

Features of Cultural Significance of Animal Science

Renata MIKHAILOVA,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary
Russia, neti-mix@yandex.ru

Vladimir SEMENOV,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia
semenov_v/g@list.ru

Anatolii TIKHONOV,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia
neti-mix@yandex.ru

Nadezhda SERGEEVA,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia
vospitsna@list.ru

Olga FEDOROVA,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia, olga.afan@gmail.com

Valentina STEPANOVA,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia, neti-mix@yandex.ru

Ekaterina AGAEVA,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia, agaeva.ek@yandex.ru

Marina CHERNOYAROVA,
Chuvash State Agrarian University, Cheboksary, Russia, luciliya@rambler.ru

Eleonora BARKOVA,
Plekhanov Russian University of Economics, Moscow, Russia, barkova3000@yandex.ru

Mikhail PRONIN,
Institute of Philosophy of Russian Academy of Sciences, Moscow, Russia, mapronin@gmail.com.

Andrey Evgenievich Makushev,
Candidate of Economic Sciences, Associate Professor, Rector of Chuvash State Agrarian University, email:
ae.makushev@yandex.ru

Correspondence should be addressed to: Renata MIKHAILOVA; neti-mix@yandex.ru

* Presented at the 38th IBIMA International Conference, 23-24 November 2021, Seville, Spain

Copyright © 2021. Renata MIKHAILOVA, Vladimir SEMENOV, Anatolii TIKHONOV, Nadezhda SERGEEVA, Olga FEDOROVA, Valentina STEPANOVA, Ekaterina AGAEVA, Marina CHERNOYAROVA, Eleonora BARKOVA, Mikhail PRONIN and Andrey Evgenievich Makushev

Cite this Article as: Cite this Article as: Renata MIKHAILOVA, Vladimir SEMENOV, Anatolii TIKHONOV, Nadezhda SERGEEVA, Olga FEDOROVA, Valentina STEPANOVA, Ekaterina AGAEVA, Marina CHERNOYAROVA, Eleonora BARKOVA, Mikhail PRONIN and Andrey Evgenievich Makushev, Vol. 2021 (35) "Features of Cultural Significance of Animal Science" Communications of International Proceedings, Vol. 2021 (35), 23-24 November 2021, Seville, Spain. ISBN: 978-0-9998551-7-1, ISSN: 2767-9640. Article ID 3860721.

Abstract

The development of modern animal science requires an in—depth study of the problems associated with it. These problems are generated in the system of relations between man and nature. On one of its practical basis is the receipt of funds for the satisfaction of vital needs through the animal, for which a subject is oriented to actively interact with farm animals; on the other, farm animals whose quality of life needs to be improved, which raises the problem of protecting them. We are talking about the problem of interaction between man and farm animals, which is associated with cultural significance of animal science. We consider the factors of this cultural significance — nature, society, the subject. The paper develops the forms of cultural significance for man, for society: a) creating means to meet human needs through the body of an animal, which is associated with the formation of a certain level of satisfying cultural existence of man; b) development of rational thinking of a person employed in animal breeding, which subsequently leads to the development of animal science; c) ‘rooted consciousness’ of the breeder, the formation of his ‘sense of place’ and the feeling and image of ‘his place’. The paper establishes the aspects of man – farm animals relation: 1) as to a specific object; 2) as to a specific subject. The paper considers the features of these relations from antiquity to the present and for the potential future in the context of changing conditions of the external environment (society).

Keywords: Nature, Farm Animals, Specific Object, Specific Subject, Animal Science, Cultural Significance.

Introduction

The relevance of the research is due to the needs of the development of modern animal breeding. In this regard the problem concerns, on the one hand, a person 1) the main element of the global food system, who is a consumer of animal products; 2) engaged in a special type of activity — animal breeding and possessing the ability to transform his labor into a kind of creative activity; 3) creating in the modern new reality his own ‘human world’ on the basis of intuition, emotions, psychological movements in the process of interaction with farm animals (thereby breaking with utilitarian orientation); on the other hand, farm animals. The activity of the subject is directed on the latter, which is associated with the possibility and the need to improve the quality of their life, the creation of conditions for their well—being [Gallo et al. (2018)], [Nordquist et al. (2017)], [Callanan et al. (2020)], [Losada—Espinosa et al. (2020)], [Bulleret et al. (2018)], [Mota—Rojaset al.(2020)], [Hosey and Melfi (2018)]. In a generalized form, the problem can be formulated as follows: protecting animals ‘from farm to fork’ [Buller and Roe (2018)]. The problems of farm animals related to their maintenance, feeding, breeding and rational use are related to the study of the science of animal breeding. The ‘twists’ and ‘depths’ of reflections on the development of animal science inevitably pose a problem for the researcher that has value for modern man and society — its cultural significance. The contexts of the foregoing affect the relevance of researching the topic in connection with global environmental problems in the system of relations between man and nature. The relevance of the research is also explained by the peculiarity of the modern stage of development of science, focused on taking into account the specifics of a world commensurate with a person. Objects of the animal world, which include farm animals, have these specifics.

The purpose of the article is to reveal the features of the cultural significance of animal science for humans and society.

Methods and Materials

Theoretical and methodological prerequisites for the study of the features of cultural significance of animal science

It is known that both in Russian and foreign literature the concept of culture has different interpretations. Originally in the era of antiquity, the concept of culture meant the cultivation and maintenance of land in order to make it more suitable for use to satisfy human needs. Associated with this is the figurative meaning of the concept of culture, which is understood as ‘leaving, ennobling the bodily—spiritual inclinations and abilities of a person’ [Brief Encyclopedia (1994)] so that they could form properties useful for themselves in nature (in plants, animals), things. For these purposes, a person transforms the environment, adapting it in a certain way. In the process of transforming the environment, a person changes himself: he forms his own personality, that is, personal growth takes place, his formation and development as a subject of activity, communication, cognition. Thus, overcoming his natural limitations, a person acquires the ability to rise above his own nature. This is how culture arose and was formed as a process and result of the realization of the human spirit. The result of the realization of the spirit is spiritual development, the acquisition of spirituality. Based on the variety of definitions of the concept of spirituality, we understand it as a qualitative definiteness, an integrative property of the human consciousness system; an ideal pursuit aimed at harmonizing the relationship between the subjective and the objective. It follows from what has been said that spirituality is associated with human subjectivity and acts as a subjective quality of the highest order. By subjectivity, we mean, firstly, something that refers to the subject — the inner world inherent in the given subject (in the broad sense); secondly, something that means dependence on the subject, that is, devoid of objectivity and inherent in a given subject, a one—sided, prejudiced attitude towards the external world, towards oneself (in the narrow sense of the word). Here subjectivity is correlated with inferiority. In this context, it would be logical to say that cognition moves from

subjective to objective or from more subjective to less subjective. 'Objective' is understood by us as the ability inherent in an individual to be aware of the peculiarity of the surrounding world, which exists independently of the person's consciousness and will. It follows from what has been said that the relationship between the subjective and the objective determines the qualitative definiteness of a person's consciousness, hence, his spirituality. The criterion for determining the quality of spirituality is the meaning—forming factor of a person's attitude to the world, to other people, to himself. It is appropriate here to quote the statement of A. de Saint—Exupéry (1987), who writes that in spirituality 'it is not the things themselves that are important, but the meaning that connects them to each other', that is, an individual perceives things and relates to them in one way or another in the context of their meaning. Hence, we can conclude that the source of all meaning is contained in the state of spirituality. It is also possible to put it in the opposite way: the vector of meaning can determine certain efforts of the spiritual component of a person. Undoubtedly, the peculiarities of the meaning of human activity can be understood only in relation to its motives. A motive is an incentive for a given activity (or action). The ideal vision, the criteria for acquiring the meaning of human activity are determined by a certain hierarchy, a choice of dominant values. The acquisition of meaning can be justified by the movement towards truth, goodness, beauty, freedom, justice and other higher values. Here we are talking about the potential for solving vital problems that a person discovers in the system of 'eternal questions' of his being. Hence, the values, being the basis of human activity, guide the content of his activity, which is associated with his certain spiritual state (by activity we mean the projection of the personality into the future).

