



the **Brooks
Institute**

for animal rights law & policy INC.

**ANIMAL LEGAL AND
POLICY STUDIES SUMMIT**

May 10–May 12, 2019

THE STANFORD INN
Mendocino, CA

RAPPORTEUR’S REPORT

Prepared by:

Chris Green

Executive Director
Harvard Law School
Animal Law & Policy Program



the **Brooks
Institute**

for animal rights law & policy INC.

Table of Contents

I. Summit Participants	1
II. Introduction	3
III. Executive Summary	4
1. Blame, Responsibility, Causation, and Individualism	4
2. Carcerality and Imprisonment	5
3. Scholarly Critique of the Animal Protection Movement	6
4. Human Self-Interest	8
5. Interdisciplinary Collaboration / Social Change	8
6. Religion	9
7. Politics	10
8. An Ethical Framework for Animal Ethnography	10
9. Animal Law Pedagogy	11
10. Climate Change & Coalitions	11
11. Personhood	12
12. Animal Wellbeing	12
13. Humane Education & Children	13
14. Community Impact of Factory Farming	14
15. Consumption Patterns	14
16. Concluding Reflections	14

Views Expressed Disclaimer

The Brooks Institute is advancing animal welfare (inclusive of dignity, well-being, protection and other rights of consideration) through the collaboration of many, diverse, interdisciplinary, and intersectional subject matter experts. Other than a passion for advancing non-human animal welfare and a willingness to collaborate with mutual respect and congeniality, it is not expected for our collaborators to share the same or common world views, philosophies, theologies, or ethics. While all our studies are conducted through gold standard methodologies, they very well may have majority, minority, and even conflicting views in the search for better and best intelligence. Therefore, individual views and opinions expressed by the Brooks Institute, its employees, Scholars, Fellows, Advisors, and other collaborators must be viewed as being independent of one another and not as a reflection on another.

I. Summit Participants

1. Brooks Institute Scholars Committee

- Justin Marceau Professor of law at the University of Denver, Sturm College of Law
- Janice Nadler Research Professor at the American Bar Foundation
Professor at Northwestern University Pritzker School of Law
- Timothy Pachirat Associate Professor of Political Science at The University of Massachusetts, Amherst
- Kristen Stilt Professor and Deputy Dean, Harvard Law School
Affiliate Professor, Department of History, Harvard University
Faculty Director, Harvard Animal Law & Policy Program
- Philip Tedeschi Executive Director of the Institute for Human-Animal Connection
Professor, Graduate School of Social Work, University of Denver

2. Animal Legal and Policy Studies Summit Invitees

- Victoria Braithwaite Professor of Fisheries and Biology, Pennsylvania State University
(attending sessions remotely via teleconference)
- David Clough Professor of Theological Ethics, University of Chester
Founder and Co-Director, CreatureKind
- Alice Crary Professor of Philosophy, University of Oxford (during Summit)
University Distinguished Professor of Philosophy, New School for
Social Research (as of July 1, 2019)
- Maneesha Deckha Professor and Lansdowne Chair in Law, University of Victoria,
British Columbia
- Angela Fernandez Faculty of Law & Department of History, University of Toronto
- Lori Gruen William Griffin Professor of Philosophy and Coordinator of
Wesleyan Animal Studies at Wesleyan University in CT
- Dale Jamieson Professor of Environmental Studies and Philosophy;
Affiliated Professor of Law; Affiliated Professor of Medical Ethics,
School of Medicine; Associated Faculty, Center for Bioethics,
College of Global Public Health; Director, Center for Environmental
and Animal Protection; New York University

-
- Claire Kim Professor of Political Science and Asian American Studies, University of California, Irvine (invited but unable to attend)
 - Will Kymlicka Professor and Canada Research Chair in Political Philosophy, Queen's University
 - Doug Kysar Deputy Dean and Professor of Law at Yale University
Faculty Director, Yale Law, Ethics & Animals Program
 - Samuel Meyers Principal Research Scientist at the Harvard TH Chan School of Public Health
Director of the Planetary Health Alliance
 - Christine Parker Professor of Law, The University of Melbourne, Australia
Visiting Fellow, Harvard Animal Law & Policy Program
 - James Serpell Professor of Animal Ethics and Welfare, University of Pennsylvania

