slaughterhouse pen with freedom. But some collapse and cannot get up, their bodies racked with weakness and pain. They will be dragged.

5. Eisnitz, *Slaughterhouse*, 133.

6. Goihl, “Transport Losses of Market Hogs Studied.”

7. Gonyou, “Stressful Handling of Pigs.”

A typical slaughterhouse “disassembles” up to eleven hundred pigs an hour. That’s a pig about every three seconds. The “required” speed of the slaughterhouse means that if the initial attempt (or attempts) to kill the pig (or stun it unconscious) fails, they won’t stop the “disassembly” line to make sure the pig is dead before they start cutting it open, or before they dip it into a tank of boiling water, which is intended to soften its skin and remove its hair. For instance, the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) documented fourteen humane slaughter violations at one slaughterhouse, where the USDA inspectors found pigs who were “squealing after being stunned [with a stun gun] as many as four times.”⁸ And as one slaughterhouse worker put it, “There’s no way these animals can bleed out in the few minutes it takes to get up the ramp. By the time they hit the scalding tank, they’re still fully conscious and squealing. Happens all the time.”⁹

While there may well be farming operations or slaughterhouses in North America where these kinds of violations are rare, the cruel treatment of animals described above is not unusual, extreme, or technically criminal. Unlike dog fighting, where a relatively small number of people at the margins of society become addicted to this perverse form of entertainment, factory farming is not the result of a few nasty guys having “fun.” Rather, it is mainstream corporate America employing torture and cruelty as means of making money—lots and lots of money for those who mastermind the factory slaughterhouses.¹⁰ For the unfortunate individuals—increasingly, new immigrants and migrant farmworkers—who have to work on these “farms” and in these slaughterhouses for a paltry hourly wage, it is cruelty as a means to an end. This is the business of torture.

When Did This System Come About?

Although crop farming was mechanized in the nineteenth century, industrialized animal farming began with the large industrial slaughterhouses,

8. US Congress, Congressional Record, V. 147, Pt. 7, May 22, 2001 to June 11, 2001, 9879.

9. Eisnitz, *Slaughterhouse*, 71.

10. In 2005, his last year before retirement, Joe Luter made almost eleven million dollars, with another nineteen million dollars in unexercised stock options. See Tietz, “Boss Hog,” 114.

especially for pigs, in the early part of the twentieth century. According to the 2008 Pew Commission on Industrial Farm Animal Production, Henry Ford got his idea for assembling automobiles from watching how industrialized slaughterhouses “disassembled” pigs.¹¹ However, it was only after World War II—when people still remembered the dust bowl and food shortages— that the push for a “green revolution” to feed a rising population, a huge availability of inexpensive farmland, a strong futurist mentality, and the desire to apply the factory model to the production of all consumer goods gave rise to factory farming.

The first serious analysis of this phenomenon was in the 1964 book *Animal Machines: The New Factory Farming Industry*, by Ruth Harrison. In the book, Harrison notes “a new type of farming, of production line methods applied to the rearing of animals, of animals living out their lives in darkness and immobility without the sight of the sun, of a generation of men who see in the animal they rear only its conversion factor into human food.”¹² Harrison saw not only the fundamental transformation of an “animal husbandry” model to a corporate factory model, she also saw a rapid and fundamental change of culture. As she duly noted: “The factory farmer cannot rely, as did his forebears, on generations of experience gained from the animals themselves and handed down from father to son; he relies on a vast array of backroom boys with computing machines working to discover the breeds, feeds and environment most suited to convert food into flesh at the greatest possible speed, and every batch of animals reaching market is a sequel to another experiment.”¹³

Although Harrison adeptly characterized the nature and logic of the factory farm system, and although her work encouraged animal welfare legislation in her home country of England, the animal welfare movement historically got little traction in America; things would get much worse in the thirty-five years after the publication of Harrison’s book. This has changed slightly in the last decade; a few states have begun to ban gestation crates for pregnant pigs and battery cages for hens, but these victories are small in the grand scheme.

11. “*Putting Meat on the Table*,” 5

12. Harrison, *Animal Machines*, 15.

13. *Ibid.*, 18.

Why Is Factory Farming Wrong?

In the first half of this essay, I sought to explain what factory farming is, when it originated in America, and how it inflicts wanton suffering on untold numbers of animals, a suffering that is by no means necessary for Americans to eat meat. Sadly, America's history is sullied by man's seemingly boundless inhumanity to man, especially during the industrial revolution: we think of the robber barons who exploited workers by paying them a pittance for working incredibly long hours in extraordinarily dangerous conditions; we think of America's sad legacy of child labor; we think of the scourge of slavery. It is ironic that just as America entered a period in which it ended the worst of these abuses of other human beings, it established a new institution that began to exploit nonhuman animals in ways and on a scale that no one could have imagined.

