Copyright

by

Carrie Danielle Gavit

2016

The Thesis Committee for Carrie Danielle Gavit
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following thesis:

U.S. Slaughterhouse Industry: Masculinity, Violence, and a Call for Feminist Intervention

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor: ______________________________
Janet Davis

____
Heather Houser

U.S. Slaughterhouse Industry: Masculinity, Violence, and a Call for Feminist Intervention

by

Carrie Danielle Gavit, B.A.

Thesis

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2016

Abstract

U.S. Slaughterhouse Industry: Masculinity, Violence, and a Call for Feminist Intervention

Carrie Danielle Gavit, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2016

Supervisor: Janet Davis

A slaughterhouse is a location in which animals are disassembled into meat products consumed by the public. In the United States, this process is made invisible due to a restructuring of the industry that took place in the mid-20th century, as well as "ag-gag" laws. Not only does animal abuse occur without repercussions but also the inhumane treatment of the workers killing, deconstructing, and processing the meat for public consumption continues without notice. For the purposes of my research, I specifically analyze the daily experiences of men working within various slaughterhouses across the country. Through academic articles, newspaper stories, investigative reports and whistleblower accounts, I gain access to workers' stories and the set-up of the U.S. slaughterhouse industry. Due to the industry's desire to increase production rates, the environment within slaughterhouses is one founded in patriarchal and capitalist notions. Each worker must prove his worth to maintain any amount of job security. At the same time, each worker must bear through the

working conditions, inhumane treatment, and the act of participating in the killing and deconstruction of animals every minute of every day. The pressure to perform accompanied with the physical, emotional, and psychological toll of the job often results in post-traumatic stress disorder for the workers. As a form of outlet, the workers resort to violence toward one another and the animals. In assessing workers' experiences and violent outbursts, I apply feminist methodologies to uncover ways of healing for these workers and possibilities for altering the industry's set-up to dismantle its foundations in patriarchal and capitalist notions.

Table of Contents

Introduction 1

The Construction of Today's Slaughterhouse 4

- From Community Butchers to Industrialized Slaughterhouses 4
- All Slaughterhouses Function as One 11

Set-Up of the Slaughterhouse 17

- Physical Lay-out 17
- How Hierarchies Distribute Power 25

Violences within Space 35

- Employer to Employee 35
- Employee to Employee 39
- Employee to Animal 44

Harm and Healing 48

- Potential Negative Effects of Work on Employees 48
- Imagining a Feminist Masculinity within the Space 53

Conclusion 57

Works Cited 61

Introduction

A slaughterhouse, or abattoir, is defined as a location in which animals are slaughtered in order to provide food for human consumption. To an outsider simply consuming the product, the space may appear as only that. However, the quotidian experiences of those working within this space unveil a site overcome with racism, violence, and, potentially, post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) perpetuated by a patriarchal and capitalist society. For my purposes, I look specifically at the men working in this environment to understand how dominant notions of masculinity within the site cause these negative effects. I define normative masculinity in a patriarchal society as an ideology which dictates that men who hold power do not feel or demonstrate love, connect with one another, or express emotions. Instead, they demonstrate their power and dominance through "individualism, assertiveness, aggressiveness, strength, and competitiveness" (Hochstetler 494). However, oftentimes the voices of those working with the space are silenced. Therefore, I turned to investigative works, undercover reports, and the accounts of whistleblowers to piece together the daily experiences of these men involved in the production of animals . Through these investigative and/or whistleblower works, it becomes evident that the men collectively participate in a myriad of violences. These violences are displayed in actions from verbal abuse, to physical abuse, to psychological abuse, as each worker attempts to survive the work day. I will detail the violences are they occur between employer and employee, employee and

employee, and employee and animal. One way in which violence is pervasive throughout the site is through institutionalized racism through segregation by departments as a means to distinguish the bodies of men from one another. For one to succeed, others must be put down. This forms a structure of power, which in this case falls along racial and ethnic lines. This hierarchical organization produces a "network of gazes" meant to keep the men in line while also in constant competition with one another – a competition that benefits the industry at a cost only for the men (Foucault 171). In the midst of reaching for "what we call 'the good life'" it becomes apparent that, for these men, 'the good life' is "a bad life that wears out the subjects" (Berlant 27). Their struggle is silenced by themselves, their superiors, and the larger culture of the industry due to the permeating patriarchal ideology. If the "masculine pretense is that real men feel no pain," then these men attempt to adhere to a set of masculine characteristics that cause them harm while continuously reinforcing a veil of patriarchy. Left without means to "envision alternative ways of thinking about maleness," to understand male pain, key patriarchal characteristics such as engaging in violence, competition, and silencing of one's emotions are pervasive (hooks "The Will To Change" 6, 37). Therefore, these men are without the opportunity, proper resources, tools, and mindset to acknowledge, voice, and cope with the violent occurrences endured within the U.S. industrialized slaughterhouse. By applying feminist methodologies to their experiences and the site of suffering, it one can illuminate the ways in which men might claim feminist tools to make sense of and unmask the the power structures at play. In doing so, those within the site

may begin to deconstruct the domineering characteristics of masculinity that prevent them from escaping the violences of the site. A "feminist masculinity offers men a way to reconnect with selfhood" as they discover a newfound "emotional awareness and expression" leading to the ability to undergo a healing process and transformation (hooks "The Will to Change" 124, 143).

The Construction of Today's Slaughterhouse

From Community Butchers to Industrialized Slaughterhouses

Internationally, from the 17th century through the 19th century, tensions existed between city officials attempting to regulate the space in which butchers slaughter and the wealthy, elite butchers who maintained "long-held privileges [and] rights…[as they] provided a reliable supply of food" (Lee 179). During the 18th century specifically, elite and well-off community butchers in places from New York City to Paris maintained some control as to the location and methods of slaughtering despite increasing concern about public health issues and environmental problems resulting from butchering. The home was the preferred site for less wealthy butchers due to the cost of renting space from an elite butcher who owned a licensed slaughterhouse in a more central location in the city. However, slaughtering closer to the markets allowed butchers to sell the meat to the public at its freshest. Therefore, less wealthy butchers could choose to slaughter in "alleys or back courtyards, typically near butcher's stalls" each day to sell fresh meat to the public or pay rent for an official space (Lee 47). After slaughter, butchers had approximately "ten to twelve hours…before the meat became unfit for human consumption" (Lee 180). They were encouraged to keep their stalls clean, but increasingly the slaughter of animals publically became a social issue. The blood, parading of animals through crowded streets, and, most significantly, the sight of violence and death resulted in the coming demise of community butchers.

"Bourgeois citizens condemned the normalization of violence" occurring in the city as many "accidental[ly caught] sight of animal slaughter" (Lee 50).

Due to these issues, butchering was increasingly categorized as a "nuisance trade" alongside "tanners, soapmakers, tallow chandlers, bone oilers, and fat renderers" due to population growth and urbanization (Lee 179). And by the early-19th century, both elite and less wealthy butchers were fighting a losing battle. Although it would take nearly a century to finally take hold, centralized slaughterhouses were gaining traction. Previously, the demand for meat kept some power and control in the hands of the butchers. However, population growth and urbanization left butchers with the responsibility to provide meat to consumers at a close distance to their homes. Centralized slaughterhouses provided the public with just that. In doing so, this shifted power into the hands of the public. The public's ability to choose which stall to purchase from altered the way animals were killed, meat was produced, and cuts were purchased. They no longer needed to travel to a butcher nor did they need to purchase from a butcher they considered uncleanly or unsuitable. Yet, the visibility of violence associated with the act of killing, the health hazards of butchering in the streets, and the continual reminder that meat was derived from a once living animal were no longer acceptable for the middle and upper classes. Americans "had decided that the old system of making meat…was unhealthy, dangerous, and unsuited to life in a modern nation" (Ogle 30).

However, the success of centralized U. S. slaughterhouses first required many developments. These were, primarily, "the great marvel of the age, the railroad" and

refrigeration in rail cars (Ogle 15). With the "seven thousand miles of rail" laid down in the 1830s and 1840s connecting the west to the east, the "logistical complexity of moving that livestock from the countryside to the city's slaughterhouses" was simplified (Ogle 14-15). As livestock arrived in cities with slaughterhouses such as Chicago, Cincinnati, and St. Louis, distribution of the fresh beef became the next issue to address. Shipping of fresh beef assisted with cutting down on the number of slaughterhouses nationally. It was Gustavus Swift, born in 1830 on Cape Cod, who found the solution. In the late 1870s, using Chicago as a central location, Swift, along with his brother Edwin, hired engineer Andrew Chase who combined ice and railroads creating refrigerated railcars to prevent the beef from spoiling on the trip. They could not simply throw ice into the rail cars, though. Beef hung on an overhead rail in the center of the car while ice and brine were located at either ends of the car (Cronon 234). Venting helped keep cool air moving throughout the car cooling the beef constantly. The success of dressed beef also marked the end of the local butcher. Dressed beef sellers strategically lowered prices and slowly weeded out the butcher shops in towns. However, butchers didn't go down without a fight as is demonstrated through the *Slaughterhouse Cases (1873)*. In 1869, the General Assembly of Louisiana passed a law titled "An Act to Protect the Health of the City of New Orlens, to Located the Stocklanding and Slaughterhouses, and to Incorporate the Crescent City Livestock Landing and Slaughter House Company" allowing New Orleans to create a corporation that centralizaed slaughterhouses. This would assist with the contamination of land and water by multiple slaughterhouses located

throughout the city. Butchers who owned private slaughterhouses in New Orleans argued before the Supreme that requiring them to work in centralized slaughterhouses under a monopoly "deprived [them] of their livelihood and property" (Lee 198). The argument was put forth through the postwar amendments, most specifically the Fourteenth Amendment. Butchers claimed this amendment protected their privileges and immunities as citizens. However, the Supreme Court ruled against the butchers stating that the amendment protected their federal citizenship rather than state citizenship. They were required to follow the new regulations and integrate into the centralized slaughterhouse.

Similar to the "collective cultural guilt" and harm the middle and upper classes felt from viewing animals pre- and post-death during the time of community butchers, the centralized slaughterhouse saw its own set of complications based on sight (Fitzgerald 60). Due to its urban location, visibility to the public remained at play even if they did not witness the acts of violence firsthand. This is often cited through Upton Sinclair's muckraking exposé of the Chicago Stock Yards in *The Jungle*, published in 1906. Through this fictional account, Sinclair notes the maltreatment of immigrant, working class individuals who are assigned the violent, dirty tasks within the stockyards, most specifically within the Kill Room. The two aspects most often targeted and critiqued after the publication of this novel included the industry's working conditions and health regulations. Although the public responded passionately, their concerns were for the state of the meat they consumed, not the livelihoods of the immigrant, working class individuals. President

Roosevelt passed the Federal Meat Inspection Act of 1906 which "established standards for plant sanitation and required inspection of all meat" but did not address worker treatment (Eisnitz 21).

