Proposition 2: Profit vs. Humane Treatment

The systematic defilement of our nation’s livestock industry has reached its apex. Not only are animals being slaughtered and disassembled as if they were used vehicles, but the conditions in which these animals are being forced to live through are terrible. Proposition 2 is a simple way to improve living conditions for farm animals, allowing them to do basic things such as turn around or stretch their limbs. Denying these simple abilities to animals is not acceptable; animals are living, feeling beings, and deserve a better standard of life.

Politicians against proposition 2 claim that if we give animals better living conditions, our food supply will be at risk, and exposure to Salmonella and Bird flu will rise because of out-of-state importation of eggs. However, forcing chickens to be cramped into cages with tons of other chickens creates a much higher risk of transferring illnesses. If they are spread out, they will be healthier and reduce the chance of spreading disease. But more than just eggs are at stake, other farm animals will be affected by this proposition too: chickens, pigs, and calves. Giving animals more room will promote healthier livestock, and give them more comfortable, humane treatment that they deserve.

Proposition 2 is supported by local family farmers because they care about the welfare of their animals and the health of their customers. In contrast, factory farms oppose Proposition 2 because it cuts into their yearly profits and corporate goals. Why trust the opposition of Proposition 2 when they’re supported and funded by large corporate farming companies such as
Moark L.L.C and United Egg Producers? They focus on using scare tactics and fear instead of acknowledging the welfare of their animals. They only have a single goal: Profit.

One of the largest problems of the inhumane livestock industry is the fact that it has been commercialized and taken over by greedy, profit seeking corporations. “To supply a beef slaughterhouse, ConAgra operates a pair of enormous feedlots. Each of them can hold up to one hundred thousand head of cattle” (150). Animals were never meant to be forced to live together at such large numbers and close proximity. This super-sized corporate version of the rural farm has transformed into the breeding grounds for inhumane treatment of animals on a massive scale.

This initiative also helps keep the environment clean and pristine. Proposition 2 is supported by The American Public Health Association, California Clear Water Action, and Sierra Club California. Factory farms are notorious for contaminating local waterways, lakes, groundwater, soil, and air. They often dispose of waste into the ground, untreated, and ready to seep into your town’s local water supply.

Consider this: “In the USDA study 78.9 percent of ground beef contained microbes that are spread primarily by fecal material.” (197). How can we expect the animals we rely on to be healthy when feedlots like ConAgra’s produce more waste than Denver, Boston, Atlanta, and St. Louis combined? It’s clear that animals need more space and better sanitation. It seems absurd not to pass Proposition 2 when conditions such as these are commonplace.

Yes, if we pass Proposition 2 it will cost farmers and consumers money. But how much? According to a study done at the University of California Riverside costs would be insignificant. “Economic analyses found that moving to a more spacious system of housing hens would cost consumers about a penny an egg.” (Gardner). A penny an egg? That’s it? That’s a small price to pay to give animals humane treatment.
All animals deserve certain rights, especially animals that our economy depends on to keep the food supply moving smoothly. I believe Proposition 2 will help the health of animals, promote humane treatment, and make people realize that farm animals are not being handled properly. Vote yes.