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| Provide a hook that hints at the issue and gets the audience interested.  Picture this, cows crammed into spaces for their entire lives, without anything to do but eat and produce milk. Now picture a hen, stuffed in a cage for its entire short life—a cage that allows for virtually no movement of the animal—and its entire existence is for one thing, to produce breakfast eggs for McDonald’s patrons. |
| Describe the issue as well as its historical/social importance without giving your opinion/argument.  Animal factories, or “factory farms” that produce mass quantities of meat and animal products for consumption are a fixture in the American way of life. Much of what we consume is “factory produced,” meaning, it isn’t locally grown and comes from large, industrial-sized plants where animals are potentially treated inhumanely and forced to reproduce and die in extremely harsh conditions. |
| Clearly state your argument claim  Clearly, this system is harmful to the animals and should be changed to be more humane and gentle to the animals that will one day end up on dinner plates. |
| Present and provide analysis for at least 2 pieces of evidence from 2 different sources (sources must be cited) that support their claim.  According to Oliver Broudy, author of “Factory Farming Ignores the Suffering of Animals, “In the U.S., birds have as little as 48 square inches, a six- by eight-inch space. The United Egg Producers' standards are gradually increasing over the next five years. We'll get up to 67 square inches. But that's still not the industry average, and even 67 square inches is just [the size of] a sheet of standard letter paper.” This amounts to a very small space in which a live chicken is allowed to live out its extremely short life, before it ends up being slaughtered. In terms of what that would look like for a human being, imagine spending your life trapped inside a space the size of your closet. In addition, the inhumane treatment at factory farms becomes apparent when you examine the conditions of the way that animals are used to produce the product that the factory farm is trying to acquire. “Fifty years ago, cows were basically fed on grass. They walked around and selected their food themselves, food that we can't eat, chewing it up and producing milk that we *can* eat. Now cows are confined indoors, and a lot of their food supply is grown specifically for them, on land that we could have used to grow food for ourselves” (Broudy). The fact that the cows that produce the milk are kept locked away, almost like the chickens that are slaughtered, is a similarity between the mistreatment of both these animals, but another point to make is that the natural instinct and behavior of the animals, when you subject them to “unnatural” conditions of not allowing them to roam around and feed themselves on a farm, it denies their basic instincts and behavior, which is a form of mistreatment. |
| Acknowledge the alternative argument.  Even given these facts, some would argue that the treatment of animals in these factory farms is not really inhumane or abusive. |
| Provide a clear reason AND a piece of cited evidence for the alternative argument.  According to Charles Stenhold, author of "The Animal Agriculture Industry Cares About the Welfare of Animals,” “Farm Sanctuary charged veal farmers in New Jersey of malnutrition practices because of the absence of fiber in their calves' diets. However, a coalition of dairy farmers, animal nutrition specialists, and dairy extension specialists at Rutgers University testified that it is typical to not give calves fiber because it is not healthy for a calf's developing digestive system.” In other words, according to these sources, denying some animals the right to choose their own food, in this case, calves the right to eat grass and vegetation, may actually be beneficial to the development and growth of the animal. This argument would seemingly support the practice of denying cows the right to “free range” on a farm and eat the grass and vegetation. |
| Somehow refute the evidence or reason for the alternative/counter argument by either citing evidence that "undoes" the evidence of the alternative/counter argument OR attack the "logic/reasoning" behind the reason for or the evidence of the alternative/counter argument.  However, this evidence, first off, doesn’t argue that the animals should be contained to an inhumanely small space in order to keep them from eating less-than-perfect food for their development. In addition, this evidence also doesn’t argue that full-grown cows, whose digestive systems may not be adversely affected by eating “free range” grass and vegetation, should be denied the opportunity to express their own natural inclinations and habits to do so. To deny the full-grown cow the right to roam and “free range,” just like denying a chicken the right to even move itself in basic ways is still inhumane. |
| Conclude with a clincher.  So, the next time anyone takes a bite out of a steak or readies a couple eggs to make their morning omelet, they should potentially think about where they bought their agricultural “products” and how those “products” were once treated before they ended up on the meal plate. |