Throughout the New Deal era of the 1930s , new pro-worker programs encouraged a shift in focus toward the forming of slaughterhouse unions in order to improve working conditions. Two groups, the United Packinghouse Workers of America and the Amalgamated Meat Cutters, "represented more than 95% of the slaughterhouse employees" by the 1960s (Fitzgerald 61). It became known in the United States that a slaughterhouse was "staffed by highly paid, unionized employees" who had "good benefits [and] pension" (Barboza 1, Schlosser *Food Inc.).* The question was whether or not these changes would hold within the industry. Beginning in the 1960s, companies such as Iowa Beef Processors (IBP) accelerated a process which began immediately after WWII – a "redesign [of] the modern meatpacking industry" effectively dismantling the progress in regards to higher wages, better benefits, and workplace protection through unionization from the early 1900s (Olsson 13). This began with relocating the slaughterhouses from public, urban cities with high visibility to rural areas. If the middle and upper classes were not concerned with how employees were treated but only with distancing themselves from the violence and killing behind the slaughterhouse walls, a rural location was the ideal solution. In addition, unions decreased with the transition from urban to rural sites making them no longer a threat to the industry's desired modes of production (Olsson 13).

Unions were dismantled in three ways primarily: economic restructuring, working class fractionalization, and employer ascendancy (Fitzgerald 61). When slaughterhouse employees became highly unionized in the 1930s due to previously unsatisfactory working conditions, men – and women – across various racial and ethnic divisions joined together in support of necessary changes within the industry. The notion that each individual made up part of the working class tied them together despite their position, race, or ethnicity. Unions held strong earning increases in pay and benefits for slaughterhouse workers. By the mid-20th century, the industry was composed mostly of white men with experience who were able to maintain the unions. The urban to rural shift, therefore, disrupted this strong unionization as the rural communities did not have strong histories of unionization. The work force hired in these new locations changed, as well, due to the deskilling of jobs in order to decrease wages. The deskilling of jobs allowed almost any individual with any background to work at a slaughterhouse. This increased working class fractionalization. Unlike previously when workers from different backgrounds came together to fight for better conditions, the industry strategically increased animosity between various ethnic and racial groups through layoffs to further decrease unionization. "The diverse and fluctuating demographic composition of the industry and fear of job loss" work to the advantage of employers (Fitzgerald 61). Therefore, companies such as IBP maintained power and control over their work force and the industry as a whole.

The dirty and violent jobs permanently became the position for the working class. Both a century ago and today a hierarchy controlled by white men leaves the working class members subjugated and struggling with little agency. Instead of hoping for a pay increase or a promotion, these workers are left with no security, no hope for upward mobility. The deskilling of positions requires little to no training to apply for a job on the line, therefore making each worker easily replaceable. Continuous fear of job loss accompanied by the deskilling of jobs leaves these workers in constant uncertainty as to whether or not a job awaits them each day. Furthermore, it perpetually reallocates them to the lower positions in the hierarchy unable to break free from employer control.

Due to the imposed hierarchy and lack of job security, workers succumb to and reinforce dominant notions of masculinity that permeate the space. This masculinity is built on characteristics such as "individualism, assertiveness, strength, and competitiveness" (494). Pain should be endured, and emotions should be masked. Any characteristic associated with femininity is discarded and viewed as a weakness. In order to achieve this version of masculinity, it must be proved to oneself, fellow employees, and employers time and time again. Some men enter the space familiar with this version of masculinity. Their identity may even be deeply engrained in these notions. Others will undergo a period of transformation as they either realize they must adapt to these characteristics to survive or are quickly indoctrinated into believing this version of masculinity constitutes the only valid form of manhood. As individualism, or an every-man-for-himself attitude, is a core

component, maintaining this masculinity becomes a central focus for each man to find success. Each man is concerned for his own ability to achieve this masculinity, outperform their fellow employees, and demonstrate their worth to their superiors in order to keep their job. The pervasiveness of this masculinity contributes to the violences which occur. Through proving it, or failing to do so, the men suffer internally, engage in violent interactions with one another, commit violent acts toward animals, and attempt prove their abilities to their superiors. In doing so, each man ends up supporting and reinforcing the hierarchy, their superiors, and the system that continuously reallocates them to the bottom.

All Slaughterhouses Function as One

After the transition from community butchers to centralized slaughterhouses, the processes within the industry became routinized. From driving the animals onto the kill floor, to butchering, to packaging, each worker occupied a specific position to keep the flow regulated. The regulation of the process created a standard for how each step was completed, how each animal transitioned from alive and whole to dead and deconstructed. As the 20th century progressed, the routine became even more embedded in the industry's processes. In doing so, "the aim [was] to derive the maximum advantages…to protect the materials and tools and to master the labour force" (Foucault 142). By the second half of the twentieth century, the industry began shutting down stockyards in Chicago, St. Louis, and Cincinnati.

New slaughterhouses for chickens, pigs, and cows opened up in rural towns in Kansas, North Carolina, Iowa, Arkansas, etc. Moving from urban to rural sites automatically "shielded [the public] from the sight and sound of the violence committed in their name" (Smith 51).

With less concern for public outcries, the industry was allowed the freedom to reorganize how they desired. However, instead of individual companies choosing different routes of reorganization, they made similar adjustments despite the fact that they were in competition with one another. In Amy J. Fitzgerald's article "A Social History of the Slaughterhouse: From Inception to Contemporary Implications," she notes that the changes were "pioneered mainly by Iowa Beef Processors (IBP)" (Fitzgerald 62). Each attempted to find "new sources of cheap labor" while "speeding up the chain" (Fitzgerald 62, Olsson 13). The chain was, and is, the way that meat travels throughout the slaughterhouse. The "line speed refers to the speed required to process a certain amount of meat within a given amount of time" (Dalla and Christensen 35). Continuously speeding up the chain allowed for an increase in production without a similar increase in wages or employees hired. The same number of employees worked the same number of hours. They were required to keep up with new speeds, therefore resulting in a higher rate of production. Fitzgerald notes that in the 1970s, 179 cattle were killed an hour in comparison to 400 cattle killed an hour in 2010. Such drastic increases in speed of the chain result in an increase in injuries and illnesses for workers, as well as unbearable working conditions. Many are unable to keep instruments clean and sharp enough causing

accidents. “Repetitive movements can lead to muscle strain” such as carpal tunnel syndrome, as well (Fitzgerald 64). Furthermore, workers cannot leave the line for bathroom breaks or rest without disrupting the entire process. They become indentured servant to the chain which translates as slaves to the employers who control the speed of production.

The different companies fed off each other making similar moves in regards to employment and speed of the chain. Tyson Foods went on to purchase IBP in 2001. Although IBP processed cows and pigs and Tyson Foods is known primarily for chicken production, the two became one. This points toward the similarities in the set-up of each slaughterhouse company. No matter the rural town or animal killed, the end goal remained the same: to “continually seek to reduce their costs and increase their production” no matter the means (Fitzgerald 62). Therefore, across the span of locations and type of animals processed the same changes were made, resulting in similar outcomes. As previously stated, each slaughterhouse focused primarily on breaking up the unions which was critical to then deskilling labor and increasing the speed of the line. In both instances, slaughterhouses spent less money on workers and earned more money from production. By deskilling labor, wages decreased and the turnover rate increased. This meant that benefits generally decreased or remained non-existent for most workers, as well. Therefore, slaughterhouses continued to profit while worsening conditions for the workers creating the products.

Additionally, the industry has remained powerful through the introduction of various laws, primarily the Animal Enterprise Protection Act (AEPA), later developed into the Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act (AETA). After the increase in animal liberation acts throughout the 1970s and 1980s, Congress passed the AEPA into law in 1992 deeming animal liberation acts as "acts of 'terror'" (Marceau 1321). More specifically, this made it a crime to "physically disrupt an animal enterprise" (Marceau 1322). In 2006, the AETA was passed extending the law to "damaging or interfering" with an animal enterprise rather than limiting it to physically disruption. In doing so, individuals can be subject to criminal liability for economic injury to an animal enterprise (Marceau 1323). In the past decade, many states have attempted to pass statutes termed "ag-gag" laws. Currently, seven states have passed versions of this law to "prevent crusading activists from using undercover techniques to expose…large-scale farming operations" (Warren 1).

In two ways, this keeps power in the hands of those at the top of the hierarchy while further silencing the experiences of men at the lower end. Firstly, for those attempting to document corruption, animal cruelty, and/or mistreatment of employees within the space, their work can be deemed criminal activity for interfering with the animal enterprise. If these undercover activists cannot reach the men working within the space, workers cannot share their experiences. Secondly, those working within the space are limited as to what they can share about their experiences even if someone does attempt to document their story. Gail Eisnitz, author of *Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane*

Treatment Inside the U.S. Meat Industry published in 2006, experienced this first-hand. Her first contact for the investigative piece was Timothy Walker, a USDA employee inspecting blood samples from cows at Kaplan Industries in Florida. Walker was a whistleblower claiming that cattle were being skinned alive at the plant. As Eisnitz met with Walker and other contacts in the area, her once enthusiastic interviewees began to back out, would not allow her to tape their conversations, and would not sign affidavits for fear of job loss. Eventually, Walker was fired from his job. Later, Eisnitz learns from one of her contacts who backed out from an interview that a USDA Regional Director required the staff to "not speak with 'individuals unauthorized by the Department'" (Eisnitz 149). They were required to sign a document indicating their acknowledgement that speaking with an outsider, on or off duty, "would be grounds for immediate dismissal" (Eisnitz 150). As the "ag-gag" laws continue to gain traction in the U.S., the mass production of meat triumphs over the livelihood of the men completing the job. Without means to address their feelings on their own due to dominant notions of masculinity instilled in them or the ability to communicate their stories to others, they are effectively silenced.

For my purposes, it is key to acknowledge the similar means of production and employee treatment across the various slaughterhouses in the United States. Rather than focusing on one type of animal production, one company, or one location, I use a multitude. Although there are the previously mentioned differences, the occurrences within the workspace remain similar despite these differences.

Across academic articles, newspaper articles, and investigative reports, the instances described and the stories shared map onto one another. Each example strengthens the argument that the space within a U.S. industrialized slaughterhouse is one overflowing with patriarchal notions of masculinity and an unjust hierarchy of positions leading to violent eruptions and interactions. Furthermore, the men are left without the means to begin the process of healing as long as they remain embedded in such a space.