Thus, the relationship between the subjective and the objective, considered according to the criterion of life—meaning (higher) values, serve as the basis for clarifying the specifics, that is forms of a certain degree of spiritual development of the individual. This specific is reflected in its forms. These forms are named in Mikhailova's (2017) research. 1. Integrity and unity of spiritual development. In subject—object relations, this form of spiritual development of the individual serves to orient their consciousness towards the prospect of harmonious (balanced, ordered) relations between the subjective and the objective. This is possible while maintaining a certain measure of their correlation. We will call this form 'developed spirituality'. Its reflections can be reasonable egoism, goodness, prosperity, friendship, care, compassion, justice, conscientiousness, hard work, mercy, honor, dignity, a sense of proportion, etc. 2. The forms of 'torn spirituality' inherent in an individual: a) absolutization of subjectivity to the detriment of objectivity, b) absolutization of objectivity to the detriment of subjectivity, c) relativity of the spiritual states of an individual. The named forms of torn spirituality testify to the limitations, disharmony of spirituality, correlated practically with lack of spirituality. A reflection of lack of spirituality in relation to others can be betrayal, selfishness as focus on one's own interests, desires, motives — a person's overestimation of himself in relation to others; self—deprecation, hypertrophied altruism — overestimation of others in relation to oneself and underestimation of oneself in relation to others; caused by the influence of chances on the personality, the unpredictability of the internal instability of the personality's self—esteem in relation to others, as well as the assessment of others in relation to oneself. In real life, the spiritual states of the individual are permeated with contradictions. The latter can be caused by underestimation of the context of interaction between the individual and society, individual (society) and nature. Therefore, the ascent to spirituality is possible only in the process of the subject's creative activity. Here we should note that, being deeply personal, spirituality has at the same time a social character (it affects public life). We are talking about a certain spiritual orientation of society.

Considering the above, we will call a cultural person a person with the potential of a certain degree of spiritual development. The concept of 'cultural man' assumes the existence of culture in a subjective form — in the form of a person's abilities and his integrity (in his interests, needs, motives, value orientations, decision—making, structure of social attitudes). The main criterion here is proportion. In the process of interaction with nature (the reflection of the existence of beings, taken in its variability, is associated with the category of interaction) a 'cultural man' is able to carry out his actions in accordance with its laws. We are talking about the noosphere — coordinated interaction of man with nature, which presupposes the proportion of man in this interaction. Here we mean the level and adequate proportion of impact on nature, which in the paper by Pirogov and Privalov (2014) is considered in the form of 'not so strong', but at the same time 'sufficient' for the process of interaction 'to be carried out without hindrance'. With this approach to understanding 'cultural man' we are talking about his civilized (from Lat. Civis — citizen, civilis — civil, state) relations with nature, meaning the desire to coexist with it on the basis of a deep understanding of its essence. A person is doomed to it since, in Berdyaev's words (1990), existentially he is 'dependent on the compulsion and pressure of life and everything that relates to life'. Therefore, at the same time, we will call a 'cultural man' a 'civilized man' [here it should be noted that although science and philosophy have different views on the problem of the relationship between culture and civilization we proceed from their synonymous consideration, there are views that identify them — Z. Freud (1989), J. Maritain (1994), M. Lerner (1992) and others].

The concept of 'cultural significance' (of animal science) is associated with the concept of 'cultural man'. In our opinion, the term 'significance' is close to the word 'meaning', understood by Dahl (2004) as 'content, importance'. With regard to the problem we are investigating, we are talking about the cultural meaning, the cultural content, the cultural importance of animal science in the process of realizing human relations with nature — farm animals.

One of the types of practical human activity is animal breeding. From the point of view of philosophy it can be considered as a special type of interaction between man and nature. Livestock breeding is developing in both biological and social

contexts. In the course of satisfying his needs through activity, a person acts as a self—developing being, whose main indicator and criterion is the development of the personality, and therefore spiritual development. Hence, the process of interaction between man and nature in the form of animal breeding determines the emergence of a special spirituality. It is carried by a person (worker) employed in animal breeding. He can be a livestock technician, a zoo engineer, a family farmer engaged in a personal (subsidiary) farm, a shepherd, a cattle breeder, a sheep breeder, a groom, a poultry breeder, etc.

The theoretical and methodological basis of this work was formed by the following principles and approaches: principles of objectivity, concreteness of truth, consistency and comprehensive approach and activity approach. In the paper we also used empirical material from such branches of knowledge as veterinary medicine and animal science, biology, ecology, geography, agronomy, economic history, psychology, pedagogy, sociology, folkloristics, literature, religion, ethnography, information from periodicals.

Factors of cultural significance of animal science

Features of cultural significance of animal science are determined by the conditions of the external environment. Since these conditions influence the direction, the depth of cultural significance of animal science we call them an active force — a factor. These forces are: 1) a natural factor influencing the structure (elements and connections) and the limits of cultural significance. This factor has been developing over a long period of time [we refer to Braudel (1986)], who points to it in relation to culture]. Whatever adjustment to reality takes place the named factor contributes to the preservation of the core, the stability of cultural significance; 2) factors related to society. According to Braudel (1992), over time they change the characteristics of cultural significance. It follows from the above that the features of cultural significance of animal science have a spatial and temporal structure. These factors influence the formation and development of cultural significance of animal science through the subjectivity of a person, in which his conscious, spiritual and creative principle is important.

The interaction of society and nature occurs at two levels. At one level of interaction of society with the natural—geographical environment (the concepts of ‘nature’, ‘natural—geographical environment’, ‘geographical environment’ are interrelated, but not identical), a person uses means in his activities — soil, fields, gardens, reservoirs, various animals (including working, beef and dairy cattle). They are included in society as means of production. The geographic environment is a complex of different—quality phenomena of the Earth mantle (relief, nature and productivity of soil, water resources, climate, diversity of flora and fauna, etc.). These phenomena are the most important components of social means of production (‘humanized nature’) and a condition for the existence and development of society. Another level is the interaction of society with nature external to it. In various subsystems of nature [biosphere, hydrosphere, atmosphere (earth), lithosphere] society draws materials and energy for its development. The laws of external nature affect the elements of the means of production and the laws associated with them. The specific features of the development of many social phenomena are also associated with the laws of external nature. Rhythm of the change of day and night, seasons, distribution of geoclimatic zones have a direct impact on the cyclicity of work in agriculture. Also the natural basis for the division of labor is associated with the variety of properties of nature — hunting, agriculture, cattle breeding, fishing, etc. The importance of taking into account the natural factor as an integral condition of human life and society (obtaining livelihoods) determines the peculiarities of practical interaction with it. This means that a specific system of nature is included in the internal organization of society and is present in various social manifestations – material production, household, cognitive, moral, aesthetic, etc. In the process of mastering the local space of nature, where the livestock breeder lives, a specific perception of this space is formed in him. Emotions, soul, thought, saturated with this natural environment, completely permeate his life. Consequently, under the influence of the natural environment as the context of the life process, a person (livestock breeder, farmer) organizes his rural life.

The factors associated with society include: 1) technical and technological processes, 2) the impact of the state and power, 3) the socio—cultural situation. The development of the first factor is due to new requirements for the work of a livestock breeder. The role of knowledge in the context of the growing importance of animal breeding is under the powerful influence of technical evolution. The role of the state and local authorities is important for the approval of workers in the livestock sector as subjects of their own activities, inclinations and efforts, various applications, and self—realization. The features of practical life, directly related to economics, have an impact on the nature of the thinking and feeling characteristic of livestock breeders. The components of the sociocultural situation are religion and related traditions, the secularized direction of consciousness of members of society, as well as global problems.

Natural and social factors (external) influence the formation and development of cultural significance of animal science not mechanically, but through the subjectivity of the animal breeder's personality. On the one hand, it requires constant changes in the level of his personal development (internal condition). Personal development indicators can be personal skills, accumulated experience, creativity, innovation and the ability to cooperate, responsiveness to new social requirements and expectations regarding agriculture and food, the desire to leave their mark on the profession. On the other hand, cultural significance of animal science is not possible without taking into account and using the objective products of the human spirit (external conditions). These include large systems of ideas — knowledge, morality and ethics, beauty and

good. They are transpersonal, reproduce and are outside the personality, but are inextricably linked with the existence of man and humanity. Their role in the cultural significance of animal science is due to the measure of its importance for practical application.

