Symposium: Bioethics: Value of Bioethics Leadership for Food Animal Agriculture

164 Bioethics across the disciplines: Leadership and mutual respect. G. Varner*, *Texas A&M University*, *College Station*.

What must philosophers and animal scientists do in order to work productively together in the debate about animals ethics issues? A clarion call from animal scientists to philosophers was given by David Fraser in his 1999 article "Animal ethics and animal welfare science: bridging the two cultures." Fraser argued that several features of what he called "type 1 philosophy" had driven a wedge between philosophers and animal scientists. He described "type 1 philosophy" as endorsing a monolithic and individualistic moral principle, and as tending to lump together diverse animals and diverse practices involving them. Fraser held up as examples of "type 1" philosophy both Tom Regan, who is a rights theorist, and Peter Singer, who is a utilitarian. I agree that good philosophical leadership in the discussion of animal ethics requires us to avoid the problems that Fraser identified, but in this presentation I will stress that this does not require us to abandon utilitarian thinking in ethics. On the contrary, the two-level utilitarianism of R.M. Hare (who happens to have been Peter Singer's dissertation advisor) can endorse a diverse and context-sensitive set of what Hare called "intuitive level" rules. As a result, diverse animals and practices will not be "lumped together" and decisions about animals will sometimes involve conflicting principles, some of them focused at the population- or ecosystem-level. This must surely be a welcome result from the animal scientists' perspective, since defenders of agriculture and other uses of animals so often use utilitarian arguments. For their part, what must animal scientists do? For one thing, if they are going to think like utilitarians, then they must take seriously questions about animal consciousness. For utilitarianism is a sentientist doctrine: it ascribes intrinsic value to positive states of consciousness. So to apply utilitarian reasoning to our treatment of animals, animal scientists will have to include references to consciousness in their definitions of animal welfare. They must also be willing to admit that traditional assumptions about various practices could turn out to be mistaken. For while utilitarian thinking has an inherent conservative bias - insofar as all of the costs of proposed reforms must be taken into consideration-utilitarian thinking can also ground revolutionary changes, especially over the long haul.

Key Words: Ethics, Animal Science, Utilitarianism

165 Bioethics: The need for leadership and how societies should respond. M. G. Hogberg*, *Iowa State University*, *Ames*.

The symbiotic relationship between people and animals is well documented over time. As societies in the developed countries have changed from agrarian to industrial, consumer expectations on how and where animal are raised and used have also changed. This paper will focus on trends in society that impact animal agriculture and implications for professional societies in the animal agriculture field. Professional societies have a responsibility to create, distribute and use knowledge to meet society goals and do this in a socially responsible manner. In addition, societies have a role in providing science-based information to consumers and policy makers. Specific examples will be discussed on pro-active approaches that societies can do to meet the challenges of social responsibility in the area of bioethics.

166 Bioethics: The need for leadership and how the societies should respond. M. P. Lacy*, *University of Georgia*, *Athens*.

More and more scrutiny is being given to the use of animals in research and teaching. The use of animals for almost any reason (food, companionship, exhibit, etc.) has been questioned by some from an ethical perspective. Animal, dairy and poultry scientists obviously are trained and most interested in the science of animals, their production and use. We have left the discipline of ethics to philosophers. Bioethics is a complex, controversial and polarizing subject. Its origins go back at least to the Nuremberg War Crimes Trial, but recent advances in human medicine including stem cell therapies, cloning, genetic screening, etc. have resulted in accentuated attention to this area. Although bioethics has primarily focused on research or medical treatment related to humans, some want to apply bioethics to any living organism that can sense pain or fear. Physicians have found it necessary to insert themselves into the debate regarding medical bioethics. Likewise, animal, dairy and poultry scientists will have to venture into the debate regarding ethical use of animals. Doing so will be neither easy nor pleasant. Critics will claim we cannot be unbiased in such a debate, and it will be challenging to counter such arguments. Most of us believe the use of animals for research, instruction, food and companionship is certainly ethical, and it is difficult for some of us to see another side to the debate. As I consider the future of our disciplines and industries, it appears the next generation of animal, dairy and poultry scientists will have to be as well educated in ethics as in science. It will be important that these future scientists be trained and prepared to counter the argument that they are biased about the ethics of animal use simply because they are trained as animal, dairy or poultry scientists. Professional societies will need to continue to strive to be involved in the bioethics debate and provide unbiased, science based information just as they are involved today in controversial issues such as animal welfare, environmental protection and food safety.

Key Words: Poultry Science, Bioethics

167 ASAS Centennial Presentation: Role of industry leaders in addressing bioethical issues. J. W. Lauderdale*, *Lauderdale Enterprises, Inc.*, *Augusta, MI*.

Food animal agriculture has numerous organizations recognized as providing leaders to address bioethical issues associated with food animal agriculture, such as: production, processing, marketing, production and health products, news media, and research and extension. This presentation is limited to the animal agriculture commercial organizations (Animal health companies) supplying products to enhance animal productivity and animal health. Animal health and productivity products reach the market only following exhaustive research and development (science) and approval by national and worldwide regulatory bodies (science in the USA through the Food & Drug Administration, Center for Veterinary Medicine). Until the 1990s, leaders in the commercial industry relied on science to defend products to enhance animal productivity and animal health. However, in the 1990s bioethics began to be used in discussions as to what products are "acceptable from a bioethics perspective", with bovine somatotropin being an excellent example. Currently, declaration of ethics associated with animal agriculture is promulgated primarily from academically based and advocacy groups

in the USA. Therefore, commercial industry leaders must become proactively engaged in bioethical issues in order to influence direction and outcome of decisions regarding bioethical issues that will influence food animal agriculture. If such engagement is based on understanding both the science and bioethics of the issues, with commitment to understand and act responsibly, leaders from animal health companies will contribute positively to the advancement of food animal agriculture. Such contribution will enhance the ability to provide animal products that are safe to consume, are produced consistent with environmental preservation, are produced in a manner consistent with bioethics, and are in sufficient quantity and quality to meet the increasing world population demand for animal derived foods.

Key Words: Bioethics, Food Animals, Industry Leadership

168 Summary and perspective from within. D. J. R. Cherney*, *Cornell University*, *Ithaca, NY.*

Post-World War II changes in society and government policy led to drastic changes in animal production in the United States. Animal scientists led the way with better production systems, better breeding, better vaccinations, and better health care. Lifestyles of our society changed, leading to greater leisure time, and greater time to reflect on societies ills. Production efficiency has continued to increase, but at what costs? Do our societies and animal industries pay attention to societal needs, including animal welfare, worldwide food shortages, environmental pollution problems and ethics? Our animal sciences have undergone drastic changes in the ways we do science and the questions we research. The background of the people in our societies has changed. Our leaders in industry and the animal societies have been catalysts for some of these changes and will need to continue to be at the forefront of these issues to keep our industries viable in this ever changing world.

Key Words: Bioethics