How the Slaughterhouse is Set-Up

Physical Lay-Out of Space

When driving through one of the rural U.S. towns containing a slaughterhouse, a passerby may not immediately notice the complex. It could be misinterpreted as "the community college to the south, the tool factory to the east, or the pet-supply store to the north" (Pachirat 23). At the turn of the twentieth century, the public regarded the industry as "something special, something never before seen in the history of the world" (Cronon 207). Yet once the industry migrated to rural areas, its goal was invisibility and discretion. However, once one notices the smell in the air, the "hole-poked semi-trailers, and the rhythmic clanging of hoofs," finding the correct building becomes possible even without direct visibility (Pachirat 23). Timothy Pachirat, author of *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*, notes this during his five months working undercover in a slaughterhouse in Omaha, Nebraska. Throughout his time undercover, Pachirat carefully maps out the entire slaughterhouse as he moves from one room or one job position to another. He documents the number of employees in each space, the clean from the dirty areas, and who is affected versus unaffected from the act of and/or viewing of the killing of the animals.

Pachirat's experience takes place in a slaughterhouse that kills cows. However, his diagrams, maps, and findings are significant when mapped onto the stories shared in Gail Eisnitz' investigative piece and Virgil Butler's experience in a

Tyson chicken slaughterhouse in Arkansas described in his blog "The Cyberactivist." The multitude of examples provided in Eisnitz' book coupled with Butler's stories display similar set-ups within the individual slaughterhouses: a hierarchy of employees, a separation between those who view or commit the act of killing from those who do not, and a set of abuses employers, employees, and the animals are surrounded by and involved in within the space. In each of these works, the information is provided to the reader in a different manner. For Pachirat, he is undercover within the space. While he predominately documents his own feelings and experiences, he is able to share some stories of individuals actually working within the space through brief break room conversations. His co-workers do not know he is undercover. Therefore, he cannot necessarily interview them without exposing himself. By becoming one of the men working within this space, Pachirat's own voice serves as a substitute for those who cannot speak.

Eisnitz, too, documents her own reactions to what she learns, but she does not physically work in a slaughterhouse. She covers stories about a multitude of slaughterhouses nationwide, oftentimes speaking with those who are no longer employed or hearing experiences never before shared by employees. When she is given permission to document her interviews, she becomes responsible for making it known what the workers experience throughout their work day. Butler is a whistleblower. After leaving Tyson, he started a blog where he documented his own experiences with his employers, fellow employees, the animals, and his road to recovery from destructive forms of masculinity to a caring, compassionate,

expressive way of life. The ways in which these three must document experiences differently demonstrates the constraints often placed on employees to remain silent in regards to the inner workings of the slaughterhouse. The fact that each author endured a certain amount of suffering or underwent a struggle to complete their text is indicative of how much more difficult it is for the actual workers to share their own experiences without the assistance of a proxy.

As Pachirat begins his journey, he first enters the front office of the cow slaughterhouse in Omaha. Right away, he notes that the "front office of the slaughterhouse is indistinguishable from front offices worldwide" harking back to the similarities of all the buildings from the outside (Pachirat 28). This set-up contributes to hiding the inner workings of the slaughterhouse industry even further. Through becoming a "sanitized front for the dirty work within," the front office shields visitors from the truth (Pachirat 25). For instance, a visitor or an individual applying for a job, such as Pachirat, views the slaughterhouse for the first time through the front office. Therefore, the presentation of the front office allows the industry to welcome applications, inspectors, etc. without the immediate shock from the horrors of the slaughterhouse such as the acts of violence and killing. Workers know it is "both attached to and severed physically from the work of killing" (Pacihirat 29). In the eyes of a visitor, it is a zone free from the dirty, violent process of killing that contaminates other spaces of the factory (Pachirat 29).

Although slaughterhouses are often described as a "male-dominated work place," the front office as a clean, uncontaminated space is reserved for women, or

more specifically white women (Pachirat 16). This holds true since the industry's beginnings in locations such as the Union Stock Yards in Chicago. The increased demand for processed meat products around the 1890s allowed for "employment options [to] dramatically expand" for women (Horowitz 194). Immigrant women were often found in departments handling the animals post-death and deconstruction such as the offal and casings rooms. White, American-born women were located in "'showplaces….to aid [with the] public presentation of meatpacking as a modern business" (Horowitz 197). Their placement presented one image of the industry to middle and upper class members, while the working class women and men's placement in the industry remained out of sight. The white, female receptionist in the Omaha slaughterhouse serves a similar purpose. Her presence assists with veiling what exists past the front office of the slaughterhouse.

The front office provides a realm in the industry for women to remain outside the zones of production, outside the spaces that often result in violences, abuse of workers and animals, and potential psychological trauma**.** While there is a "small square window and a galvanized-steel door allowing visual and physical movement" into the other zones from the front office, the female workers are spared from experiencing all that occurs outside of the front office. Before entering the areas of production and killing, Pachirat sees the office of the president, vice president, and human resources manager, occupied by a white man and two white women, respectively.

Next, Pachirat enters the fabrication department. The fabrication department is located behind the galvanized-steel door of the front office and is the space where parts of animals become food items recognized in stores such as steak. This separation marks the beginning of jobs dealing directly with the animals, alive or dead, whole or deconstructed. In some slaughterhouses, such as the Smithfield pork slaughterhouse in Tar Heel, North Carolina, the fabrication department is considered a "dirty and grueling job" (York 262). However, it is relatively clean in comparison to the departments that come afterward. Although workers in this department handle pieces of raw meat, this department remains higher on the scale of cleanliness due to the lack of killing and slaughtering. "The blood in the meat has already frozen," so workers are not subjected to the large amounts of blood other departments cannot escape (Pachirat 98).

In the fabrication department, workers "reinvent chilled half-carcasses as steaks" (Pachirat 30). This is an area of reconstruction. With little to no training, workers must "box [animals] in ways that render them unintelligible as animal, as a once-living creature" (Pachirat 30). It is here that "the linguistic leap from steer to steak is enacted" (Pachirat 30). The fabrication department workers will not see a live animal and often do not even see a whole animal. Rather they deal with portions of an already-dead being, using knives as tools. They create the food that is seen by those outside the slaughterhouse in groceries and supermarkets. The portions of cow or pig become versions of steak and pork with each of their knife cuts.

It is in this space after the front office that workers begin to face sets of circumstances that require coping mechanisms. For instance, there is not "a single entry point for natural light" (Pachirat 31). The temperature remains "near 50 degrees Fahrenheit" all day long (Pachirat 31). Workers bear through these conditions coupled with days on end "without conversation or eye contact" in an "atmosphere that seems somber, almost sedated" (Pachirat 41). The pressure to keep up with the line speed in order to "maintain production [so as to] increase profits for the employer" cuts down on relationship forming or communication between workers in this department (Dalla and Christensen). With little opportunity to converse with those nearby, workers embrace the silence. It emerges as a coping mechanism to deal with the dehumanizing environment of the department and the monotonous job of "transforming one cut at a time, carcass into meat" (Pachirat 31). The workers' focus remains on making it to the end of each work shift, each day.

The cooler follows the fabrication department. It is an "unsettling land of in between where bodies and body parts [are] neither whole nor completely disassembled" (Pachirat 33). A worker will see "this tail, this carcass, that tongue, that liver…in sufficient mass" in the cooler (Pachirat 33). Workers will not see an entire animal but rather pieces that act as constant reminder to the workers that an animal once existed. They are holding pieces of a once-live being. They may not see the animal pre- and post-death, but they are aware it is an animal post-deconstruction. This is where Pachirat begins his journey as an undercover worker

in the slaughterhouse industry. For Pachirat's first two months, he continuously hangs livers on hooks in the cooler. The temperature is "just above freezing between 33-34 degrees" keeping the blood frozen resulting in less of a mess (Pachirat 35).

However, unlike the fabrication department, the cooler once again comes with its own set of less than preferable conditions. There are "no windows, outside light, or [fresh] air" (Pachirat 33). As Pachirat hangs livers for ten hours, six days a week, he begins to note how the "cooler's punishing cold" affects him and his fellow workers on the line (Pachirat 36). Pachirat explains how each job he had "came with its own set of physical, psychological, and emotional challenges" but that his "main battle" in the cooler was the monotony of his job (Solomon). Although he is performing an "act of killing at distance," it is erased by the monotony of the task (Pachirat 139). "Pranks, jokes, and even physical pain became ways of negotiating" the continuous motion of hanging livers similar to silence emerging as a coping mechanism in the fabrication department (Solomon). Butler, too, details games and competitions created on the job that workers participated in on a "regular basis for amusement and/or sport" in order to distract themselves from the reality of their job in the Tyson chicken slaughterhouse in Arkansas (Butler "Tyson Torture Tactics – Introduction").

While the games and pranks follow into the kill room, in all other regards, it is a space unlike those previously described. In terms of its position, the kill floor and front office are "as far apart physically as possible…an isolation that is mirrored bureaucratically" (Pachirat 38). This positioning is purposeful in that it reduces

visibility by “segregating and quarantining the killing” (Pachirat 61). It is here that Pachirat asks to work, shocking his co-workers and employers who try to advise him otherwise by claiming “nobody wants to do that” (Pachirat 151). Unbeknownst to them, Pachirat knows he must work on the kill floor to fully understand the violences and act of killing along with the impact of seeing an animal pre- and post-death. For this reason, the kill floor is known as “the harvesting department” and is “dedicated to the taking of life” (Pachirat 39). The act of killing takes place in an area twice as large as the fabrication department while occupying “slightly more than half the total number of workers in the fabrication department” (Pachirat 41).

The kill floor has the poorest conditions in terms of the environment of the room, the cleanliness, and the acts that take place within the space. The air is “steamy and humid” in comparison to the stale air in the fabrication department and the near freezing temperatures in the cooler (Pachirat 40). Avoiding bloody puddles and body parts on the floor become a concern for all kill floor workers. The positions available break down into knocker, presticker and sticker. The knocker “operates the knocking box [and] uses an air gun to drive captive-steel bolt into foreheads of cattle” (Pachirat 257). The presticker “uses a hand knife to make an incision along the length of the cow’s neck” (Pachirat 258). Then the sticker “uses this incision…to cut the jugular veins and carotid arteries of the cow [with] a hand knife” (Pachirat 258). All-in-all, there are approximately “fifty-feet separating the knocker and the stickers” known as the “designated space for dying” (Pachirat 61). Within this space the animal transforms from “fully animal to carcass” (Pachirat 66).