Forms of cultural significance of animal science

We believe that it is possible to find out the forms of cultural significance of animal science and their analysis based on solving the problem: what is there in animal science that can serve as an orientation of the system of consciousness of a person employed in the field, his inner spiritual world towards harmonious relations of subjective (human) and objective (external) — farm animals. According to Dahl (2004), ‘an animal... everything that lives and breathes, every living being, every individual gifted with life, that is, the ability to assimilate food, free movement and feelings ...’ According to N.F. Reimers (1988), “animals - the kingdom (*italics ed. - R.M., V.S., A.T., N.S., O.F., V.S., E.A., M.Ch., E.B., M.P.*) of living organisms: a group of heterotrophic (*italics ed. -R.M., V.S., A.T., N.S., O.F., V.S., EA, M.Ch., E.B., M.P.*) creatures, as a rule, capable of active movement and eating organic matter in the form of large or small large particles ... ”

Reimers (1988) writes that the term heterotroph (gr. heteros — other, gr. tropho — food, nutrition) means ‘an organism that uses for nutrition only or mainly (for forms with mixed nutrition) organic substances produced by other species, and, as a rule, is unable to synthesize substances of their body from inorganic substances’. All animals, including agricultural ones, are heterotrophs. Farm animals are bred through selection, that is, the selection of the desired qualities and characteristics of representatives of the wild, once captured and tamed by man. These animals are kept in specialized non—residential premises (livestock building, barn, stable, farm, cowshed, pigsty, farmyard, poultry house, apiary, etc.).

It is known that the object of study of animal science is farm animals (the concept of livestock is also widespread — ‘the general name of domestic animals’ [Dahl (2004)]) as a means of obtaining benefits for humans. Since the category of benefit fixes the result of a practical attitude to reality, for an animal breeder in his practically oriented activity this result is the possibility of obtaining funds to meet human life needs (eat, drink, dress, have a home, etc.) through the animal's body. Consequently, an agricultural animal is an object, the organism of which is associated with the production of means—objects (our term – *R.M., V.S., A.T., N.S., O.F., V.S., E.A., M.Ch., E.B., M.P.*) of consumption: 1) food products (meat, milk, animal fats — butter, lard, egg, honey, etc.); 2) raw materials for industry (wool, fur, leather, sheepskin, hair, bristles, feathers, down, etc.); 3) organic fertilizers (manure, poultry droppings); 4) use of animal power (horses, deer, donkeys, yaks, etc.) as an addition to mechanical means for agricultural and transport work.

A farm animal, being for a person a means of satisfying his needs, is not a goal in itself. The latter exists ‘for its own sake’ (Aristotle calls it ‘entelechy’), and not in something external. The named needs act as a special means of the subject as an internal regulator of his activity and determine the activity of a person to interact with farm animals. The process of interaction assumes the need to subordinate the breeder to the natural principle. This is evidenced by the fact that his way of life, work rhythms organically fit into the cycle of natural elements. Understanding the value of human interaction with farm animals due to natural necessity presupposes the importance of developing socially acceptable behavior of a person (society) in relation to them.

Hence, a comprehensive approach to the problem of the relationship between man and farm animals implies considering them (farm animals) not only as an economic, but also as a spiritual category. Varro (1937) writes: ‘the ancients had cattle in ... great honor’. ‘When the city was founded, a bull and a cow outline the places where the walls and gates should be’, ‘we have many generic names given by the names of large and small livestock’. It is not only about the consumption of products of farm animals, using them as material goods, but also about a certain, more stable spiritual life of the individual in the family, in society. The possession of domestic animals on the farm (in the literature, the concept of ‘domestic animals’ associated with keeping them for human consumption is identified with the concept of ‘farm animals’ or called domestic farm animals) contributes to the moral attitude of the owner — livestock breeder towards himself, towards his loved ones. It can be reflected in maintaining a sense of personal dignity and self—esteem in him. Prosperity (according to Varro (1937), ‘the foundation of every state is cattle’) can contribute to the provision of healthy food, clothing in the required quantity and quality, decent housing, and ultimately the maintenance and preservation of health. The moral and aesthetic attitude of a person to himself is evidenced by the fact that he understands: the perception of him by those around him largely depends on his ability to be a master.

Being a master presupposes knowledge of agricultural (household) animals and animal breeding as a branch of agriculture. Animal science received the name ‘zootchnics’ [(the term ‘zootchnics’ — translated from Greek means technique, skill, art of working with animals — was introduced into literature in 1848 by J. Bodemann). Varro writes about the peculiarities of the science of animal breeding, turning his attention to the daily work of a shepherd. He tracks ‘what the shepherds are worth’ in terms of their skills, ability to protect the herd, the health of the cattle in it. Let us cite Varro's statements about shepherds and the importance of cattle, cattle breeding in antiquity: ‘in antiquity, the most significant people were shepherds’, the fine is paid by oxen and sheep.’

The structured nature of animal science is reflected in its branches. According to Kulikov (2001) they are: 1) general zootechnics. Within its framework, the principles and methods of zootechnical work are being developed; they are common to all species of animals — animal feeding, animal breeding, zoo hygiene; 2) private zootechnics. It is focused on the development of issues of technology and breed composition of individual animal species. These issues are related to cattle breeding, sheep breeding, pig breeding, poultry breeding, horse breeding, rabbit breeding, beekeeping, fish breeding, etc. The development of animal science and, on its basis, animal breeding testifies to the important role of other sciences that are of basic importance for it. Thus, animal breeding is based on biological processes. Based on biological sciences, one can objectively judge the great variability of organisms. To take into account what is happening objectively means according to the order of things. In the context of the above, we share the point of view of the authors (Kulikov et al.) who do not accept the position of underestimating a specialist in animal breeding (zooengineering), giving preference to a veterinarian. We are also talking about agricultural machines, construction, economics, etc. The modern stage in the development of animal breeding against the background of aggravating global problems has demanded the importance of social sciences and humanities.

Modern zootechnics is focused on development not only under the influence of other sciences. It also develops under the influence of practice, thereby contributing to the further development of other sciences. Thus, as Yanlong Xue (2019) writes, the analysis of the polluting effect of aquaculture on the ecological environment, on human health, the development of measures to overcome it, prevention, control cannot be imagined without zootechnical knowledge. This knowledge is also valuable for the development of organic farming.

The owner's attitude to farm animals takes the breeder beyond the bounds of exact science. The relationship between the breeder and animals is a kind of complex game of the essential forces of man and nature. In a certain reality of communication with animals, a person launches 'tricks' invented by him (according to Hegel). He 'plays' consciously with the available possibilities. But this 'game' does not exist outside of freedom — it presupposes feelings ("levels of fuzzy thinking" when different degrees of "fuzziness" of images arise [Tsaplin (2012)]), mental life. Uncertainty, risk accompany a person under different circumstances. This is related to the demand for a complex set of mental efforts in the process of daily work, which animal breeder is busy with day after day. Mental efforts include will and mind: increased sensitivity, intelligence, imagination, foresight, intuition (Tsaplin's (2012) "levels of fuzzy thinking"), great patience, creativity, creative attitude to change. Productivity of the livestock breeder requires the need to master the entire complex of knowledge, to apply it creatively. The livestock breeder acts as a subject of creative activity. This means that the impulses of creative activity reflect the intentionality of his consciousness, human subjectivity. The attitude of a livestock breeder to his work appears as a creative process, when he is inclined to imagination, invention, the intensity of will and mind, the will to perfection, joy or grief, etc.

The efficiency of the livestock breeder's labor - the production of vital means for satisfying human needs through the animal's organism - is impossible without taking into account the importance of his attitude to the problem of satisfying the needs of the animal. In his work Tetior (2016) writes "Almost all the life and evolution of animals is determined by the satisfaction, first of all, of the most pressing biological and a number of other needs". In relation to animals, a livestock breeder needs to adapt to natural and social conditions in order to achieve economic and other goals in practice. This art can be twofold: 1) adaptation of animals to the environment; 2) adaptation of the environment to animals.