Turning to the Catholic moral tradition, there are a number of ways in which one can criticize the practice of factory farming. In the last fifty years the Catholic tradition has begun to develop the notion of "social sin," and factory farming fits this notion. However, since I wish to focus not on the wrong done by those who engage in factory farming, but on the wrongfulness of one's buying and/or eating factory-farmed meat, dairy, and eggs, I will draw on what the tradition calls *cooperation with wrongdoing*. I will proceed by first defining cooperation with wrongdoing and then exploring cooperation with wrongdoing and animal cruelty.

What Is Cooperation with Wrongdoing?

The idea of cooperation with wrongdoing is simple enough when we think about a variety of crimes. Procuring a gun for someone who plans to commit a murder is a form of cooperation with wrongdoing; buying stolen goods from someone or laundering stolen money are forms of cooperation with wrongdoing, as is knowingly investing in companies whose purpose is to engage in these kinds of activities. However, a simple definition of cooperation with wrongdoing is when a person intentionally or causally assists another person in unjust or wicked activities. A key distinction in the Catholic tradition when speaking of cooperation with wrongdoing is between formal and material cooperation. Formal coop-

eration is where one shares the object of the wrongdoer's activity. This is typically understood to be someone who advises or counsels the person principally engaged in the wrongdoing, aids them by helping them escape justice, and/or launders the proceeds of their criminality. So the person who invests in a start-up company that will run a series of Internet scams is formally cooperating in wrongdoing. So is the person who knowingly "fences" stolen paintings or buys goods made by exploited child labor.

On the other hand, material cooperation is where a person clearly has other intentions in their actions when they assist others in wrongdoing. Examples of this include a pharmacist who dispenses medication that someone else (unbeknownst to the pharmacist) uses to poison another person, or a UPS delivery person who unwittingly delivers a package that is booby-trapped to kill the recipient. While they causally assisted someone in wrongdoing, they typically did not intend to do so. In these cases of material cooperation with wrongdoing, the actors are engaged in good and legitimate activities, and the bad effects that flow from their activities are clearly outside of their intentions. In more typical examples of material cooperation, the cooperator is well aware of the way a wrongdoer can or is using the cooperator's otherwise good actions to facilitate wrongdoing. In such cases, the person doing an otherwise good action may treat the wrongdoer's activities as an unwanted bad side effect. Moreover, in addition to not intending the wrong action, if cooperation is to be considered material, we have to weigh the good against the potential bad. So a delivery person might know that he or she could potentially and unknowingly deliver a deadly package, despite all precautions, and still see that the good of delivering mail in general outweighs the possible harms that could be done.

Cooperation with Wrongdoing and Animal Cruelty

So now we come to the question of cooperating with cruelty toward animals, whether it involves participating in dog fighting or in factory farming.

Let us begin with those who set up and run a dog fighting operation. These are people who provide the seed funding to begin the opera-

tion; find, buy, or steal the dogs, including dogs that are used as “bait” in the training of the fighting dogs; train them to maim and kill other dogs; and in various other ways mistreat them, for example, starve them or socially isolate them to make them more vicious. These people are all engaged in a practice that our society has defined both socially and legally as wrongdoing.

Then there are those people who aid and abet the operation—by bringing dog food, by selling the operators grandstand equipment and seats, by running the food concessions at the dog fights, by advertising the fights through word of mouth and other underground means, and so on. Such people are likely to be formally cooperating with the operation, though in some cases through lack of knowledge or understanding, or even by duress, may be only materially cooperating with the dog fights.

Then there are those who attend the dog fights. Presumably, attendees purchase tickets and/or place bets with the “house.” Thus attendees typically financially support the operation. Even if they don’t have to pay for a ticket or bet on the matches, they are there to witness this blood sport.

Presumably, the audience sees nothing wrong with what they are witnessing, or else many of them would not be there. However, that does not justify their participation and support of it. While one could say that the audience is only “taking in entertainment” or “attending a sporting event,” those are simply not adequate descriptions of what is going on. We cannot simply choose a morally neutral way of interpreting these actions, but have to take into consideration what is actually happening. The description must match reality. And one of the morally significant true descriptions of what spectators at dog fights are engaged in is morally and financially supporting the institutionalized practice of animal cruelty and torture. This description is much more truthful than “they are just taking in entertainment” because there are no credible mitigating or justifying factors for their support of this blood sport. To say “we all need some entertainment or relaxation,” or “this is a good opportunity to spend time with my friends,” does not change the fact that attending these dog fights hardly makes sense unless one approves of them. The cruelty to these dogs is not an incidental side effect to dog fighting. It is inherent to the sport of dog fighting as it is practiced.

In short form, a similar argument applies to eating pig meat, 95 percent of which is produced by factory farms, a bureaucratic and institutionalized structure that, again, gives no significance to the welfare or well-being of the animals apart from what maximizes the corporation's profit. Assuming that this cruelty to the pigs is inherent to the production of factory-farmed pig meat—what I have called cruelty meat—does purchasing and eating pig flesh fall under the category of formal cooperation with wrongdoing?