It becomes clear that in the span of job positions at the slaughterhouse, "the majority of slaughterhouse workers operate in the zone of death" (Pachirat 61). Very few come into contact with a live animal and even fewer with an animal pre- and post-death. Although there are negative components to cutting and handling portions of dead animals, workers can still distance themselves from the direct act of killing and violences associated. Once entering the kill room, distancing is no longer an option as workers are faced with the reality of watching or participating in the death of an animal. In this moment, visibility of killing and death becomes a form of violence workers must endure regardless of whether or not they are actually participating in the infliction of death.

How Hierarchies Distribute Power within the Space

During Pachirat's time undercover he began asking questions as to how the often white, male supervisors and managers maintained their power and control over an entire work force of employees in various spaces throughout the slaughterhouse? Pachirat chose to address Michel Foucault and the significance of surveillance within a confined space. While Foucault focuses on prison sites, the set-up of the industrialized slaughterhouse allows for comparable analysis.

First, it is necessary to address the employee and how he is bound to the slaughterhouse similarly to the prisoner's relationship to the prison. As slaughterhouses occupy the small, rural towns, they become the main source for

employment. Despite the conditions within, individuals look to the slaughterhouse as the solution to their socioeconomic status with hope for change. As Pachirat awaits a position, he observes those around him with "faces [that] betray the most emotion, the most hope" to finally receive a job in the slaughterhouse (Pachirat 94). When he is picked before some who have waited for days, he faces a dilemma: "doubt, tinged with guilt" (Pachirat 90). He is hired, and "this denies someone else a desperately needed job" (Pachirat 90). While he struggles ethically with this realization, Pachirat's desire to reveal the inner workings of the industry push him to continue. From his time on the inside, Pachirat observes that if one secures a job in the slaughterhouse, holding onto it is important. Individuals line the employment offices daily hoping to receive a position. If they are unlucky one day, they return the next to sit and wait until their name is called and a position offered. Therefore, each employee is easily replaceable as training is often minimal, costing the slaughterhouse near to nothing to continuously retrain new employees. Like the prisoner, the slaughterhouse employee must carefully remain in line or face unemployment.

Although the conditions inside the slaughterhouse are poor, the need for a job trumps the ability to be selective. Those living in these small, rural towns do not generally have the option to deny a slaughterhouse position. However, the hope that the position will result in a better life for the employees, their families, and their community is but a fantasy. Even though it is a fantasy, it is one they maintain a significant attachment to throughout their work. These employees come to face a

“set of dissolving assurances…that society will reliably provide opportunity…that seem fair and that foster life as a project of adding up to something” as Lauren Berlant describes in her text *Cruel Optimism* (Berlant 3). Yet, they cling to the fantasy that by remaining with the position and adhering to the rules, regulations, and conditions, it will produce “an improved way of being,” or an improved lifestyle (Berlant 1). Instead, their employment is a “slow death” in which “people are worn out by…life-building, especially the poor and the nonnormative” (Berlant 38).

Much like a prisoner contained within in the prison, the racial other – citizen, migrant, or undocumented – is held in the slaughterhouse. “The cluster of promises” that accompanies the concept of a steady job does not pan out for slaughterhouse employees. There is no rise in socioeconomic status, no optimism for a change in conditions, and nowhere else to turn in the town for such fantasies to be fulfilled. In attempts to remain on good terms with the slaughterhouse, employees become “attached to modes of life to which they rarely remember consenting” (Berlant 52). They can continue their work as instructed or lose their job at a moment’s notice.

After undergoing the process of applying for a job and considering the circumstances of those around him who were engaging in the same application process, Pachirat was hired. He held positions in different departments, as an employee and, after two months at the plant, as a quality-control manager, allowing him to personally understand the tying of the worker to the slaughterhouse like a prisoner to a prison and to discover the “internal hierarchies of the slaughterhouse”

and the “networks of power” that maintained the efficiency of the slaughterhouse through control of its employees (Pachirat 16).

With the modern remaking of the industry, employers enforced a “racial hierarchy among workers [to] exploit and maintain social control over their employees” (LeDuff 361). “Whites, blacks, American Indians, and Mexicans [all occupied] separate stations” distributing each race to a different department, using different tools and machines, and coming into contact with each other and the animals in different ways (LeDuff 362). Typically, the distribution of races/ethnicities is seen as “white on top, Indian in the middle, and colored on the bottom” (LeDuff 369). The lower a race/ethnicity is on the hierarchy, the more violent, dirty, and dangerous the job position. However, the aggressive recruitment of migrants shifted the inner workings of the slaughterhouse. While the “white man…standing on the scaffolding above the factory floor” or occupying the front offices remained in the same position, each section of the hierarchy below shifted up placing migrant workers “on the bottom rung” (LeDuff 361, 364). This reflected previous slaughterhouse hierarchies during the Stock Yard era as Eastern European immigrants received the lower positions. The difference was a shift from Eastern European immigrants to those from “Central and South America, Southeast Asia, and East Africa” (Solomon).

The hierarchy within the space contributes to the position the workers have but also to the circumstances workers endure in terms of which workers have specific sight due to their positioning within the space as well (Fitzgerald 61). While

the "contemporary slaughterhouse is a 'place that is no-place,' physically hidden from sight by walls," certain employees within the slaughterhouse are not entirely spared from what is visible inside these walls (Pachirat 3). From each race to each individual employee, visibility or non-visibility of the violences and act of killing is dependent upon their job and whether it relegates them to the front office, the fabrication department, the cooler, or the kill floor. How an employee comes into contact with an animal based on each of these sections within the slaughterhouse determines the workspace environment, the interactions an employee will have with upper management and fellow employees, in what way the employee will view the animal, and the forms of violences, exploitation, and psychological damage an employee may suffer.

Looking back to different spaces Pachirat notes, the separation between the front office and other rooms begins the "demarcation [which] enables the volatile combinations of citizenship, race, class, and education that separate the…zones of privilege from zones of production" (Pachirat 27). As Pachirat leaves the front office, the hierarchy becomes evident as he passes the office of the president, a white man, and the "overhead offices belonging to the human-resources manager and the vice president, both white women" (Pachirat 27). As he moves from the fabrication department, to the cooler, to the kill room, the jobs become less desirable. Therefore, the races are divided accordingly depending on which races occupy positions in the specific slaughterhouse. Whites receive the cleanest jobs, separated from the viewing of and/or act of killing. Blacks follow in spaces such as the

fabrication department or the cooler. Migrants receive the dirtiest, most violent, and most dangerous positions in the kill room.

Additionally, the increased use of the fractionalization, or the dividing of different groups, along with the addition of migrants to the workforce, assisted employers in "the exploitation of racial tensions" amongst groups inside the factory (LeDuff 361). This was not the first time the industry used racial/ethnic divisions to their advantage. Although decades had passed, the industry used the same methods employed during the Stock Yard era to exploit racial tensions through segmenting different races and ethnicities in different departments. By playing into racial segregation through the positioning of employees into various sections of the slaughterhouse, "the employees [begin] to see competition in skin tones" (LeDuff 362). The competition was seen in the form of employee lay-offs, hiring practices, and treatment by employers. This creates a distraction from the white employers who maintain the hierarchy and are the leaders of "racial stereotyping [and] verbal harassment" within the industry (LeDuff 361). Rather than pushing back against the inhumane treatment they receive by their employers, the workers remain focused on the differences between each race that have been purposefully emphasized. The racial differences distract from the abuses employees receive from employers. Therefore, employers are able to remain at the top of the rung untouched by the employees who are placed lower in the hierarchy.

Instead of overthrowing the hierarchy and taking back control from the white employers, the segregation within the industry is so pervasive it "tends to

lead to silence rather than disclosure" (Nebraska Appleseed 53). If not silence, the scenario may play out with "threats of physical violence and death" between employees inside the slaughterhouse, during breaks outside of the slaughterhouse, or in communities separated from the slaughterhouse entirely (LeDuff 361). The hierarchy prevents the forming of relationships amongst employees of different race and ethnicities while the pervasive notions of masculinity – namely the concept of every-man-for-himself – decrease relationships between workers within the same room of a slaughterhouse, as well. This further assists with a decrease in forming of unions. There is an animosity felt among workers of different races and of workers within the same departments rather than a melding together of employees suffering similar scenarios within the slaughterhouse. Employees are unable to look past their own differences to fight for the rights of all employees beneath the white employers who are exploiting them daily.

With an understanding as to how fractionalization of races and ethnicities segment the work force, along with the deep-rooted notions of masculinity, next, it is important to note how this fractionalization and individualistic attitude contribute to the surveillance of each body in order for the slaughterhouse to function so efficiently. In Foucault's analysis of the prison system, he focuses on "how visibility functions as a mechanism of power" (Pachirat 11). Without "darkness and concealment" in the space, the bodies come under "continuous and permanent systems of surveillance" that take the place of overt physical punishment (Pachirat 11). In *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, Foucault argues how

“a body that is docile may be subjected, used, transformed, and improved” (Foucault 136). Surveillance in prisons transforms prisoners into docile bodies as they are supervised by their superiors but also by their fellow inmates. Foucault describes this as “disciplinary power…that of a network of relations from top to bottom” (Foucault 176). “The uninterrupted play of calculated gazes” forces each prisoner to not only stay in line, but also to improve or undergo a process of normalization (Foucault 177). No longer is the power to discipline or enforce change only in the hands of the superiors who gaze upon the prisoners from time to time. Rather the prisoners possess the ability to constantly view one another as they are “judged, measured, compared with others” (Foucault 191). In being subjected to this visibility, they each routinely adhere to the guidelines or regulations set in place by their superiors. They are “trained or corrected, classified, normalized” against one another so that “conformity [is] achieved” (Foucault 191, 183).

In the slaughterhouse, the hierarchy, fractionalization, and every-man-for-himself attitude are the foundation for tracking docile bodies, or the men working within the slaughterhouse. The slaughterhouse employees understand the significance of receiving a position and the dire need to hold onto it however they can. This makes them vulnerable, though, as they must accept the “pressure upon them” and forgo “resist[ing] the grip [the industry] has on them” (Foucault 27). The slaughterhouse is a “machinery of power that explores [the human body], breaks it down and rearranges it” in order to create a system of bodies that functions as the industry needs in order to maintain production (Foucault 138). As each body

quickly transforms into one that is docile and vulnerable, it can be molded by its superiors, as well as, by fellow employees in line with how prisoners are normalized. The key difference in the two scenarios is that the slaughterhouse employee's livelihood outside the slaughterhouse walls rests on his ability to adapt properly to maintain some amount of job security whereas the prisoner is contained at all times within the prison walls. Although the predominately male, immigrant workforce can leave the walls of the slaughterhouse physically, his experiences and their effects follow him. The vulnerability enforced within the space exists even outside the slaughterhouse affecting his state of mind at all times. Yet, he must return at the start of each work day in order to afford a life outside of the slaughterhouse, even if that life is deeply impacted by the violent nature of the workspace.