The first includes domestication, selection of wild animals and their transformation into domestic (farm) animals, selection of these animals that took place at the junction of human societies and their environment. The problem of the origin of domestic animals is studied by many sciences, but the main one among them is animal science. The reflection of the subject of animal science is the knowledge of the origin and transformation of each type of domestic animal separately, as well as the history of animal breeding as a whole. In the literature [Darwin (1859, 1867), Trapezov (2013)], the concepts of tamed, domesticated and farm animals are distinguished. Without going into details, we note that the process of taming is considered a mandatory stage of domestication. Domestication became possible as a result of the transition from the stage of unconscious selection (as we see, by "trial and error") of wild animals to the stage of purposeful, regulated selection for domestication behavior [Trapezov (2013)]. The foregoing leads us to the conclusion that domestication should be considered as a stage in the development of knowledge of nature and human thinking. Ch. Darwin, who considered domestication rather as artificial selection (here a person sets a goal) than natural [Trapezov (2013)], points to the criteria for recognizing domesticated animals: an increase in reproduction rates, a change in the proportions of organs and body parts, the development of a complex form of behavior, unquestioning obedience to man and service to him (for example, dogs that were the first of the animals to be tamed by man can graze herds, guarding and protecting them; they can hunt, track, guard). It is believed that the above criteria are applicable to animals on modern livestock farms or in a personal backyard. According to DeMello(2021), 'Domestication refers to keeping animals in captivity, selectively breeding them for human purposes and controlling their feeding, reproduction and other aspects of life, thus creating dependence on humans for survival'.

For animal science (as well as for science in general), important questions are, first, why man domesticated a small, limited number of animals; secondly, why were there high rates of change in domestic animals, where did the unimaginable

number of their breeds come from [Trapezov (2013)]. In an attempt to answer the questions posed, we draw our attention, on the one hand, to the object - to the animals bred as a result of domestication. As Shcheglov and Baryukov write in their book (2011), not all types of animals are subject to domestication. It is subject only to those who have the corresponding higher type of nervous activity, plasticity and adaptability to environmental conditions, the ability to fulfill the economic purpose required of them by a person - the hunting instinct, the ability to produce products, the ability to reproduce in captivity. It is also important to take into account the common differences that all domestic animals have (in comparison with wild ancestors and relatives) - a change in temperament or disposition in cases where they allow a person to interfere even in such an intimate side of their biology as reproduction; increased productivity or any other enhanced economic quality, a variety of variability of qualitative and quantitative traits. In some species of domestic animals, the herd reflex is largely lost, the seasonality of the reproductive function is smoothed, and the body's resistance to diseases is reduced [ibid.]. On the other hand we draw attention on the subject of domestication. In reality, the subject determines the object of selection for domestication. In domesticating animals, man took risks while at the same time convincing himself of the possibility of resorting to a reliable, predictable source of more varied food. At the same time, the source was under man's control. The source provided him with previously unknown opportunities, and in return demanded from him only the application of his forces. In the ongoing scientific research on the problem of domestication of great interest is the study of its origin, as well its continuous process; its consequences for humanity in the present and in the future. According to Vigne (2015), numerous gaps in understanding the origins of domestication cover the problems of causal factors, as well as a variety of strategies developed by societies of the past. In the context of these problems, it is appropriate to note the characterization of domestication by Trapezov (2013) as "the earliest intellectual achievement of mankind" or an approach (in social and cultural anthropology) to domestication "along an intellectual trajectory" [Cassidy(2020)]. In other words, the intellectual character and therefore the intellectual value of domestication is emphasized. By and large, domestication means the ability of a person to live "using" nature" and assimilating it into "culture" [Ellen and Fukui (2021)].

In order to adapt the surrounding anthropogenic environment to animals, man develops in himself the ability of a certain way of activity in relation to nature. These abilities are formed by his spiritual world under the influence of the "spirit of the area" - specific local natural and climatic conditions, methods of management practiced in the area. Through his labor, the livestock breeder consciously affects the natural environment changing the rural landscape. The result is a variety of farm buildings (covered or uncovered yards for livestock) in rural areas, artificial ponds, forest plantations, road and bridge construction, various devices and mechanisms, etc. (at the same time, a person can use them for various economic and cultural purposes). In the process of communicating with nature (farm animals), during a long stay in a certain place, a livestock breeder develops devotion to the place, a stable consciousness and a spirit of rootedness. The result of this consciousness is the desire to preserve the rural way of life. The adaptation of the environment to farm animals is associated with scientific and technological progress in animal breeding. It leads to the appearance of new machines, new methods of solving production problems, and to a new understanding of animal breeding. The selection of the technical and technological component of production is based on the criterion of its adaptation to the living conditions of farm animals. This leads to the creation of humanistically and ecologically oriented agricultural machinery. Under the new conditions, machine technology, on the one hand, requires a narrow specialization (differentiation of knowledge) from a person, and on the other, the expansion of knowledge. Both sides are associated with the creation of conditions for raising the level of education of the livestock breeder, ultimately - the diversified development of personal qualities.

Thus, the forms of cultural significance of animal science for humans, for society are: 1) participation of animal science in the creation of means to meet human needs through the body of the animal. Associated with this is the formation of conditions for maintaining a certain level of satisfying human cultural existence; 2) the formation and development of animal breeding through the domestication of animals as a result of common sense and as a continuous process, which testifies to its intellectual significance. The development of animal breeding was put on a scientific basis; 3) cultural and civilized arrangement of the environment and formation of animal breeder's feeling and image of "their place".

Results and Discussion

It has been established that the attitude of a person to farm animals as an attitude to living things should be considered as a specific attitude. On the one hand, it is due to a person's attitude to them as an object to meet their various material and spiritual needs and interests. On the other hand, it is caused by the peculiarities of the attitude towards them as a specific subject. They, as Singer (2002) emphasizes, as well as human beings, can feel pain ('biological value'), various forms of suffering (from pain, from fear, etc.), thus they need protection from suffering, favorable life, humane attitude.

Let's consider each side separately as a certain worldview position. On the issue of attitudes towards animals as a specific object, researchers' opinions basically coincide (their analysis was carried out in the article by M.D. Kovyreva and V.D. Chernyaeva (2020) and others.) R. Descartes (1989) considers animals as machines without mind. They lack language, general intelligence. E. Thomas (2020) suggests that these statements by Descartes seem to be compatible with the point of view of those who recognize the mind in animals. According to Thomas, a philosopher uses introspection (by analogy) to show that certain types of human behavior are dependent on automatic bodily processes. According to Descartes, as

Thomas notes, the behavior of animals is similar only to the automatic behavior of humans. Thus, on the basis of analogy, the behavior of animals appears to be automatic, and it does not depend on thought. Hence the animals must be regarded as machines. It becomes clear that the object here is an animal — an ‘automata’. Hence, Descartes's statements lead us to the idea that ‘an animal as a machine’ is a specific object. According to I. Kant (1963), the meaning of animals is determined by the ultimate goal, which is man. They are not conscious. Animals deserve protection only in order not to kill in a person sympathy for other people's suffering, for other people. For this reason, in order not to harm humanity, Kant does not justify human cruelty to animals. The philosopher does not consider the reasons associated with animals.

The point of view on the problem of treating animals as an object is known in our time. Describing the attitude towards them as a tool (for example, when using them in experiments of various levels), the experimenters [according to Singer's book (2002)] themselves admit that they ‘made animals suffer greatly before death’; they made no attempt to alleviate their suffering — radiation or poison was slowly killing them [here we refer to the practice of experimenting on animals (dogs, pigs) in the USA — by the Lovelas Foundation in New Mexico, Rochester Medical University, American Food and Drug Administration; at the request of the US Animal Welfare Committee since 1970, the country's Department of Agriculture has been publishing a bulletin with information on the number of animals that are used in various experiments]. Consistent with what has been said, let us give an example of experience when a living organism is perceived as an object and is considered as an instrument. Varro writes about it: ‘One incident, although incredible, should be captured in memory. One stallion could not be forced to cover his mother; the groom wrapped his head around his head and made him unite with his mother; when he untied the one who had jumped down, the stallion rushed at him and bit to death’. The emotional element of the stallion's behavior in the form of fear, anger, anxiety can be explained as follows. The image of a mother providing him with food through a nipple is for him a nurse and a protector, who is nearby, taking care of him. Such an image is captured by a stallion from birth — already in the first days of his life (this image is still associated with the same). As a result of the violence shown by man to the animal, it was made to violate this habitual image. The foregoing allows us to conclude that the attitude towards animals on the part of a person (society) must undergo profound changes. We agree with researchers who recognize the need to treat them as a specific object.

But on the problem of treating them as a specific subject, real and potential contradictions are shown.

