

PRESS RELEASE

For free use. Vienna, [insert date].

Fourteen independent lines of evidence, one finding: new transdisciplinary study on industrial animal production published

Vienna — Independent researcher Thomas Schüller (Syntagma Forschung, Vienna) has published an extensive transdisciplinary reappraisal of industrial animal production under the title *“Animal, Human, Industry”*. The work appears bilingually (German/English) under the open CC BY 4.0 licence on Zenodo — together with all source files, verification records and machine-readable claim data.

The methodological core: consilience

What is unusual about the work is not a single discovery but its construction. Fourteen methodologically **independent** layers — from biochemistry through epidemiology, ecology, behavioural biology, ethics and law to political economy — are worked through separately and only brought together at the end. They converge on the same diagnosis.

“When bodies of evidence that owe each other nothing methodologically arrive at the same point, the result is more robust than any single study,” says the author. This principle — *consilience* — comes from the philosophy of science and is used explicitly in the work as a test criterion.

Selected findings

- **Land and yield:** About 83 percent of the world’s farmland goes to animal products, which supply roughly 18 percent of calories (Poore & Nemecek 2018, *Science*).
- **Feed instead of food:** 36 percent of the calories from the world’s crops go into the feed trough; only about 12 percent of those return as human food (Cassidy et al. 2013).
- **Hidden costs:** The societal health costs of red and processed meat for 2020 are estimated at around USD 285 billion — costs that do not appear on the shelf price (Springmann et al. 2018, *PLOS ONE*).
- **Ethical convergence:** Six mutually incompatible schools of moral philosophy — from Singer’s utilitarianism to Nussbaum’s capabilities approach — reach the same practical conclusion.

What the work explicitly does *not* claim

The study makes its limits explicit. It targets **industrial** animal production in societies with real freedom of choice — and expressly **not** subsistence husbandry, indigenous food sovereignty, or people in poverty contexts. “Food sovereignty is itself a claim of justice. An animal ethics that overrides it becomes unjust in turn,” the ethics volume states. The obvious economic lever — a meat tax — is likewise not recommended without pointing to its **social regressivity**.

The author’s own worldview (marxist-materialist) is disclosed openly and methodologically controlled through a documented self-audit procedure, rather than concealed.

Verification and openness

All core sources were **independently verified twice**: via web search and additionally against the PubMed database of the US National Library of Medicine (26 biomedical sources, all confirmed with a PubMed ID). Errors found — including one incorrect journal attribution and one

unverifiable author attribution — were corrected, and the corrections **documented within the work** rather than quietly removed. A machine-readable claim dataset (22 definitions, 50 claims, 40 bridges) is included.

The work is independent and privately funded: no institutional affiliation, no third-party funding, no industry cooperation.

Scope

Main work (14 layers), seven sub-papers, nine bilingual deep-dives (including biochemistry/medicine, ecology, digestion and comparative animal digestion, alternative technologies, animal ethics, food politics, law, global food security, health economics), a pamphlet, a source-criticism annex, and infographics. Complete edition: 141 pages (DE) and 122 pages (EN).

Contact: Thomas Schüller · Syntagma Forschung, Vienna forschung@tschueller.com · ORCID 0009-0003-9799-6747

Licence: CC BY 4.0 — text, graphics and data may be freely reused with attribution. **DOI:** [insert after Zenodo upload]

Track: FORSCHUNG · ORCID 0009-0003-9799-6747 · forschung@tschueller.com · CC BY 4.0