Foucault discusses a network of gazes that is central to the functioning of the slaughterhouse due to the separate workspaces for employees. Each employee must face supervisors and inspectors. This is how employees are "compare[d] with one another…classif[ied] according to skill and speed" (Foucault 145). As one of the superiors "walk[s] up and down the aisle of the workshop," he watches and assesses the productivity of each employee (Foucault 145). Each employee must perform with the "least cost and [be] maximized as a useful force" to benefit the slaughterhouse (Foucault 221). While not all employees within a department participate in the same act, there is a set of expectations that accompanies each position and in order to fully succeed at a position, a worker must grasp tightly to

the dominant notions of masculinity. One must outperform fellow workers through maintaining the characteristics associated with this masculinity. For instance, as a liver hanger Pachirat learns he must hang one liver every two seconds. He admits how he senses “eyes watching, appraising” as he first takes up this position (Pachirat 115). It is this gaze that encourages him to do the best he can, keeping pace with the others. If he did not, he would not only feel as though he failed himself but also all those watching and the employers who determine whether or not he will stay on the job. The gaze forces him to engage in the competition, to push through any pain, swallow any emotional responses, and appear confident in his abilities.

The gaze of superiors begins the “supervis[ing] of the conduct of each individual, to assess it, to judge it, to calculate its qualities or merits” (Foucault 143). It sets in motion “supervision of the smallest fragment of life and of the body” that maintains a vulnerability in employees allowing for complete cooperation (Foucault 140). It is important that the employee is “induce[d]…into a state of conscious and permanent visibility that assures that automatic functioning of power” (Foucault 201). Inevitably, this visibility “increase[s] aptitudes, speeds, output, and therefore profit” as it transforms bodies into “a machinery” (Foucault 210). A worker maintains the speed of the line, meets his hourly and daily quotas, and perseveres through the poor working conditions and pain no matter how unjust. When faced with constant visibility, the unknown of whether or not one is actually observed or gazed upon forces employees to continuously seek to meet standards.

Violences within Space

Employer-Employee

In order to maintain control over many employees, employers use sight and visibility causing employees to feel as though they are under constant supervision and observation. They must perform according to standards and in line with the ascribed characteristics of masculinity so as to not lose their jobs. However, this is not the only mechanism resorted to by employers. Additionally, employers use their power at the top of the hierarchy to express dominance and control over employees on the lower rungs of the ladder. To assert their own masculinity, they prey on the more vulnerable men to strip them of their masculinity and, hopefully, to remove the opportunity for them to re-assert their masculinity. This is achieved by breaking down employees verbally, physically, and psychologically. In doing so, employees fear employers, are not as likely to push back against employers, and continue to comply with the regulations and standards in the industry rather than attempting to assert any dominance over their employers.

In Gail Eisnitz' investigation of the slaughterhouse industry, she originally intended to explore animal suffering. Once she began interviewing those working in or retired from the industry to hear stories of animal suffering, Eisnitz discovered there was a "price extracted from employees working the line," as well (Eisnitz 270). As she followed this lead, she was informed of horrific stories and presented with startling facts about the industry. Not only was meatpacking the "most dangerous

industry in the United States," but also employees were six times more likely to suffer an injury or illness than a coal mine employee (Eisnitz 271). Those in charge of the employees often directly impacted the illnesses, injuries, and unbearable conditions suffered by employees. As employers desired to maintain the speed of the line and the standardization of each product, this meant the exploitation of employees. Beginning with the workspace, employees share stories of working endlessly with "no clock, no windows, [and] no fragment of the outside world" (LeDuff 366). They are left with a task to complete and an employer to please. Coupled with the gaze of both employers and fellow employees, the workspace environment sets up the employers to further dehumanize and control the employees.

In the slaughterhouse industry, employees are kept on a rigid schedule to sustain the daily output of products. Therefore, the line cannot stop without interfering with the end goal. This begins to affect employees in small ways. For instance, they must acclimate to the breaks they are provided. In Eisnitz' investigation, she learns that employees have two seven-minute breaks no matter how long the work day. When considering that employees tend to have 10-12 hour work days, these breaks, along with a 30-minute lunch break, do not appear adequate. Employees must adapt to this structure, though. The line will not stop, and they cannot leave their post. Each employee is allocated to a specific position on the line to keep production flowing. Each second is accounted for. An employee cannot adequately double-up for a few minutes so another employee can escape

quickly for a bathroom break or quick snack. Whether or not workers adapt to the schedule, employers enforce it leading to moments of dehumanization for employees. Asking to use the bathroom only to hear no, "workers sometimes go to the bathroom on themselves" as they have no other choice instead of bothering to plead with employers (Eisnitz 271). In Pachirat's case, he experiences a situation in which the supervisor allowed unscheduled bathroom breaks as a compromise with the workers. When the supervisor was caught, he was not punished. Instead, he was instructed to suspend the employees' bathroom breaks entirely for a day. This would prevent employees from accepting compromises from supervisors and, instead, force them to follow the imposed routine in the slaughterhouse. Like the continuous gaze, this form of violence maintains the employees' vulnerability and willingness to comply.

In more extreme conditions, employers maintain the line, as well. Eisnitz uncovers stories of employees enduring injuries and illnesses because they cannot leave the line. In terms of injuries, they often occur due to the superficial training employees receive and the speed of the line that requires them to keep up with a pace conducive to accidents. Employees lose their fingers, hands, and arms from knives, are disfigured when body parts come into contact with machines, and are sometimes killed. In these instances, employees leave the line to go to the hospital. However, Eisnitz speaks with an individual who describes how a woman had complained of headaches and was required to remain on the line by her supervisor. She fell to the floor and died. Others face [missing word] such as "being crushed by

cattle; burned by chemicals; stabbed; breaking bones; suffering miscarriages and fainting from the heat, fast pace, and fumes" (Eisnitz 273). Oftentimes, employees are provided with "painkillers and large doses of Vitamin B" and told to return to their position (Eisnitz 273). If they do not, they are told "the plant doors are open and [they] can leave because other workers can be hired…right away" (Eisnitz 275). If they continue to address their injuries and illnesses, they can face punishments such as picking up cigarette butts off the ground outside in freezing temperatures and rain (Eisnitz 274). Such threats and consequences leave employees with little choice but to quit or continue to endure the circumstances to earn a steady paycheck.

While the abovementioned examples deal with physical injuries and illnesses, they result in emotional and psychological discomfort. In knowing that employers control their bodies through deciding when they can eat, use the bathroom, and to simply move from their spot on the line, employees feel dehumanized. Their bodies are no longer their own in entirety. To provide for themselves and their families, they must sacrifice this control to their superiors. To further ensure that employees cooperate, their superiors "cause humiliation, offense, and distress" as is displayed in the examples of workers going to the bathroom where they stand and continuing to work through unbearable pain (Nebraska Appleseed 52). Employees feel as though they are "treat[ed] worse than animals" by their superiors (Nebraska Appleseed 52). Whether injured or uninjured, they are reminded of how they are easily replaceable. Their dedication to the job is

appreciated only as long as they are able to keep with the speeds. Once injured to the point that it results in a decrease in daily output, they are no longer of service to the industry and are "cast aside" (Eisnitz 275). Like each animal inhumanely slaughtered alive, these workers are "reminders of a system that places nearly as little value on human life as it does animal life" (Eisnitz 275).

Employee to Employee

Despite the industry's goal to "gain the most profits with the least possible consideration for employee mental and emotional well-being," workers often do not bond together (Gaston and Harrison 16). Their similar suffering does not triumph the need to outperform for job security. In Virgil Butler's blog, "The Cyberactivist," he details the conditions of the kill room in the Arkansas Tyson chicken slaughterhouse and how such conditions further prevent bonding . Butler describes how it was "so loud you could scream and not hear yourself…you had to communicate with hand signals" (Butler "Inside the Mind of a Killer"). He points out how the loud noises, the speed of the line, and the supervisors suppress the employees from engaging in conversations with one another. Anything that could potentially disrupt the flow of production is deemed inappropriate and unnecessary in the slaughterhouse. Therefore, workers resort to a multitude of different mechanisms in order to cope with their circumstances. As one begins to understand the "flatness of the hours threaten[ing] to stretch into an unbearable eternity," it

becomes important to find ways to break the monotony (Pachirat 137). If the monotony continues without disruption, it is difficult to ignore the "fatigue…and stress of completing tasks quickly in a confined space" (Pachirat 123). Pachirat argues some type of distraction is "essential to both psychological and physical survival" (Pachirat 138).

Both Pachirat and Butler provide multiple accounts of the games, or horseplay, workers engage in to break the monotony. Engaging in a job that "lacks task meaningfulness" allowed workers to continually hang, cut, dissect, etc. without a decrease in output (Grey 22). Pachirat describes the kill room as "boisterous…[full of] songs, shouts, and whistles" (Pachirat 41). Although workers may not be able to effectively communicate, the sound of their own voice or the ability to see another worker shouting or singing breaks the monotony. In Pachirat's words, "every act of disruption…becomes an expression of being, of knowing that you are still there" (Pachirat 139). The monotony causes workers to find methods to numb themselves so they can get through the days. For instance, each "fragment of a tune [can] carry [a worker] through the next hour" until the end of the day is reached as it helps to keep workers present rather than lost in their minds due to the monotonous task at hand (Pachirat 125). However, this is not where the disruptions end. They become much more involved than a tune whistled by one worker. Pachirat watches workers throw pieces of animal fat at one another with means to communicate over the noise or joke around when supervisors are not present. In this case, Pachirat interprets the interaction as horseplay, a harmless act by workers. It was a gesture

of acknowledgement between workers that their job was difficult. It was a reminder that the day would end eventually.

For Butler, the games workers played were more violent and deeply engrained into the fabric of the kill room. Although he participated in them during his time in the kill room, as he looks back and reflects, he sees them as destructive rather than as a means to foster good will between workers. For instance, Butler describes how new workers were treated as they first entered the kill room. Often, the new workers were the target of the other employees' games and amusement, which were forms of initiation into the workspace. One game Butler titled "shit fights" involved grabbing a chicken and hitting the small of its back while aiming at another employee. This would become a competition, seeing who could hit other employees the most. Another game involved "chucking [chickens] into the exhaust fans [which] would pulverize it and sling it back as much into a person's face" (Butler Sept 27 2003). In his blog, Butler addresses the "brutality of the competition" and the effects it has on workers (Butler "More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job"). Conditioned by notions of masculinity to always come out on top, losing the competition left workers unhappy. He shares an instance in which a worker was "aggravated [from losing] and picked up a piece of pipe [and] started whacking the chickens' heads off" (Butler "Tyson Torture Tactics – Twisted and Bizzare"). Therefore, the jokes, pranks, and games turned into competitions of masculinity.