In search of evidence for recognizing farm animals as specific subjects, we must turn to modern research. Relying on empirical research based on observations, a number of modern scientists including Sinha (2016) have come to the conclusion that the gestures of monkeys express their intentions. This is a specific language; they are able to indicate objects or events in their environment using shouts and gestures. Other researchers also point to this specific animal language. The paper by Tetior (2016) says that the expression of the intentions of animals in the animal kingdom in order to survive are such characteristics as loud cries, growls, hiss; demonstration of fangs, teeth; lifting wool; the special buzzing of bees and the sounds they make. The researchers came to the conclusion that animals in one way or another - through emotions, cries, gestures, postures of suffering or threats - react to certain situations in the environment that are relevant to them [(we considered it possible to give examples for the reason that both animals in the animal kingdom and farm animals have a "limit of sensitivity" (the term we borrowed from P. Singer)], the absence of language does not mean the lack of the ability to suffer (or frighten).

From what has been said, there follows the problem of the need to determine the boundaries of permissible handling of a specific object — farm animals in particular. For the sake of fairness, we note that here subjective relation to them should be considered permissible. We search for the realization of the idea of a subjective attitude to this specific object in the context of taking into account the peculiarities of the practical (and derived from it cognitive) human activity in various concrete historical conditions.

1) In the context of the above, we are interested in the position of Chesnov (2013), who believes that the attitude towards the animal during the genesis of culture among certain peoples allowed for subjectivity. In this regard, the author provides several evidence. First. We are talking about the Khanty attitude to the killed bear, which the author calls ‘strange’: ‘They treat its skin with the deepest reverence, seeing it as an ethnic ancestor. And the meat inside is only meat, and you can safely eat it. It turns out that if the skin is a status ritual part of the carcass, then the inner part (meat) is an object of food resource’. At the same time, the author tries to present the situation in a different way: if both parts are connected, then the whole beast will acquire its sacredness. In this case, as we understand it, it cannot be said that the inner part — meat — should be considered separately from the skin and admit the possibility of its use as food. Second. Chesnov describes a conversation with a French scientist who was studying Greenlandic Eskimos. He asked him a question: ‘These people, from infancy, eat killed animals (seals, walruses). It can be assumed that they have no sense of compassion. Is it so?’ The guest from France answered the question, referring to the answers of other people, when he himself asked them a similar question: ‘God probably created them so that we would not die of hunger.’ These words, heard from other people, contain ontological compassion for a person. It can be concluded that in the human sense, even in situations of balancing on the brink of life and death, ethical issues come to the fore. Third. Chesnov emphasizes two important features that unite the Evenks (the people of Siberia) with the Australian aborigines: 1) cariativity (compassion). The author writes: ‘... cariativity was a vector of bioethics’; 2) ‘deep conformity to nature’ (conformity to nature as a reconciliation of human potential with

the basic properties of natural resources, while the person himself is a part of nature) of their cultures. According to the author, we are talking not only and not just about ecophilicity, but about the value of both natural resources and human potential. For comparison: the Chukchi (since the 14th century their society began to specialize in military affairs) are wasteful of life — their own and that of others, people, animals (they have long lost a herd of wild deer, etc.). Thus, we share the point of view of Chesnov, when he connects the process of cultural genesis with different foundations of society, where in the context of the research topic we are mainly interested in bioethical foundations.

2) Questions of the culture of animal husbandry were reflected in the works of Varro, the agronomic writer of ancient Italy. He wrote about the need to take care of animals so that they do not get sick and the expected benefits could be obtained from them. He noted that lambs should be "pampered with good food and taken care that they do not suffer from the cold and heat" [Varro (1937)]; "The food that they (the sheep) willingly eat, for example, fig leaves, chaff, grape pomace, bran, is given to them in moderation so that they do not remain hungry and do not overeat. Both disturb the nutrition of the body ..." [Varro (1937)]. Varro instructs to protect the animal in case of suffering from too much work - to pour water over it, to support its strength with food; throw something over the animal so that it can keep warm; give warm water for drinking, etc. As you can see, the writer is concerned about the problems of animal suffering from diseases. The issue of animal health is considered by him as "a complex and necessary issue" [Varro (1937)]. The main reason why "sick cattle" appears to be a disaster is that "the owner often suffers great losses" [Varro (1937)]. In the thinker's reasoning, the problem of animal suffering is focused on a direct connection with human needs. The objective relationship to the animal by Varro is built in a simplified form: "the owner suffers losses" means a one-sided direct economic interest of man in the animal. We are talking about the absolutization of subjectivity (human) to the detriment of objectivity (the interests of the animal). Recognizing the merits of the ancient writer in the formation and development of animal science, we draw attention to the fact that at that time he did not know the idea of the suffering of farm animals during their slaughter and killing.

3) In pre-revolutionary Russia (under the conditions of extensive livestock farming), the peasant knowledge "about cattle" with an orientation toward a humane (moral) attitude as a reflection of an attempt at a subject attitude towards animals was confirmed in practice in the private households of the population, landlord households. Engelhardt (1987), in his letters from the village, described a case that reflects the attitude towards animals as a specific subject in his household. He wrote about his recognition of the knowledge of the "old woman" (a peasant woman who helped him run the household). In his opinion, she always fiddles with the cattle, is compassionate to the extreme in her love for the cattle, feeds and drinks them all day long; he does the same with his piglets; knows every duck and chicken by sight. With a loving attitude to animals, the "old woman" has accumulated knowledge about them, knowing their nature to the finest detail. This was expressed in the ability to "excellently" treat animals. "The cattle will get sick - now it is to the "old woman". She does not use any medication; heals livestock with clean air, sunlight, suitable food, soft bedding, careful grooming, affection. The "old woman" "studies the individuality of each cattle and, accordingly, puts it in one or another hygienic condition, feeds it with this or that feed".

4) Let's consider the analysis of the experience of animal breeding in the daily life of the Kurgan population (their everyday life was close in relation to rural life, life rhythm) and of the surrounding villages in the 1920s in the conditions of the emergence of a new social reality in Russia [(the analysis was made by Kladova (2015) based on the materials of the newspaper 'Krasny Kurgan' for the period 1920 — 1930)]. The newspaper published materials on agriculture related to the issues of feeding, breeding, and treatment of farm animals. The goal was to educate the population employed in animal breeding, as well as specialists in veterinary medicine, animal science remote from the district center (for them this knowledge served as additional information). It seems to us that here we are talking about the cultural and civilizational significance of propaganda and attempts to introduce scientific knowledge into the consciousness of the population engaged in animal breeding. Despite these efforts on the part of the authorities, during the period under review, illiterate peasants in their minds and in practice continued to focus on traditional methods of keeping (as well as treating) animals. According to Herder (1959), 'the farther peoples are from an artificial, learned way of thinking, an artificial, learned language and bookishness, the less their thoughts are suitable for paper', for understanding the text written on paper. Kladova gives examples, when local veterinarians criticized the well-known practices of keeping and self-treating animals; they also paid attention to the harm caused to livestock by horsemen and healers through various beliefs (relics of a bygone era). It turned out to be a difficult task to weaken, undermine their authority. For instance, in case of eye disease, the owners threw tobacco or salt into the horse's eyes; mastitis in cows was treated independently with various poultices or a compress, tying a hot brick to the udder. Veterinarians knew that animal diseases depend on the conditions of their care. We are talking about feeding animals, 'the old fashioned way', with straw or, at best, with hay; about keeping animals ('most of the owners keep their cattle in a non-insulated stable in winter' or 'just under a shed'). It seems to us that the newspaper rarely published articles where the attitude towards farm animals can be characterized as subjective. Nevertheless, sometimes they were published. This is indicated by the following instruction: 'During the milking itself, no work in the yard should have taken place, so as not to disturb the animal.... Treat the cow affectionately'. It should be noted that cattle (including cow — 'the nurse of the family') and horses were of a certain value and therefore aroused the greatest interest among the population. The cow was not only a means-object of material consumption (as food, etc.), but also spiritually significant: it was given to the best worker of the Kurgan machine-building plant (in 1935). But cows were given for the same purpose for it to be the nurse. Keeping a cow on the farm made sense, it was associated with the

ability to be at a certain level of material wealth — life insurance for a peasant family. Thus, in the period under review, the attitude of a livestock breeder to farm animals, in our opinion, can be characterized as a form of torn human spirituality: on the one hand, the absolutization of subjectivity to the detriment of objectivity; on the other hand, the attitude towards the object is partially compassionate (without taking into account the idea of compassion for animals when they are slaughtered, killed).