3. Brooks Institute Staff

- Timothy Midura President, Executive Director, General Counsel
- Sarah Muñoz Director of Administration, Project Manager
- Amanda Yancey Director of Systems, Project Manager

4. Summit Rapporteur

- Chris Green Executive Director, Harvard Animal Law & Policy Program

I. Introduction

In May 2019, the Brooks Institute convened and hosted the first “Animal Legal and Policy Studies Summit.” The three-day event brought together scholars and academics from a wide array of disciplines to Northern California to meet, describe their own research and backgrounds, and exchange ideas about the future of what are commonly referred to as the fields of “Animal Law” and “Animal Studies.” One driving motivator for assembling these academic leaders was to foster discussion that would identify key questions or areas of inquiry that could benefit from additional scholarly attention or data. The information generated and knowledge gained during the Summit ideally then would inform both the Brooks Institute and its Scholars Committee about where additional resources might best be applied or utilized.

While the “Animal Studies” label can be useful to frame or draw a circle around those thinking and writing about animal issues, it’s generalizing effect can risk masking the rich diversity of disciplines and scholarly traditions represented at the summit (law, philosophy, history, religion, ethics, social psychology, political science, environmental science, public health, and animal behavior). And although many scholars may fall under the rubric of Animal Studies, or even Animal Law, simply due to the subject matter of their work, those invited to participate in the Summit were academic professionals that not only study animal-related issues, but actively endeavor to improve the condition of nonhuman animals through that scholarship.

The conversations during the Animal Legal and Policy Studies Summit generated several fundamental themes and specific ideas among the participants. The format of the event consisted of two introductory sessions in which each of the participants spoke briefly about their own research; three sessions that each were hosted by a different smaller working group; and then a final, open-format session to help draw broader conclusions and ideas from the Summit. In advance of the meeting, each participant also submitted a one-page summary of their research interests. On the last day, everyone who attended was interviewed individually on camera by a member of the Scholars Committee who asked a series of questions about their work, issues facing the larger field, and their experience participating in the Summit. Those interviews all now have been edited and are hosted for public viewing on the Brooks Institute website.

II. Executive Summary

Many of the core themes that emerged during the Summit sessions are described below and identified by subject-matter headings.

1. Blame, Responsibility, Causation, and Individualism

One of the primary underlying themes that repeatedly came up during the Summit was the dichotomy between focusing on individuals as opposed to larger structures when it comes to blame, responsibility, and effectuating social change. The primary “negative” side of that type of focus is a reliance on punishing individual actors in order to discipline or deter the infliction of harm upon nonhuman animals. Such punishment obviously includes criminal prosecution and incarceration, but it also includes publicly exposing the identities and acts of those who have harmed animals—e.g. engaging in widespread viral shaming of individuals and entities via social media.

Jennifer Jacquet at NYU has written about how such shaming can be an effective populist tool to hold individuals accountable for harmful acts when circumstances prevent them from being criminally prosecuted. However, one of the Summit participants currently is exposing the more pernicious side of shaming through documenting the story of a factory farm worker who subsequently committed suicide after being shown harming animals in an undercover video released publicly by an animal protection group. That scholar’s goal is to openly examine society’s obsession with engaging in scapegoating and punishment—which are believed to be a means of simply avoiding discussions about collective complicity and responsibilities. Indeed, while the worker shown in the video faced incarceration for his conduct, the factory farm itself experienced no repercussions as a result of the organization’s investigation. The underlying thesis is that we either can base our societal approach on the idea that there are all these sadist workers running around looking for an opportunity to abuse animals, or we can take a step back and say, the entire structure makes these actions not only possible, but probable—just the same way that placing low-level U.S. soldiers in positions at Abu Ghraib led to photographs of Iraqi prisoners being sexually humiliated.