Rather than harmless play, the treatment of new workers, the lack of relationships between workers, and the intensity of the games based in violence display how the dominant notions of masculinity function within the space. The slaughterhouse functioned as a space for men to "express and validate a masculine identity" as one of "individualism, assertiveness, aggressiveness, strength, and competitiveness" (Hochstetler 494-495). Butler notices how none of the employees desired to be "perceived as 'weak'" by co-workers or supervisors (Butler "More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job"). If an employee was determined weak, co-workers "would band together to run them off" (Butler "More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job"). A weak employee could not keep up with the pace, and, therefore, "brought down the whole crew" (Butler "More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job"). This reflected poorly on the kill room as a whole due to a decrease in production. Therefore, employers allowed a certain amount of "horseplay" to weed out workers not fit to keep up with the pace and the violent, competitive environment. The competitions and pranks became one method of forcing an employee to quit. Butler describes how making an employee the lowest man on the ladder "broke them down psychologically [as] no one likes to be…told they are less of a man" (Butler "More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job"). In order to fit the mold of a tough man, workers had to participate in competitions. Additionally, they had to assist with breaking down the weaker men. Like Foucault's gaze, this was a method used for "the policing of men" (Connell and Messerschmidt 844). The workspace became "proving grounds for

masculin[ity]" as each worker is observed as tough or weak, masculine or emasculated (Hochstetler 495).

While Butler struggled with this performance of a specific type of masculinity, he realized that he could not communicate with his co-workers about his feelings or thoughts. "There is no emotional space" for men in this environment (Snorton 17). Butler feared being labeled as "soft" for the other men would turn on him. He questioned why a "loving, caring, compassionate attitude [was] considered a weakness by society…why people have to pretend not to care in order to show they are strong" (Butler "What Are We Responsible For?"). Alongside the value placed on competitiveness, dominance, aggression, violence, and the ability to persevere through pain with control of one's emotions, the dominant notion of masculinity within this space calls for labeling "traditional feminine qualities as a weakness" (Hochstetler 496). Under negative feminine qualities falls expressing any care or concern for fellow co-workers' suffering. Even worse would be admitting they cannot "learn to endure pain" (Seidler 13). These feminine qualities become "signs of weakness…threats to their male identities" themselves (Seidler 9). Therefore, even if struggling on the inside as Butler does, each worker must "relate to their bodies as machines" (Seidler 13). While they may have "feelings of powerlessness," it is necessary that they learn a "disavowal of…emotional lives as elements…that need to be controlled" (Seidler 9-10). In Butler's case, adhering to this type of masculinity allowed him, along with other workers, to maintain a status

as a man who can "make it even under adversity and in the face of threat" (Hochstetler 500).

Employee to Animal

In order for workers to "assert masculinity and gain status" within the space, the most vulnerable men – those who fail to obtain the dominant characteristics of masculinity – are under closer observation (Hochstetler 497). Like the superiors who seek ways to control the employees, the employees who adhere to the dominant masculinity of the space are able to break down those who cannot meet the standards. However, these men are seeking ways to release emotion in a manner controlled by them. For employers, it is displayed through dehumanizing the employees by denying them restroom breaks, relationships with one another, and a work environment suited for human survival. As previously stated, employees engage in horseplay, pranks, and competitions to disrupt the "black recess in [their] minds…[the] terror of monotony" and to express themselves in an appropriate manner according to dominant standards of masculinity within the space (Pachirat 137). The games can be destructive for those who are targets. At times, the target is a worker who has yet to prove himself or who has already failed to meet the masculine standards present in the space. In almost all cases, though, the animals are targeted. Whether weapons against other workers or means to release emotion through violence and aggression, the animals suffer inhumanely in the space due to

these masculine bodies as the slaughterhouse manages them, not just due to the machines and processes set in place.

When all the processes are followed properly, the animals are still subject to an inhumane death. A whistleblower's accusation that cattle were skinned while still alive led to Eisnitz' ten-year-long investigation into the U.S. slaughterhouse industry. Although the knocker shot the animal as instructed, the speed of the line, poor training, and a gun that lacked proper maintenance led to cattle remaining alive while traveling the line. Each animal was shackled to the overhead rail, cut along the throat, and then skinned and split in half all before being knocked unconscious as it should. The same can occur for chickens when they are boiled alive before proper stunning and/or slitting of the throat. Butler's first blog entry details his experience watching chickens suffer in this way.

Despite the already brutal way in which many animals suffer before death in slaughterhouses, workers are often caught abusing animals further. Butler posts multiple blogs over this topic sharing the ways in which workers brutalized animals. Workers used the animals to express emotions in a manner that they controlled, as well as for amusement. Either way the animals would leave the slaughterhouse dead and ready for consumption, so supervisors did not always interject when workers brutalized the animals. This was the case when workers were left to dispose of the runts. A runt is a chicken that does not "develop properly…[they] are smaller and not desirable for meat" (Butler "Tyson Torture Tactics – Culling the Runts"). These chickens had to be killed and would not become a product, so workers threw them

into exhaust fans, stepped on them, etc. In terms of amusement, workers used the animals as a distraction. Like the games and competitions, abusing the animals became a way to disrupt the monotony and confront the "problem of being…of knowing" they are present rather than lost in their minds (Pachirat 138). For amusement, some would "pull [the chickens'] heads off and thr[o]w it on the floor to watch it flop" (Butler "Tyson Torture Tactics – Culling the Runts"). Chickens were hung on the rail by their heads instead of their feet so workers could see them squirm. Butler shares how workers "shoved each chickens' head up the butt of the chicken in front of it" to cause more confusion and distress for the chickens (Butler "Tyson Torture Tactics – Twisted and Bizzare").

Instead of losing control of their emotions, workers released only one emotion: anger. The anger was displayed through attacks on the animals. When workers were angry or frustrated, the chickens were in front of them as vulnerable targets. Like the most vulnerable workers, the chickens were always available to face destruction by those adhering to the dominant notions of masculinity requiring them to appear tough, aggressive, and violent rather than sympathetic, compassionate, or expressive. Butler describes how the workers were "more prone to violence" and "much more likely to physically attack" (Butler "Inside the Mind of a Killer"). While workers could attack each other, this caused more of a disruption that resulted in supervisor interference. Therefore, the chickens were an easy substitution for attacks. The "meanness would be unleashed on the birds" in violent ways (Butler "Tyson's Usage of the 'Chicken Plant Attitude'"). Workers would

“whack chickens’ heads off…because one of them shit on his face” (Butler “Tyson Torture Tactics – Twisted and Bizzare”). Pachirat also shares how workers would abuse the cattle similarly. When cattle did not move toward the knocker as instructed, it slowed down the overall process reflecting poorly on workers. Aggravated, workers “used the electric cattle prods extensively, sometimes sticking them under the animals’ tails and into their anuses” (Pachirat 145).

While the assaults to the animals are neither justifiable nor excusable, they are an expression of a labor system that dehumanizes its workers. Thus, one should not simply place blame on one group of individuals “exposed to a warped ‘little world’ that is controlled by such a powerful and heartless” industry (Butler “More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job”). Instead, it is vital to question why workers who are treated so inhumanely by their superiors would resort to similar treatment for both their co-workers and the animals.

Harm and Healing

Potential Negative Effects of Work on Employees

Sociologists such as Amy J. Fitzgerald, Linda Kalof, and Thomas Dietz discuss the "'Sinclair hypothesis' – [that] the propensity for violent crime is increased by work that involves the routine slaughter of other animals" (Fitzgerald et al. 159). In their article "Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime Rates: An Empirical Analysis of the Spillover From 'The Jungle' Into the Surrounding Community," they argue that there is a "link between the increased crime rates and the violent work" in slaughterhouse communities (Fitzgerald et al. 158). However, this conclusion disregards the daily experiences of the workers within the slaughterhouse. Focusing solely on "total arrest rates, arrests for violent crimes, arrests for rape, and arrests for other sex offenses" allows for a gap in research (Fitzgerald et al. 158). It is necessary to first hear the workers' stories and all they endure within the space physically, emotionally, and psychologically, as well as attempt to understand how the continuous involvement in the killing and dissection of live animals affects each worker psychologically.

In attempting to close the gap, it becomes clear that in the span of job positions at the slaughterhouse, "the majority of slaughterhouse workers operate in the zone of death" (Pachirat 61). Very few will come into contact with a live animal if it is properly stunned, and even fewer with an animal pre- and post-death. Although there are repercussions from cutting and handling portions of dead animals as

stated above, workers can still distance themselves from the direct act of killing, in this job position. This is why, when Pachirat asks to train in the position of knocker, many workers respond with concerns stating he "will have bad dreams" and that the position will "mess [him] up" (Pachirat 151). Some even claim they "feel guilty enough as it is" being employed in the slaughterhouse without filling the position of knocker (Pachirat 151). After speaking with other workers, operating as the knocker for only two cows, and considering how he feels afterwards, Pachirat comes to a conclusion about killing directly versus indirectly in the slaughterhouse.

Sight and visibility play a role in Pachirat and his co-workers' ability to separate themselves from the direct act of killing. Pachirat describes it as "simply moral math: the kill floor operates with 120 + 1 jobs" (Pachirat 160). When he is in the cooler, not only does he not see a live animal, but also he does not see a complete being resembling an animal at all. He is instructed to handle one organ. Therefore, he separates and distances himself from the act of killing. He is a worker in the slaughterhouse industry who handles animal parts rather than participating in the killing of animals. Even as he moves onto the kill floor as a quality-control employee, he convinces himself he is not actively participating in the killing of animals. "Only the knocker delivers the blow that begins the irreversible process of transforming live creatures into dead ones," therefore deeming the knocker the "+1" in the equation (Pachirat 160). If the "work of killing…is isolated and concentrated…in the knocker [then] the knocker alone performs the work of killing" (Pachirat 159). What Pachirat and his co-workers do in the space becomes "morally

unrelated to that killing," separated from the act, merely a continuation of the knocker's irreversible act (Pachirat 159).