5) In the context of the concepts of a specific object and a specific subject, further we are interested in the peculiarities of the attitude towards animals in the conditions of industrial animal breeding. We consider this problem on the basis of the experiences of Russia in the Soviet period in the mid—1970s [here we rely on the study by Borodai (1988)], as well as the United States and other countries under current conditions. At the same time, our task does not include assessing what is happening in a particular country. It is important for us to trace the problem at the initial stage and at the stage of intensive large—scale transition to industrial animal breeding. In Russia in order to raise (dairy) livestock concrete ‘industrial complexes’ were built with the mechanization of feeding, milking, and manure removal. However, observations have shown that in a concrete environment (where there is not enough space for normal behavior), keeping animals for more than seven months negatively affected them. So, the productivity of cows sharply deteriorated, and often they, in their mass, did not live up to biological maturity. At the same time, the problem of manure deficit has become more complicated, which means a chronic shortage of organic fertilizers. Caring for the welfare of living organisms — soil, plants, animals, did not seem to be a significant problem. The main question was: ‘Why is there not enough milk?’ The answer seemed simplistic and unambiguous: it is necessary to find the ‘correct’ engineering solution. Its essence was to provide farms and complexes with new equipment (milking installations, etc. to ensure high—quality milking of cows). It was obvious that the technocratic approach to living nature gave rise to an alienated, soulless attitude towards it. This approach contradicted with the centuries proven folk wisdom: ‘An evil hostess’s kind cow will not give much milk.’

The problems of the transition to intensive animal breeding in the USA (starting from the middle of the twentieth century), in other countries and the consequences associated with it are actively discussed in modern foreign literature [Kraham (2017), Qian et al. (2018)]. On the one hand, they deal with the problems of increasing livestock production in order to meet the demand of the growing world population and its food preferences. On the other hand, they discuss the problems of implementation of industrial methods of animal husbandry in "farms-factories" (Singer) [(they are called the operation of "concentrated feeding" of animals due to the high density of livestock, creating cramped animals; livestock is constantly in a closed room without sunlight, which was the result of the use of vitamin additives; the production of offspring became possible all year round [Kraham (2017)]] Among the negative consequences of the impact of industrial animal husbandry on its ecological component, researchers pay attention to the problems of air pollution, water (in rivers, lakes, oceans), soil, climate change, and a reduction in biodiversity. The reasons that cause them are also named. For example, animal waste from intensive operations is thrown into agricultural land and on a larger scale than the earth can absorb. Soils are fertilized without measure. When wastes are decomposed dust particles, bacteria, volatile organic compounds, hydrogen sulfide, ammonia and other odorous substances are thrown into the air. Manure often contains many problematic substances (high levels of nitrogen and phosphorus; endocrine disruptors that can interfere with the transmission of hormonal signals in animals and humans), etc. [Kraham].

Thus, based on the analysis of the experience of the development of industrial animal breeding in different countries of the world, we came to the conclusion that it never did without environmental costs. Both in Russia, and in the USA and other countries, the principle of ‘not so strong, but sufficient’ (in moderation) impact was not observed and could not be observed in relation to the environment. In an integral system of relations man (society) — nature, the latter was considered as external (object). In essence, it is, according to Scruton (2006), “about the crisis of animal husbandry” within the framework of the industrial model of its development. The foregoing allows us to conclude that the attitude towards farm animals on the part of a person (society) should undergo profound changes. The criterion for these changes should be a humanitarian reassessment of the relationship between man and farm animals. The understanding that these animals are a necessary component, an accomplice of the existence of man and society, a condition for their existence should prevail.

If the expression "crisis of animal husbandry" is translated into the language of philosophy, then it can be interpreted, correlating with the concept of danger. According to dialectics, where there is danger, there are opportunities for solving the problem. And this requires a new level of understanding. The foregoing allows us to conclude that the attitude towards farm animals on the part of a person (society) should undergo further changes.

In this regard, in the context of the ongoing changes in industrial animal husbandry in the modern world, let us consider the problem: what are the current Russian realities in the system of human interactions with farm animals in terms of their well-being? Here we will rely on the research of A.A. Ksenofontova, A.A. Ivanov, O. A. Zudkova, O.A. Voinova, D.A. Ksenofontov (2020). The material for the study, as the authors themselves write, was collected at an enterprise that is a typical representative of modern industrial animal husbandry - at the dairy complex of the Voronezh region, designed for loose housing of 1112 Holstein cows. The average period of use of animals is indicated - 2-3 lactations. The object of the study is represented by 160 animals of the main herd. In accordance with the methodology [to assess animal welfare, the

authors used the Welfare Quality method, which was developed at the Wageningen University and Research Center in the Netherlands (Wageningen Universiteit en Researchcentrum)], a sample of 60 animals was made from these animals.

First of all, let us note that nowadays at livestock enterprises, which represent the most important branch of the agro-industrial sector of Russia, noticeable changes are taking place: mechanization and automation, as well as a general intensification of production; constant selection work in order to increase the productivity of animals. As a result, modern industrial animal husbandry, as the authors of the study point out, cannot even be compared with what it was 10-20 years ago, and also has almost nothing in common with the personal subsidiary plots of the population. It is fair to say (and we share the position of the authors of the paper) that at this enterprise, the main zootechnical indicators (especially feeding, keeping and health of livestock) are focused on creating appropriate conditions for realizing the genetic potential of animals, and with it on achieving the required level of well-being. Taking these indicators into account, it seems realistic to fulfill the task - to achieve the level of productivity of farm animals, and therefore, their economic efficiency. It is important for us to track: how the named zootechnical indicators, being related to human activity (subjective), are aimed at creating certain conditions for achieving the required level of animal welfare (objective), and as a result - the possibility of realizing their genetic potential. It is clear that here at the same time there are opportunities for a breakthrough to achieve the level of animal productivity, to improve the quality of livestock products, and to achieve economic efficiency of production. Summarizing the above, let us ask ourselves the question: how do the features of the relationship between a person (subject) and industrially grown farm animals (object) in the context of animal welfare principles reflect the ethics of livestock production? We will look for answers to this question, taking into account the following provisions (named in the mentioned article as tasks): 1) assessment of the usefulness of animal feeding, 2) assessment of the conditions of keeping cattle, 3) the state of health of the livestock, 4) assessment of the mental and emotional state of animals, 5) a comprehensive assessment of the level of well-being of the dairy cattle.

The conclusions of the authors of the paper, in accordance with the formulated provisions, are as follows. 1. One of the criteria of the "feeding" principle of well-being is "the absence of prolonged hunger". The study identified 25 percent of cows with a low degree of nutrition (15 individuals out of 60 animals). This was estimated at 26 points (hereinafter, according to other criteria, the maximum score was 100). This indicates that the rights of animals to freedom from hunger and thirst are violated in this enterprise, and this affects their health. The consequence is a decrease in productivity. 2. Implementation of the criterion "freedom of movement" at the enterprise is based on a loose way of keeping animals (in itself, this method is considered the optimal condition), when they are all year round in a room divided into sections. But in contrast to the loose method of keeping animals in the natural environment, in the premises of the barn, the named method is accompanied by conditions of a covered metal floor, an excess of the density of livestock in the sections. Such a picture indicates a lack of space and associated discomfort. The attention of the authors of the study was also attracted by the injury of animals due to the lack of space for comfortable rest, systematic blows against the stall equipment (out of 60 cows, 45 heads were seen with serious damage to the skin; the absence of lameness in animals was estimated at 26 points). This practice of keeping animals cannot be considered ethical. Under such conditions, cows do not have the opportunity to exhibit their characteristic species-typical behavior associated with grazing (it is possible only in natural conditions). This is reflected in the physical and emotional well-being of animals when they are deprived of their natural behavior. As you can see, in industrial conditions, the possibility of providing animals with sufficient living space and a place for rest is curtailed. This leads to a decrease in the time of lying (rest), hence an increase in the level of aggressiveness, an increase in the proportion of atypical behavior of animals. 3. According to the criterion of "absence of diseases" in animals, the attention of researchers is drawn to the indicators of the presence and number of problem calving; mortality; various injuries limiting their movement; consequences of artificial synchronization of ovulation, etc. According to this criterion, 2 points were given. The analysis of the condition of the animals was also carried out according to the criterion "no pain from technological operations on the farm". This refers to the procedure for removing the tail with rubber rings (considered the most painful and inhuman), dehorning of animals. According to this criterion, a score of 3 points was given. 4. Implementation of the criterion "expression of socially oriented behavior" (here freedom from discomfort, from stress and freedom of natural behavior are taken into account) received a score of 4 points). This testifies to the fact that all the named freedoms at the enterprise are being violated. The natural typical behavior for cattle - to be and rest in the pasture (or walk) - cannot be realized, since the cows do not have the opportunity to leave the premises. According to this criterion, a score of 0 was given.