The inverse, or “positive” side of bounding responsibility to individual-level choices, as opposed to looking at the deeper structures, is the reliance on consumers to improve the conditions of animals simply by making the “right” choices in the marketplace. This critique is a core part of the scholarship of another participant, who posited that it is both unwise and unfair to put all of one’s faith or reliance in consumer choice—which itself can be easily co-opted and manipulated. That scholar believes one cannot expect fundamental social change to come from individual consumer choices that themselves

are confined within a neoliberal buffet of options, but instead one must challenge the very buffet itself, or at least the limited range of options that are being offered.

The group collectively agreed that it would be very beneficial to convene a larger summit or conference on “Blame, Responsibility, Causation, and Individualism.”

Stepping back slightly further, the group discussed the ways in which structural binaries can limit the way we’re able to think about certain issues and further foreclose our imaginative approaches to solving problems. Specifically to this point, framing questions in terms of “individual responsibility vs. structures” may only help propagate another problematic binary, and we may need to think more deeply about ways to avoid such issues being viewed overly simplistically as “either/or” dichotomies.

2. Carcerality and Imprisonment

Closely related to these notions of individual blame and responsibility, the group felt that one of the most ripe areas for critique is the prosecution-oriented, incarceration approach to Animal Law.

There is sentiment among some in the practicing field that nonhuman animals deserve our advocacy and legal protection because they all are “fundamentally innocent.” In contrast, any human who commits an act of harm is deemed “guilty” or “bad,” and therefore deserving of whatever punishment the legal system is able to mete out. One reason the animal protection movement has pushed for increased criminal punishment was that historically many incidents of cruelty or abuse were routinely ignored by prosecutors as insignificant and allowed to occur unchecked, even when in clear violation of the law. However, the issue becomes much more complicated in the context of industrialized animal agriculture where most of the discrete inflictions of pain or abuse come at the hands of low-level workers—who either are directed overtly by facility owners or managers to engage in such harmful conduct, or are situationally forced to do so simply as a result of the unreasonable demands of the work (line-speeds, quotas, etc.). And again, due to the nature of undercover investigations, it is those low-level workers, often themselves the victims of exploitation, who most frequently are captured in undercover footage and subsequently prosecuted.

The group highlighted the work of Donald Black regarding “high” and “low” status offenders and victims and discussed how that might inform a critique of this approach. More structurally, the group examined the limitations of the current criminal justice system which is built entirely on the notion of evaluating an individual defendant and deciding whether that individual had a particular cognitive mental state to then commit a particular physical act with their body. If they did, and weren’t forced to do so or

protecting their own life, they are deemed to be “guilty.” In this way factory farm workers are scapegoated within the context of a broader American criminal law that cannot recognize scapegoating for what it is—since the entire analysis is completely blind to any context outside of duress, self-defense, etc.

Following on the structural comparison with Abu Ghraib, members of the group said they would like to see a project or a conversation around “carceral workers” (police officers, corrections officers, animal factory workers), who operate in systems where they find themselves engaging in horrific acts. It may be that the causes of these acts are very similar because such workers are cast in roles that require them to cage or slaughter other living beings on a grand scale. Such research potentially might challenge the narrative of the lone “bad apple” frequently used to justify the punishment and incarceration of individual actors. And perhaps by identifying and exposing any commonalities among these situations, such research could help determine more accurately what actually is driving the abuse that occurs. To that point, it was underscored that one really important aspect in thinking about the question of carcerality is the captivity itself. It was then recommended that members of the group read Lori Gruen’s book, *The Ethics of Captivity*.

One potential result of future research or narratives around “individual responsibility vs. systems responsibility” in relation to cruelty could be to develop model legislation or other legal responses that courts could look to as best practices for disposition and intervention. This could counteract the traditional individual punitive practices that have come to predominate criminal justice responses to cruelty in the wake of the LINK being the dominant (even only) narrative in such venues.

3. Scholarly Critique of the Animal Protection Movement

The Summit participants discussed the value of critical discourse in providing a critique of the animal protection / animal rights movement itself. Most agreed that it would benefit the movement (and help animals) to take a close, clear-eyed look at current strategies and approaches to analyze what is or is not working. While the group members may have different opinions on which specific strategies would or wouldn’t work in particular contexts, or even what the most important critiques are, they all believed there is something to be gained by studying and critiquing current and historical approaches.