While Pachirat constructs a logical, mathematical method to ease his mind as he works in the various departments of the slaughterhouse, those who perform the job of knocker, presticker, and sticker on a daily basis do not necessarily have their own logical method of coping. It is important at this point to remember that Pachirat is an academic studying this space while his co-workers are not. Jennifer Dillard describes the "psychological consequences of the act of killing" in her article "A Slaughterhouse Nightmare" (Dillard 5). As the kill floor employees face inhumane treatment from employers, the hierarchical structures at play set to tear workers down, and the uncomfortable workspace environment, they must also face their involvement in the act of killing and bloodshed on a daily basis.

The act of killing becomes a driving force in the workers' own dehumanization and desensitization as they attempt to cope with the way they are treated in the space and the eventual way they begin to treat animals. How employees abuse animals due to psychological harm (PTSD) is broken down into two categories by Dillard: those who kill violently and against regulations to cope and those who resort to emotional dissonance or "doubling" of the self to cope (Dillard 8). She describes male employees' actions related to killing animals as a form of an outlet for the emotions they are feeling regarding the way they are treated within the slaughterhouse which is exacerbated by the lack of communication and relationships formed over similar suffering in slaughterhouses.

There is no sense of bonding over the difficulty of their work, how it makes them feel, or how it affects them outside of the slaughterhouse. Therefore, male employees often begin to take pleasure in "the gruesome deaths of thousands of animals every week" (Dillard 5). "Every act of disruption…becomes an expression of being" for the workers as they begin to struggle with a "problem of being…of knowing you are there" amongst the monotonous tasks and unbearable work environment (Pachirat 139). By interrupting the monotonous task, the workers are claiming agency to engage in an act of their own deliberate choosing rather than as they are instructed to be employers. Employees use their tools as weapons to kill rather than instruments to produce a product. For example, employees resort to "brutal prodding," are seen "throwing dying birds just for fun...[with] no remorse," and "skin and boil fully conscious individuals" to liven up their tedious work shifts and release their frustrations (Dillard 7).

Dillard quotes from Ed Van Winkle, a hog sticker at a Morrell slaughterhouse in Iowa, to explain the process of "doubling" as a coping mechanism for the act of killing. There are two phases to the act of "doubling" as described through Van Winkle's experiences. The primary component to doubling is "[you] can't care" in order to cope with the trauma (McWilliams 1). An employee can only continue killing according to the regulations through "emotional dissonance," his own dehumanization, and desensitization to the process (McWilliams 1). If this step is not enacted, employees may end up killing violently due to the subconscious effect of their emotional response on their work. The second component to "doubling"

explains how workers reach emotional dissonance. An employee must "div[ide] himself into two functioning wholes" (Dillard 8). One self exists outside of the slaughterhouse while "the worker's other self – the self developed to work in the slaughterhouse – kills the [animal], literally unable to care about the animal" (Dillard 8). Van Winkle details an instance when a pig nuzzled up against his leg similar to a dog. Moments later, Van Winkle was required to kill this same pig. Doubling causes a decrease in "the employees' ability to empathize and identify with the pain suffered by animals" (Dillard 9). Therefore, Van Winkle experienced this instance through a doubling of the self in order to remain in line with the regulations of his job. This instance can be related to the way in which Butler felt when seeing how his co-workers abused new workers. The self that existed in the workspace was able to distance itself from caring about the new worker's abuse. However, when writing the blog post, Butler reflects on the situation with a different mindset. For both Butler and Van Winkle, the abuses and the very act of killing itself become a part of their daily life. They are desensitized to the act. In the end, the maltreatment of the workers by employers and fellow employees, the hierarchy, and the environment in the industry lead not only to the killing of animals but also to the "killing of people" in terms of their humanity and physical, emotional, and psychological well-being (LeDuff 362).

Imagining a Feminist Masculinity within Space

An understanding as to how the act of killing, and more generally the overall involvement in the slaughterhouse industry, affects workers' daily lives reveals key components that lay the foundation for an outcome of violence and physical, emotional, and psychological harm. While the set-up of the slaughterhouse and the hierarchy within it are central to the workers' struggles, the dominant notions of masculinity ultimately uphold the standards for how each man addresses and copes with his circumstances in the slaughterhouse. Since "most men never think about patriarchy," it exists as the "single most life-threatening disease assaulting the male body and spirit" (hooks "The Will to Change" 17). The slaughterhouse industry is a space that is plagued by this disease resulting in the destruction of men.

As bell hooks describes in *The Will to Change*, it is not that "men are unwilling to change" but, instead, that a space has not been provided for men to be "taught the art of loving" and to "let go the will to dominate" (hooks "The Will to Change" xvii). In reclaiming feminist tools for men, such as learning what it means to love and express emotions, the "crisis of masculinity" can be addressed (hooks "The Will to Change" xvii). However, this requires breaking down and disregarding notions of what it means to adhere to a masculinity embedded in patriarchal ideals. In the slaughterhouse industry, the prevalence of "emotional stoicism" within the space reinforces the belief that men "are more manly if they do not feel" (hooks "The Will to Change" 5). This explanation creates an understanding as to why both employers

and employees engage in the abuse of each other and the animals. As young boys, they are often taught to "act out or implode" rather than "express with words what they feel, when they feel it" (hooks "The Will to Change" 42). Mapping this idea onto the men's actions in the slaughterhouse shows why men turn toward violent destruction rather than emotional conversations or compassion. Instead of attempting to productively assist or instruct those who struggle in the environment, many choose to engage in pranks or competitions that involve violence, abuse, and the inevitable breaking down of fellow employees. In doing so, they choose the path they believe makes them the type of men patriarchal culture calls for. "Men cannot be men if they are not in control," and acting on their underlying emotions rather than expressing them directly allows them to maintain control over themselves and others (hooks "The Will to Change" 30).

In choosing such control, these men are "doomed…to live in states of emotional numbness" (hooks "The Will to Change" 6). This is evidently displayed through Dillard's explanation of the workers' doubling of the self or violent outbursts. Through these two responses, they are able to entirely dismiss or "hide their emotional awareness" (hooks "The Will to Change" 8). The workers are successful if they believe in patriarchal norms as they have not resorted to feminine qualities of feeling, and/or they hide their ability to feel as they "fear…being attacked and shamed" by the men around them (hooks "The Will to Change" 8). In this case, it is clear that the gaze of others acts as a "practice of shaming… to keep [men] in check" in terms of maintaining the standard of the products and adhering

to the dominant notions of masculinity within the site (hooks "The Will to Change" 47). Either way, it "encourages patriarchal thinking…as the easiest path to manliness…reward[ing] men for being out of touch with their emotions (hooks "The Will to Change" 44, 70).

There is, however, one emotion they can express: anger. This justifies why violent outbursts are accepted in the workspace and why employees often do not leave despite violent interactions between them and employees, employers, and/or animals. More so than just an accepted emotion, anger and rage are "positive expression[s] of patriarchal masculinity" (hooks "The Will to Change" 7). In this space, anger and rage are encouraged through expressions of violence. Not only does it keep the violent task at hand on track, but it also stays in line with the continued dominance of patriarchal notions of masculinity. It is "deemed 'natural' by the psychology of patriarchy…that there is a biological connection between having a penis and the will to do violence" (hooks "The Will to Change" 55). Therefore, maintaining control over one's emotions through violent expressions further reinforces one's manhood. It allows men to, once again, "prove their manhood" as they display their ability to "wear a mask" rather than expose their true feelings and dominate in the workspace as the job at hand already calls for them to engage in violent acts (hooks "The Will to Change" 121, 153).

hooks argues that, in order to begin reversing patriarchy as embedded in dominant notions of masculinity, it must be "collectively acknowledged the damage patriarchy cause and the suffering it creates" (hooks "The Will to Change" 30). Men

cannot be blamed as the problem and left to destruct on their own as those within the slaughterhouse often do. Male pain must be addressed as real and acceptable and, then, men can learn to express it and cope. Through feminist masculinity, there is a shift. Instead of valuing independence, silence, anger, and emotional dissonance as solutions, a community of men suffering is formed. "The art of connecting with others" creates real men rather than proving manhood through sustaining abuses and enacting abuses (hooks "The Will to Change" 121). These connections provide men with the space to have "emotional awareness and expression" that is both essential to healing and respected by those within the community (hooks "The Will to Change" 143).

Conclusion

Individuals such as Eisnitz are limited in helping these workers. While she was able to expose inhumane treatment of animals and workers in the early 2000s, today she could be prosecuted for her work. "Ag-gag" laws are primarily set in place to dissuade animal rights activists from spreading proof of animal abuse within the industry. However, this also shields the public from understanding the inhumane treatment workers endure, too. The abuse of animals within the industry is linked to the abuse of the workers. One does not exist without the other in the slaughterhouse industry as it currently operates. Therefore, as "ag-gag" laws not only make invisible the animal from which meat is made but also the workers who disassembly the animal into the product. The laws silence and make invisible the workers' experience to the public , as well as prevent those like Eisnitz and Pachirat from sharing the workers' experiences. Therefore, responsibility rests on the same men who are silenced to shift the dominant attitudes in their work environment – an unfortunate consequence of "ag-gag" laws.

On the one hand, Butler demonstrates the recovery process that is possible despite "ag-gag" laws. He transformed from one of the men participating in abuses to the animals and weaker workers, to someone who could not bare to watch these actions occur. He recognized that "adopting an attitude of 'looking out for #1 at all costs'" was not productive (Butler, January "More Thoughts on Working at Tyson at Such a Horrible Job"). Rather it led to disassociation from how he felt about the violent act he committed hour after hour, day after day. Even once he was able to

acknowledge his feelings, he felt unable to speak to anyone without being deemed 'weak' or 'soft' by his co-workers (Butler "Inside the Mind of a Killer"). Butler had to leave the space in order to fully heal and to recognize the worth of each animal and worker alike. In doing so, he realized "it obviously takes much more strength and courage to care" than to resist dealing with one's emotions and feelings (Butler "What Are We Responsible For?"). He overcame the patriarchal culture that dominated the workspace in order to recreate his notion of masculinity.