The study also examines the features of the relationship between humans and animals in the conditions of intensive work of livestock enterprises. It is noted that a person (subject) by his actions is primarily interested in obtaining the maximum amount of products (and by any means). Here, the significance of a humane attitude towards animals fades into the background (hence, we characterize the attitude of a person to an animal as objective). The result is a reduction in the number of years of an animal's life, which means the use of its economic potential. In the course of experiment, the attitude of the animal towards humans according to the criterion of "friendly attitude towards humans" was estimated at 25 points. The assessment of the criterion "positive emotional state" of animals (here attention was paid to such indicators of the emotional state of animals as activity, playfulness, being busy with something useful, friendliness, relaxation, fear, the presence of nervousness and irritability, suffering, etc.) was 0 points (it should be noted that on the part of the

experimenters maximum conditions were created to minimize the subjectivity of the assessment). As a result of the study, based on numerous experiments and calculations, at an enterprise recognized as of intensive industrial animal husbandry, the following points were given for 4 principles of animal welfare: "good feeding" - 21, "conditions of detention"- 30, "state of health" - 4, "behavior" - 3. For us the conclusion of the authors of the study is important, which, in our opinion, can serve to identify the trend of changes in the quality of life of animals in industrial animal husbandry. 1. The importance of optimal barn organization so that sufficient attention can be paid to each individual; creating environmental conditions that are favorable for the health and well-being of each individual cow and all together. 2. Creation of a complex algorithm of actions on the part of a person, in which it would be possible to take into account the "subtleties" of working with animals, hence form a totally responsible attitude towards animals, inhuman, but living as a human being.

The conclusions of Russian researchers on the problem under consideration echo those of scientists from other countries. Taking into account the topic of our research, we emphasize: in our opinion, the unifying line of consonance of the ideas of scientists from different countries is the idea of the need to form harmonious relations between the subjective (human) and objective (farm animals), which means their complementary coexistence.

We agree with the authors who associate such coexistence of man and farm animals with the development of organic animal husbandry. In organic farming, according to Padel, it is important to emphasize that it must meet the behavioral needs of specific animal species [Padel, 2019]. Organic animal husbandry implies, among other requirements, the observance of four essential principles in relation to animals: maintaining a high level of their health (the principle of health), integrating livestock with agricultural crops and reusing nutrients on the farm or in the region (the principle of ecology), respect animal rights (the principle of justice), responsibility for the humane treatment of animals by the people who work with them (the principle of care). Knowledge of animal behavior is important for safer and more efficient livestock management [Grandin, 2017]. In the processes of introducing and using new technologies, it is important to assess the atypical behavior of animals, hence the need to measure conditions that threaten the welfare of animals (lameness, heat stress, body condition, bruises during transportation) [Grandin, 2020]. These indicators (assessment, measurement) are important to ensure a good quality of life for animals kept in intensive rearing systems. Other authors [Pierce, 2019] draw their attention to the fact that over the past few decades, scientific knowledge about the cognitive, emotional abilities of animals has expanded; but they did not lead to an improvement in the treatment of captive animals. According to the author the science of animal welfare was adapted to industrial animal husbandry and was directed to a narrow field of this science. For the science of welfare, it is important to find out: what improves the life of animals, what do they want, how do they feel in captivity? But it turned out that science proclaimed the idea of improving the quality of life of animals, and in practice efforts were aimed at further strengthening and legitimizing the exploitation of animals in industrial animal husbandry ("human industry"). This attitude towards livestock contributes to the destabilization of the classic formulation of the rule of "five freedoms" (proclaimed by the Code of Recommendation), which are important for animal welfare science. It is these freedoms that are called upon to become a significant tool for the formation of adequate moral response to the suffering of animals imposed by people.

The problem of the importance of deep changes in relations between man and farm animals, as it becomes clear to us, must first of all be connected with the criterion that actualizes the idea of humanitarian reassessment of these relations. There should prevail the understanding that these animals are a necessary component, an accomplice of the existence of man and society, a condition for their existence. It is important to realize and understand that animals, once through domestication transformed from wild animals into agricultural, animals "for us", in the modern civilized world should exist "with us".

It becomes clear that in modern conditions from the zootechnician [american experts have calculated that the farmer, along with other professions, must also possess the profession of zootechnician [Petrenko et al. (1995)], it is required to take into account the specifics of his farm animals. Such logic is focused on help, support, empathy, care, trust, complicity, compassion, certain actions in the interests of another, responsibility towards him. The logic of influencing an animal as an object differs from the logic of interaction, which is characterized by coercion, submission, mastery, and control with "insensible indifference" [Simmel (2002)]. In terms of meaning, the significance of the logic of interaction with farm animals lies in the spiritual development of the person occupied by them. This is associated with the formation of harmonious relations between the subjective (human) and objective (farm animals) and therefore, their complementary existence.

In modern conditions, issues related to human interaction with farm animals require certain methods, forms and techniques of their perception, understanding. Here thinking does not simply reproduce, but is called upon to act in accordance with the meaning of the object. In the context of the above, we rely on the conclusions of G. Hosey and Melfi (2018): 'Anthropology, which studies human—animal interactions (HAI), has grown significantly over the past 20 years, has advanced further in its research. Now the time has come to synthesize them on the basis of empirical data that is known about the relationship between humans and animals (including farm animals). Based on these studies, the authors point out two important issues: providing animals with security and emotional support) are useful for a person — for his emotional balance (a kind of 'release' of accumulated tension), for health; hence, man can use farm animals for therapeutic purposes;

b) it is important to recognize that our interactions with farm animals also have consequences for them — the attainment of well-being that affects their quality of life. We share the authors' conclusions that the study of the problem of human interaction with farm animals is becoming significant in modern life.

Conclusion

Features of the cultural significance of animal breeding are set by the entire system of social relations. These features are: 1) the formation of conditions for maintaining a certain level of satisfying and cultural existence of a person on the basis of creating means to meet his needs through the body of farm animals; 2) the development of the human ability of animal husbandry to intellectual activity, to rational thinking, which led to the development of animal husbandry on a scientific basis; 3) the rooted consciousness of the livestock breeder, which forms in him a "sense of place", the image of "his place", recognizable by the identification of "his place" depending on the specifics of the surrounding natural habitat of certain species of farm animals. The above-mentioned features of the cultural significance of animal breeding are uniquely reflected in the relationship of man to farm animals, on the one hand, as a specific object and, on the other hand, as a specific subject at different stages of human development.

References

- Belyaev, D.V. and Ivonin, F.M. (1951), To improve breeding work in fur farms, Karakul breeding and animal husbandry, No5, 39-45.
- Berdyaev, N.A. (1990), The meaning of history, Mysl, 175. [online] [date of reference 26.03.2021], available at: http://www.odinblago.ru/smisl_istorii
- Borodai, Yu. M. (1988), Specificity of agricultural labor as a philosophical problem, Man and Earth, Agropromizdat, 16-36.
- Braudel, F. (1986), The Structures of Everyday Life: Possible and Impossible, Material Civilization, Economics and Capitalism, XV-XVIII centuries, 679.
- Braudel, F. (1992), The Structures of Everyday Life: Possible and Impossible, Material Civilization, Economics and Capitalism, XV-XVIII centuries, 679.
- Brief Philosophical Encyclopedia (1994) Progress, Moscow.
- Buller, H. and Roe, E., (2018) Food and animal welfare, Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Buller, H., Blokhuis, H., Jensen, P. and Keeling, L., (2018). Towards farm animal welfare and sustainability. *Animals*, 8(6), 81.
- Callanan, J.J. and Allais, L. eds., (2020). *Kant and Animals*. Oxford University Press.
- Chernyaeva, D.V. (2020) Ural Journal of Legal Research, 4, 110 - 122.
- Chesnov, Ya.V. (2013), Bioethics and Medicine as Factors of Cultural Genesis (In connection with the domestication of plants and animals), Bioethics and Humanitarian Expertise, 67-86. (Retrieved February 20, 2021), <https://iphras.ru/page27446721.htm>.
- *Code of Recommendations for the Welfare of Livestock: Cattle 2003 (England)* Available at: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69368/pb7949-cattle-code-030407.pdf (Accessed: 10 October 2021).
- Dahl, V. I. (2004), Explanatory dictionary of the living great Russian language: selected articles, OLMA-PRESS, 700.
- Darwin, C. Tamed animals and cultivated plants: Transl. and published by V.O. Kovalevsky / Ed. I.M. Sechenov, A. Ger.
- DeMello, M. (2021) The Domestication of Animals. In *Animals and Society* (pp. 102-116). Columbia University Press.
- Descartes, R. (1989) Discourse on the method. Works in 2 volumes, Mysl.
- Ellen, R. and Fukui, K. eds. (2021) *Redefining nature: ecology, culture and domestication*. Routledge.
- Engelhardt, A.N. (1987), From the Village: 12 Letters, 1882-1887, 637
- Freud, Z. (1989), Future of One Illusion, Twilight of the Gods, Politizdat, 95-128.
- Gallo, C., Tarumán, J. and Larrondo, C., (2018) Main factors affecting animal welfare and meat quality in lambs for slaughter in Chile. *Animals*, 8(10), 165.
- Grandin, T. (2017) Temple Grandin's Guide to Working with Farm Animals: Safe, Humane Livestock Handling Practices for the Small Farm, Storey Publishing, North Adams, MA, USA.
- Herder, I.G. (1959), Selected Works: State Publishing House of Fiction. Available at: https://platon.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/istorija_prosveshhenie/gerder_izbrannye_sochinenija/11-1-0-46211959. - 392.
- Hosey, G. and Melfi, V. eds., (2018) *Anthrozoology: Human—animal interactions in domesticated and wild animals*. Oxford University Press.
- Ivanov, A.A. (2007), Ethology with the basics of zoopsychology: Textbook, Lan.