In terms of learning from other successful social interventions, one participant gave a detailed historical account of the various legal, social, political, and economic factors that drastically curtailed public smoking in the U.S. That illustration sparked much conversation about other similar examples that might be worthy of further study.

Another participant highlighted the importance of the way public attitudes shifted in the smoking example and suggested that there hasn't been any real rigorous or scholarly assessment of public attitudes towards animals since the 1970's. That scholar then suggested conducting an "animal census," or a census of national attitudes and behavior involving animals (and perhaps environmental issues as well). This not only could help with developing future strategy, but also could establish a baseline to evaluate the impact of various interventions over time.

Acknowledging the skepticism some have for traditional attitudinal surveys, one participant suggested taking a multi-disciplinary approach involving different people with different expertise to design and build the content of such a survey. Another participant then agreed it would be great to bring together a group of methodologists representing different ways of gauging a baseline and design something that would be unique not only in terms of its substance, but in terms of its approach. This combination of different methodologies then could be used to present a rich, complex, variegated picture that wouldn't be subject to some of the criticisms of traditional attitudinal surveying—although surveying still could be a component. Such a multi-faceted instrument then could be used to further determine how we change, or even mark political progress, regarding animal protection strategies, and more deeply inform both scholars and advocates about societal attitudes on the role of different animals.

Regarding those varying roles, one participant noted that some in the animal law realm seem to ascribe to the narrative that if we start by protecting pets, or if we incarcerate people for harming pets, or we place a value on pets through attitudinal studies, suddenly the general public will start caring about the condition of other categories of animals and their condition. Several participants believed it would be a fascinating and very relevant research question to accurately assess what happens when people associate with pets. Do they suddenly start to care about other nonhuman animals, issues of race and gender, or other injustices?

One participant made an observation about the great strides that resulted from the biomedical research community adopting the "Three R's" approach to "Replace, Reduce, and Refine" the use of animals in scientific experiments. First suggested in 1959, this concept took a while to gain traction, but now has been fully internalized and indeed made mandatory within the research industry and the entities that fund such work. It then was suggested that scholars in the field should try to envision an analogous concept that could be applied to food animal production. That might be a bit more difficult to get agricultural producers to adopt, given that the animals themselves are the commodity, rather than an intermediary vehicle to obtain results or information. But with the advent of plant and cell-based proteins, one could imagine institutions adopting some sort of

policies to reduce the amount of animal products used. Either way, the group deemed it to be an idea worthy of further study.

4. Human Self-Interest

One of the Summit's most interesting and engaging conversations centered around the role of human self-interest--critically examining the efficacy, ethics, and potential long-term consequences of framing animal protection arguments in ways that appeal to public self-interest.

Some posited that this simply is how law and policy works with regard to social change--that in order to achieve such shifts one takes the rhetoric of a moral appeal and then internalizes that moral appeal into a perception of self-interest on the part of the actors so they actually will move in a desired direction. But others highlighted the dangers of such an approach. For example, many of the punitive aspects of existing criminal animal protection laws were motivated by stoking fears of "The LINK"--a historical narrative which asserts that failing to harshly punish and deter animal cruelty inevitably will lead to humans being harmed or killed in the future. Many feel this LINK narrative directly led to many of the problems regarding human incarceration and the disproportionality of punishment for individuals who cause harm to animals while operating within larger structures that are fundamentally based on such abuse (factory farms, research labs).

Others expressed concern that couching animal welfare arguments in terms of human self-interest could lead to people caring about animal concerns only when they personally have something to benefit or lose. More specifically, some noted how this strategy could backfire in relation to the animal protection community spending its limited time and resources forming broader coalitions with environmental groups around climate change, only to have those coalitions abandon animals the moment that human self-interest and the interests of other animals diverge (biogas, etc.).

