Course: Bio Animal Science Grade level 10- 12

Type: Argumentative Structure: Argumentation/ Analysis

Teaching: Should consumers purchase beef products that have been altered from their natural state? After reading provided texts, write an argumentative paper that addresses the question and support your position with evidence from the text. Be sure to acknowledge competing views.

Performance level: 3

Student 3

 “Ten years ago, the rejected fat, sinew, bloody effluvia, and occasional bits of meat cut from carcasses in the slaughterhouse were a low-value waste product called 'trimmings' that were sold primarily as pet food.” (Colleen Vanderlinden). I had no idea what was actually in the beef products I bought until I did research for this module. I love eating cheeseburgers, but now I find myself thinking twice before I put it in my mouth. Do you want to eat real, natural beef or some mystery food that looks like beef? If you purchase organic beef, you know exactly what you are eating, what it is made of, and that nothing has been added or altered. Bacteria resistance, health risks, and pink slime will be the main points use to show why consumers should buy organic beef. Everyone should know exactly what is in the food they purchase so that they can make healthy choices. Beef programs will tell you there is nothing wrong with their products but, this paper will uncover many of the shocking secrets of the beef industry.

 Farmers that raise organic cattle do not use antibiotics or other medications. This assures the consumer that the beef has not been changed. Many drugs that are administered to humans, such as Cipro and Baytril are now being used in food animals. Getting accurate information on antibiotic use is a difficult task because it is not publicized by the meat industry. “When a veterinarian diagnoses one infected bird, farmers treat the whole flock by adding the drug to its drinking water.” (Dr, Margaret Mellon). Bacteria are microorganism which have no chlorophyll and multiply by simple division. Some bacteria cause diseases, but others are necessary for fermentation and other bodily functions. If too much of any antibiotic is administered to a food animal, the bacteria living inside of it will become resistant to that drug over time. This scares people because if this bacteria gets into their system, it may not respond to antibiotic treatment. Many farmers use antibiotics in their animals to keep them strong and health so they do not have to watch them suffer and die. I agree that the animals should not suffer, but ifdrug resistant bacteria spreads to humans, there is no telling what it would do. It may even have the potential to kill in humans.

 We face hundreds of health risks every day we are alive. A few health risks include: sports, driving, working out, and eating meat products. “About 80% of the ammonia produced in industry is used in agriculture as fertilizer.” (Department of Health NY). The other 20% of ammonia is sprayed on our beef products to keep them “clean”. This process can be very dangerous for consumers. “Ammonia is very corrosive and damages cells in the body on contact.” (Department of Health NY).Most people would agree that cancer is unpredictable, but Professor Harald zur Hausen does not think so. He has been experimenting around the world and collecting data where beef consumption is high. "There is a high rate of colon rectal cancer in countries with high red meat consumption. Yet, in countries where white meat, specifically smoked chicken, grilled fish, is eaten more, there is no increased risk through the carcinogens produced is more or less the same.'' (Harald Hausen). Diethylstilbestrol is a synthetic estrogen that was synthesized in 1938. It was first given to women in the mistaken belief that it would minimize complications in pregnancy and losses. Studies later showed that this drug caused a rare vaginal cancer in women that were exposed to it. This was withdrawn from the market, but it is still put into feed additives that are fed to feed animals. In this way, we are still exposed to the drug and the harmful effects. When concern was raised, the USDA removed it from the feed and added another drug just like it. The USDA has not confirmed or denied this claim, but why take the chance?

 The meat industry tries to save money any way it can. Now they have decided to use the leftover carcass trimmings to put into meat as “boneless lean beef”. “In huge factories, the company liquefies the trimmings and uses a spinning centrifuge to separate the sinews and fats from the meat, leaving a mash that has been described as 'pink slime,' which is then frozen into small squares and sold as a low-cost additive to hamburger." (Colleen Vanderlinden). They do not even have to put it on the label as it is considered a “processing ingredient” along with the ammonia they spray it with to get rid of the harmful bacteria crawling all over it. What else are they hiding that we have not heard about yet? As consumers, we have the right to know exactly what is in the meat that we purchase. The USDA and the FDA say it is safe for us to eat, but why will they not put the ingredients on the package? Why would they hide it from us if there is nothing wrong with it?

 Organic beef is much healthier and safer for consumers than the “pink slime” we find in the supermarket. The more antibiotics we administer to feed animals, the greater chance there is of creating deadly bacteria that won’t respond to antibiotic treatment. I refuse to eat this beef product that has been sprayed with cleaning products to get rid of the bacteria. I will not let the meat industry trick me into buying these fake beef products that they have slapped together to save some money. If it is all safe for us, why hide it? I want to know exactly what I am eating so that I can make a healthy choice. Stand up for yourself and your family and do not let the meat industry sell you lies. Eating organic meat is very healthy and you will finally be able to say that you know exactly what you are buying.
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| Where’s the BeefStudent 3 |
| Annotation |
| Focus | 3.5 | Clearly stated claim. Did not meet counterclaim as strongly as the opening indicated. |
| Reading/Research | 3.5 | Some statements made within the body paragraphs were not strong enough or lacked the textual evidence to drive position over the top. |
| Controlling Idea | 3.0 | Good strong claim with support, but did not take the counterclaim and argue against them. |
| Development | 3.5 | The writer takes the reader through their side of the argument. However, the writer should develop the counterclaim throughout the paper. |
| Organization | 4.0 | The paper has a clearly defined thesis statement. The points made in thesis statement were discussed methodically throughout the body paragraphs. The conclusion restated the thesis and a call to action made. |
| Conventions | 3.0 | A few minor errors with this paper. However, the writer has good command of the English Language. Writer needs to be careful with contractions in a formal paper. |
| ContentUnderstanding | 3.5 | Writer has a good understanding of their side of the argument. Writer needs to work on understanding of counterclaim.  |