- Kant, Immanuel (2021) Groundwork of the Metaphysic of Morals, part II (The Metaphysical Principles of the Doctrine of Virtue), paras 16 and 17 [Online], [Retrieved March 29, 2021] https://www.childhoodworld.org/Myaso/Prava_zhivotnyx_Wikipedia.pdf.
- Khairov, B.A. (2018), Neolithic Revolution: The History of Domestication of Certain Animal Species by the North Caucasian Tribes, *Bulletin of the V. Ch.E. Akhrieva*, 73-90.
- Kladova, K. Yu. (2015), Livestock in the daily life of the Kurgan people in the 1920s. (based on the materials of the newspaper "Krasny Kurgan") <http://avu.usaca.ru/ru/issues/72/articles/1775>.
- Kovyreva, M. D and Chernyaeva, D.V. (2020), On the question of the legal personality of animals No. 4, *Ural journal of Legal Research*. <https://doi.org/10.34076/2658-512x-2020-4-110-122>
- Kraham S.J. (2017) Environmental Impacts of Industrial Livestock Production. In: Steier G., Patel K. (eds) *International Farm Animal, Wildlife and Food Safety Law*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18002-1_1
- Ksenofontova, AA., Ivanov, AA., Zudkova, OA., Voinova, OA. and Ksenofontov, DA. (2020) 'The level of well-being as a marker of ethical attitude towards productive animals' *Izvestiya TSKHA*, 2. DOI 10. 26897 / 0021-342X-2020-2-99-115
- Kulikov, L.V. (2001), *History and methodology of animal science: textbook*, RUDN Publishing House, 146.
- Lerner, M. (1992), *Development of Civilization in America. The way of life and thought in the United States today: in 2 volumes, vol. 1.*, Raduga, 671.
- Losada—Espinosa, N., Miranda—De la Lama, G.C. and Estévez—Moreno, L.X., (2020) Stockpeople and Animal Welfare: Compatibilities, Contradictions, and Unresolved Ethical Dilemmas. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 33(1), 71—92.
- Maritain, J. (1994), *Philosopher in the World*, Graduate School, 192.
- Mikhailova, R.V. (2017), On the spirituality of the peasantry (theoretical and methodological aspect), *IU MGOU*, 274.
- Mota—Rojas, Daniel, Donald Maurice Broom, Agustín Orihuela, Antonio Velarde, Fabio Napolitano and María Alonso—Spilsbury. (2020) 'Effects of human—animal relationship on animal productivity and welfare'. *Journal of Animal Behaviour and Biometeorology*. Malque Publishing.
- Nordquist, R.E., Van der Staay, F.J., Van Eerdenburg, F.J., Velkers, F.C., Fijn, L. and Arndt, S.S., (2017) Mutilating procedures, management practices, and housing conditions that may affect the welfare of farm animals: implications for welfare research. *Animals*, 7(2), 12
- Padel, S. (2019) The principles of organic livestock farming, *Improving Organic Animal Farming*, Vaarst, M. and Roderick, S. (Eds). Burleigh Dodds Science Publication, Cambridge.
- Petrenko, I. Ya., Chuzhinov, P.I., Ismuratov, S.B. (1995), *Farm Economics*, Interprax, 328.
- Pierce, J. (2019) Putting the "Free" back in freedom: The failure and future of animal welfare science, *Why We Love and Exploit Animals: Bridging Insights from Academia and Advocacy*, Dhont, K. and Hodson, G. (Eds), Routledge, Oxfordshire, England, UK.
- Pirogov, A. I. and Privalov, I. Yu. (2014), 'Philosophy of management as a methodological basis of social management in an information society', *Economic and social-humanitarian research: scientific journal*, 108-117.
- Qian, Y., Song, K., Hu, T. and Ying, T. (2018) Environmental status of livestock and poultry sectors in China under current transformation stage. *Science of the Total Environment*, 622, 702-709. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.12.045>
- Reimers, N.F. (1988), *Basic Biological Concepts and Terms*, *Prosvescheniye*, 319.
- Saint-Exupery, A. de (1987), *Air Force Pilot*, *Pravda*, 253-357.
- Scruton, R. (2006) *Animal rights and wrongs*. A&C Black.
- Shcheglov, E.V. and Bardyukov, A.M. (2011) *History of zootechnics*, *KolosS*, 108.
- Simmel, G. (2002) *Big cities and spiritual life*, *Logos*.
- Singer, P. (2002), "Liberation of Animals", *Kiev Ecological and Cultural Center*. [Online], [Retrieved March 20, 2021], <https://booksonline.com.ua/view.php?Book=118570&page=2>
- Sinha, A. and Lysenko, V.G. (2016), Do Animals Have Consciousness? *Philosophy of Science and Technology*. [Online] [Retrieved November 9, .2020], file: [/// C: / Users /% D0% 9C% D0% B8% D1% 85% D0% B0% D0% B9% D0% BB% D0% BE% D0% B2% D0% B0 / Downloads / est-li-u-zhivotnyh-soznanie-intervyu.pdf](///C:/Users/%D0%9C%D0%B8%D1%85%D0%B0%D0%B9%D0%BB%D0%BE%D0%B2%D0%B0/Downloads/est-li-u-zhivotnyh-soznanie-intervyu.pdf), 66–77.
- Tetior, A.N. (2016). Ethological (animal) roots of terrorism, aggression. *East European Scientific Journal*, 8 (5), 79-87.
- Thomas, E. 2020. *Descartes on the Animal Within, and the Animals Without*. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*. 50(8), pp.999-1014, [Retrieved March 20, 2021], <https://doi.org/10.1017/can.2020.44>.
- Tikhomirova M.N. (2020) The Status of Livestock of the Inhabitants of the Villages of Seitovo and Timshinyakovo at the End of the 20th Century (Preliminary Results of Study). *Herald of Omsk University. Series "Historical Studies"*, 7(2), 129-139.
- Trapezov, O. V. (2013), Domestication as the Earliest Intellectual Achievement of Humanity, *Vavilov Journal of Genetics and Breeding*, 17 (4/2).

- Tsaplin, V.S. (2012) The principle and nature of rationality, Questions of philosophy, No12, 116-123.
- Varro, O. (1937), On agriculture, OGIZ — SELKHOZGIZ, 107 — 135.
- Vigne, J.D. (2015) Early domestication and farming: what should we know or do for a better understanding?. *Anthropozoologica*, 50(2), 123-150.
- Yanlong Xue. (2019) Intensive Livestock Breeding Waste Pollution and Its Application Value in Ecological Environment and Pollution Control Process, The Frontiers of Society, Science and Technology, Vol. 1 Issue 4, 188—195.
- Ze'ev Levy, Ze'ev (2021), Ethical issues of animal welfare in Jewish thought. [online] [date of reference 29.03.2021], available at: <https://archive.is/20120708140551/findarticles.com/p/article/>