While Butler remains an example of the transition that is possible for each of these men, on the other hand, many do not have the opportunity to leave their jobs to fully engage in a healing process. For these men, the workspace environment itself must be freed from patriarchal and capitalist notions so that a healing process is possible. However, with "ag-gag" laws in place shielding the public from knowledge as to how their food is produced, this places sole responsibility on the individuals oppressed, exploited, and dehumanized by their environment to transform their environment. Even though these men should not be expected to take on full responsibility for such a transformation, using Butler as an example, they could each can make small adjustments to shift the attitude in the workspace. This could look like helping train a new employee who is struggling, to resisting the temptation to engage in competitions and pranks, to using breaks to begin forming relationships to build trust and friendship. Once the workspace functions as a team of individuals who care about the success of the whole rather than individuals who strive for their personal success alone, a foundation will be set to dismantle the

patriarchal culture of the space. In doing so, they will not "cease to be real 'men'" (hooks "The Will to Change" 3). Instead, like Butler, the men will be able to redefine their notion of masculinity into notions of multiple masculinities, all of which are built on feminist ideals of "knowing how [to] express love without fear of exploitation or oppression" (hooks "The Will to Change" xii). In doing so, there will be a "male reclamation and recover of self, of their emotional right" fully transforming the space into one of acceptance and healing (hooks "The Will to Change" 16).

While transformation via the workers seems ideal, other avenues must be explored to take some responsibility away from the workers to change themselves. A more practical possibility for changing the very structures maintaining this industry must be presented. One way in which the workers could take back some control over the workspace environment is through unionization. Although this comes with its own set of complications because it is difficult to create, sustain, and maintain a workforce that is disposable, it is still a viable option for dismantling the oppressive structures.

If workers organized and unionized, there is the possibility that the public would gain visibility into the inner-workings of the industry. Rather than the public deeming these men as innately violent due to the reports of some animal activist undercover investigations, the men could shift this perspective by speaking to the inhumane conditions and poor treatment that underpin their violent reactions toward each other and toward the animals. The public would be made aware of the

direct link between the suffering of the animal and that of the worker due to the overall set-up of the slaughterhouse industry and those who run it. Through unionizing and creating a dialogue about the exploitation of non-human animals and human workers alike, the governmental organizations, such as the Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the USDA, that have stood by as this workforce is oppressed and exploited would be encouraged to adapt and implement labor laws – and perhaps animal cruelty laws – that have so far been ignored. Such unionizing in just one meat-processing company or one area of the country could perhaps spark a transformation in the industry as a whole providing those working within slaughterhouses an opportunity to reclaim their workspace and their physical, emotional, and psychological health.

Works Cited

Barboza, David. "Meatpackers' Profits Hinge on Pool of Immigrant Labor." *The New York Times* 21 Dec. 2001: Web. 21 Oct. 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2001/12/21/us/meatpackers-profits-hinge-on-pool-of-immigrant-labor.html>.

Berlant, Lauren Gail. Cruel Optimism. Durham: Duke UP, 2011. Print.

Broadway, Michael and Donald Stull. "I'll do whatever you want, but it hurts." *Labor: Studies in Working-Class History of the Americas* 5 (2008) : 27-37. *Google Search.* Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://labor.dukejournals.org.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/5/2/27>.

Broughton, Chad. "Migration as Engendered Practice: Mexican Men, Masculinity, and Northward Migration." *Gender & Society* 22 (2008) : 568-589. *SagePub*. Web. 1 Oct 2014. <http://gas.sagepub.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/22/5/568>.

Butler, Virgil. Website. *The Cyberactivist*. Blogspot., 2003-2007. Web. 2014.

Collins, Patricia Hill. "The Politics of Black Feminist Thought." Black Feminist Thought. N.p.: Hyman, 1990. 1-18. Web. 1 Apr. 2015.

Collins, Patricia Hill. "Toward an Afrocentric Feminist Epistemology." Black Feminist Thought. N.p.: Hyman, 1990. 201-19. Web. 1 Apr. 2015.

Connell, R. W. *Masculinities*. 2nd ed. N.p.: Polity, 2005. Print.

Connell, R.W., and James W. Messerschmidt. "Hegemonic Masculinity: Rethinking the Concept." Gender and Society 19.6 (2005): 829-59. Web.

Consalvo, Mia. "The Monsters Next Door: Media Constructions of Boys and Masculinity." Feminist Media Studies 3.1 (2003): 27-45. Web.

Cooper, Marc. "The Heartland's Raw Deal." *Nation* 264.4 (1997) : 11-17. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014.

Cronon, William. *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1991. Print.

Dalla, Rochelle and April Christensen. "Latino Immigrants Describe Residence in Rural Midwestern Meatpacking Communities: A Longitudinal Assessment of Social and Economic Change." *Hispanic Journal of Behavior Sciences* 27 (2005) : 23-42. *SagePub*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://hjb.sagepub.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/27/1/23>.

Dillard, Jennifer. "A Slaughterhouse Nightmare: Psychological Harm Suffered by Slaughterhouse Employees and the Possibility of Redress through Legal Reform." *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy* 35 (2008) : 391-409. *SSRN*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1016401>.

Diner, Steven J. *A Very Different Age: Americans of the Progressive Era.* New York: Hill and Wang, 1998. Print.

Eisnitz, Gail A. *Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment inside the U.S. Meat Industry*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus, 1997. Print.

Fitzgerald, Amy J. "A Social History of the Slaughterhouse: From Inception to Contemporary Implications." *Human Ecology Review* 17 (2010) : 58-69. *Google*

Search. Web. 1 Oct. 2014.
<http://www.humanecologyreview.org/pastissues/her171/Fitzgerald.pdf>.

Fitzgerald, Amy, Linda Kalof and Thomas Dietz. “Slaughterhouses and Increased Crime Rates: An Empirical Analysis of the Spillover From ‘The Jungle’ Into the Surrounding Community.” *Organization Environment* 22 (2009) : .158-184 *SagePub.* Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://oae.sagepub.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/22/2/158>.

Food, Inc. Dir. Robert Kenner. Magnolia Home Entertainment, 2008. DVD.

Gouveia, Lourdes and Rogelio Saenz. “Global Forces and Latino Population Growth in the Midwest: A Regional and Subregional Analysis.” *Great Plains Research: A Journal of Natural and Social Sciences* (2000) : 305–328. *Google Search*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://digitalcommons.unl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1515&context=greatplainsresearch>.

Hochstetler, Andy, Heith Copes, and Craig J. Forsyth. "The Fight: Symbolic Expression and Validation of Masculinity in Working Class Tavern Culture." American Journal of Criminal Justice 39 (2014): 493-510. Web.

hooks, bell. *We Real Cool: Black Men and Masculinity*. New York: Routledge, 2004. Print.

---. *The Will to Change: Men, Masculinity, and Love*. New York: Atria, 2004. Print.

Horowitz, Roger. 1997. “”Where Men Will Not Work”: Gender, Power, Space, and the

Sexual Division of Labor in America's Meatpacking Industry, 1890-1990." Technology and Culture 38:187-213. Print.

Jablonsky, Thomas J. *Pride in the Jungle: Community and Everyday Life in Back of the Yards Chicago.* Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993. Print.

Katz, Jesse. "The Chicken Trail." *Los Angeles Times* (1996). *Google Search.* Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://www.byjessekatz.com/#/stories/newspaper-stories/the-chicken-trail>.

Kimmel, Michael. "Invisible Masculinity."

LeDuff, Charlie. "At a Slaughterhouse, some Things Never Die." *New York Times* (2000). *ProQuest*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014 <http://ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/91370722?accountid=7118>.

Lee, Paula Young. *Meat, Modernity, and the Rise of the Slaughterhouse*. New Hampshire: University of New Hampshire Press, 2008. Print.

Marceau, Justin F. "Ag Gag Past, Present, and Future." Seattle University Law Review 38.4 (2014-2015): 1317-1344. Web. 9 Mar. 2016.

McWilliams, James. "PSTD in Slaughterhouses." *The Texas Observer* 104 (2012) : 40-41. *ProQuest*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/login?url+http://search.proquest.com/docview/921541520?accountid=7118>.

Molina, Natalia. *Fit to be Citizens? Public Health and Race in Los Angeles, 1879-1939.*

Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2006. Print.

Nebraska Appleseed. *The Speed Kills You: The Voice Of Nebraska's Meatpacking Workers*. (2009) : 56-62. *Google Search*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://boldnebraska.org/uploaded/pdf/the_speed_kills_you_030910.pdf>.

O'Donnell, Santiago. "Jobs Lure Farm Workers to Midwest: Employment: Meatpacking company with a history of safety violations has recruited 200 employees from Ventura County." *Los Angeles Times* 7 April 1991: Web. 21 Oct. 2014 <http://articles.latimes.com/1991-04-07/local/me-453_1_ventura-county>.

Ogle, Maureen. *In Meat We Trust: An Unexpected History of Carnivore America* New York: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013. Print.

Olsson, Karen. "The Shame Of Meatpacking." *Nation* 275 (2002) : 11-16. *EBSCOhost*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014.

Pachirat, Timothy. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight.* New Hanover, CT : Yale University Press, 2011. Print.

Richey, Warren. "'Ag-Gag' Laws Head to Court: So Far, Animal Rights Activists are Winning." The Christian Science Monitor. 31 Dec. 2015. ProQuest. Web. 9 Mar. 2016.

Schlosser, Eric. "Cogs in the Great Machine." Fast Food Nation. New York: Harper Perennial, 2002. Web. 21 Oct. 2014. <http://www.thirdworldtraveler.com/Health/Cogs_Machine_FFN.html>.

Seidler, Victor. "Masculinities, Bodies, and Emotional Life." Men and Masculinities

10.1 (2007): 9-21. Web.

---. *Rediscovering Masculinity: Reason, Language, and Sexuality*. London: Routledge, 1989. Print.

Sinclair, Upton, and Maura Spiegel. *The Jungle*. New York: Barnes & Noble Classics, 2003. Print.

Smith, Mick. "The 'Ethical' Space of the Abattoir: On the (In)human(e) Slaughter of Other Animals." Human Ecology Review 9.2 (2002): 49-58. Web.

Snorton, C. Riley. "Transfiguring Masculinities in Black Women's Studies - The Feminist Wire." The Feminist Wire. N.p., 18 May 2011. Web. 04 May 2015. <http://thefeministwire.com/2011/05/transfiguring-masculinities-in-black-womens-studies/>.

Whittaker, William. "Labor Practices in the Meat Packing and Poultry Processing Industry: An Overview." *Congressional Research Service* (2005) : 1-53. Web. 1 Oct. 2014.

"Working Undercover in a Slaughterhouse: An Interview with Timothy Pachirat." Interview by Avi Solomon. Boingboing. N.p., 8 Mar. 2012. Web. 14 Oct. 2014. <http://boingboing.net/2012/03/08/working-undercover-in-a-slaugh.html>.

York, Richard. "Humanity and Inhumanity: Toward a Sociology of the Slaughterhouse." *Organization Environment* 17.260 (2004) : 260-265. *SagePub*. Web. 1 Oct. 2014. <http://oae.sagepub.com.ezproxy.lib.utexas.edu/content/17/2/260>.