For it to be material cooperation, the cruelty would have to be an unfortunate side effect that was not essential to the production of the meat as it is actually produced today in America.¹⁴ However, in North American factory farming, cruelty is not a mere evil side effect or by-product to some legitimate good of eating pig meat. The cruelty is as an essential and necessary part of the logic of factory farming as is the cruelty to dogs in contemporary dog fighting. For in factory farming, the welfare of the animals is of no accord; it is entirely a matter of raising the animals in a way that maximizes profits. Any care or consideration given to the animals in the logic of factory farming is ordered to future maximization of profit. A proper description of factory farming understands cruelty as an essential element, and thus meat that one knows is from such a source is improperly referred to merely as meat, but is properly and truthfully described as cruelty meat.

Thus, if I were to eat North American factory-farmed bacon or ribs, I would consent to the cruelty that is inherent in the production of that bacon and ribs. It is analogous to buying stolen property. Even if I intend only good and upright uses of a bicycle or a flat-screen television, if I know (or have very good reason to believe) it is stolen property, then I am formally cooperating with wrongdoing. I consent or even contribute to the wrong—both the wrong done to the victim of the theft, and the wrong of supporting and sustaining the thief in his business. So it is if I eat factory-farmed bacon or ribs. I consent and perhaps contribute to the wrong done to the victims of the cruelty, and I support and sustain the wrong done by the factory farm industry. Hence I formally cooperate in the cruelty to pigs when I buy and/or eat the bacon or ribs.

14. Furthermore, for it to be acceptable material cooperation, the good of eating pig meat would have to outweigh the cruelty that factory farming their bodies produces.

This is especially true since there is no need to eat cruelly pig meat. Millions of Americans don't eat pigs. And if you can afford it and want it, you can search for and pay the premium for pigs raised largely free of the worst cruelty (although this pork is harder to find). There's simply no moral justification (or "duress" in the terminology of moral theology) for continuing to buy and consume cruelly pig meat. Doing so is ignorance, laziness, or gluttony, or perhaps all three.

Final Considerations

In this essay I have argued that wanton animal cruelty is an inherent element of modern American factory farming, and that if we wish to be morally serious human beings, we should refuse to cooperate with this hideous wrongdoing. Noncooperation requires that we refuse to buy or eat cruelty meat. Within the limited argument I have made in this essay, that means not buying any kind of pig meat unless you have very good reason to believe that that meat did not come from factory-farmed animals. Similar arguments can be made regarding other factory-farmed animals.

Factory farming is problematic for reasons beyond those upon which I have focused in this essay. Factory farming contributes more to global warming than all our motor vehicles combined. In a world with so much starvation, the diversion of huge amounts of grain to factory-farmed animals is extremely wasteful. Eating hormone- and antibiotic-stuffed cows, pigs, and chickens harms our endocrine systems and makes us far more susceptible to drug-resistant "superbugs," which kill more people than we'd like to acknowledge. Our meat-heavy diets—diets made possible because of cheap industrial meat—are generally bad for our health. While all significant evils, they are not the point here.

Beyond that, there are also arguments one can make as to why one might not want to eat pigs or other kinds of animals, whether factory farmed or not. Some of these arguments—whether they be about the health or ecological benefits of not eating animals, or about the consideration we should show to other animals as God's creatures—are serious and worthy of consideration.¹⁵ However, the moral argument against eat-

15. I have argued elsewhere that we should consider vegetarianism based on

ing factory-farmed pigs seems overwhelmingly obvious. If one is not willing to consider and act on that, then these other arguments would seem to have little chance of a fair hearing, though the health argument, with its appeal to blatant self-interest, is certainly successful at times.

Furthermore, Christians have a responsibility not to eat factory-farmed animals because of the potential scandal. By “scandal,” the Christian tradition means that when those of us who are exemplars for other Christians—whether as parents, teachers, priests, ministers, or lay leaders—do things that we know are wrong, we may lead others to think that such wrongs are actually morally acceptable. This is the point of Matthew 18:6: “If any of you put a stumbling block before one of these little ones who believe in me, it would be better for you if a great millstone were fastened around your neck and you were drowned in the depth of the sea.” Once we understand the evil of cruelty meat, we have a particular obligation to witness to those who do not yet understand this form of cruelty.

There has not been enough leadership on this issue by Catholic theologians. One, however, has spoken out on one aspect of the issue, and his words are worth quoting: “Certainly, a sort of industrial use of creatures, so that geese are fed in such a way as to produce as large a liver as possible, or hens live so packed together that they become just caricatures of birds, this degrading of living creatures to a commodity seems to me in fact to contradict the relationship of mutuality that comes across in the Bible.”¹⁶

our Christian witness to the eschatological peaceable kingdom. See Berkman and Hauerwas, “A Trinitarian Theology of the ‘Chief End of All Flesh,’” and Berkman, “The Consumption of Animals and the Catholic Tradition.”

16. Ratzinger, *God and the World*, 78–79.