

I'm going to present an argument by analogy for this claim:

(M) You shouldn't purchase meat from factory farms if you can afford a healthy diet without doing so.

Consider this scenario:

Suppose there were a society in which the majority of people wore clothing made from the skins and other body parts of slaughtered dogs. Suppose, in order to produce such clothing, the dogs had to be bred, kept in extremely cramped conditions, and subjected to painful procedures—for instance, ripping out their teeth and slicing off their paws with a hot knife, all without any form of anesthesia. Doing this is the only way to prevent them from biting and scratching each other while they're confined.

Suppose, further, that there's a source of clothing in this society that does not involve this process or any similar one. Some people in this society are allergic to this alternative, non-dog clothing, but most people aren't.

So, here's the argument:

(M1) You shouldn't purchase the dog clothing if you can afford non-allergenic clothing without doing so.

(M2) If so, then you shouldn't purchase meat from factory farms if you can afford a healthy diet without doing so.

(M3) So, you shouldn't purchase meat from factory farms if you can afford a healthy diet without doing so.

I expect most people to agree with M1.

I don't have time here to defend M2 (the analogy), so let's have that discussion in the comments.

References

Alastair Norcross – "Puppies, Pigs, and People: Eating Meat and Marginal Cases"