5. Interdisciplinary Collaboration / Social Change

The group acknowledged the need for more interdisciplinary collaboration especially as it pertains to what enables social change, or makes it possible. Some proposed bringing scholars and practitioners of social change theory and law together with members of the animal protection community to explore common ground and compare notes as to what has or has not worked in the respective areas.

One participant expressed interest in assembling an interdisciplinary collection of people to think seriously about alternatives to individual guilt, blame, responsibility, and causality, to more centralized notions like complicity and contribution. These

collaborators could include photographers, visual storytellers, poets, novelists, short story writers, but also philosophers, lawyers, and social scientists. Another participant seconded this idea, stating that developing innovative multidisciplinary and cross-cultural ways of thinking about our relationships is central to moving forward. Yet another added that support should be given to advocates working on animal rights within socially vulnerable communities to help build alliances with those broader communities.

In regard to this nexus with other social justice issues, commonly referred to as “interlocking oppressions” or “interconnected injustices,” one participant described how some in the past simplistically have viewed issues such as racism, sexism, and speciesism as similar tracks running in parallel—while eco-feminists and other critical race theorists have held that they are not just isolated tracks running in parallel, but rather interconnected taxonomies of power that are mutually reinforcing. Another participant also interjected about the invidious ways certain categories of humans historically have been animalized by dominant power structures (e.g. Jews, Africans, etc.) and thereby designated as being lower on the evolutionary ladder.

6. Religion

The Summit also yielded substantive discussions of the roles religion and history play in supporting or hindering the cause of animal welfare. There seemed to be consensus that significant opportunities exist within both Islam and Christianity to better the welfare of farmed animals and the manner in which they are raised, transported, and slaughtered.

One participant described a central theme in their own current research regarding the way followers of Islam essentially are absolved from any blame or guilt when consuming animal products that are produced in ways that violate several religious injunctions. Instead, the “sin” of those violations attaches only to the individuals performing the slaughter. This broad public absolution accordingly allows those violations to perpetuate unchecked—because if the products were to be declared haram, or impermissible, it effectively would shut down factory farming. This scholar was interested in getting feedback from the group regarding other examples where the mere possession or consumption of something in and of itself is not illegal, yet the process of production turns it into something that is illegal (blood diamonds, etc.). Others echoed that the absolution of purchasers from the sins of production was of fundamental interest and worth exploring further.

Another participant then noted that additional funding could help determine how academic research on religion and animals could be used to influence attitudes and practice within religious communities. More specifically, one idea was to have

curriculum design specialists work on developing educational interventions and teacher trainings that could be inserted into the UK's mandatory religious education in public schools. There also could be a great opportunity to develop the next generation of religious animal scholar activists by helping promising doctoral students focus their work on thinking about scholar activism within religious communities. The Animals and Religion Group at the American Academy of Religion is a locus of such like-minded scholars. There also has been work in both the U.K. and U.S. convening Christian church leaders to draw the connection between Christian ethics and farmed animal welfare and more support would be helpful to scope how to expand that work with organizational partners.

7. Politics

One participant offered the suggestion of raising the profile of animals within the field of Political Science—observing that there is literally nothing written about how the animal question is debated within political parties or how they such parties their positions around animal issues. It then was pointed out that the “Dutch Party for the Animals” has a constituent demographic that is not necessarily what one might assume, actually skewing older and more conservative. Another participant added that the same is true for the U.S. prison reform movement where both traditionally far-Left and far-Right organizations are both working together to transform prisons.

In response, one participant said it would be great to see a conference that takes the idea of animal membership in the polity seriously, but from various political theory traditions—i.e. not just the democratic liberal tradition, but from an anarchist tradition, a feminist tradition, an indigenous tradition. It would be beneficial to help that conversation flourish beyond just the question of whether animals should be members or not, and explore what kinds of alternative policies we actually could imagine.

8. An Ethical Framework for Animal Ethnography

One of the more practical ideas that resonated with many of the Summit participants related to the lack of an existing ethical framework to guide those who seek to do ethnographic work with animals as ethically as possible (social scientists, philosophers, etc.). It was suggested that just among the individuals attending the Summit there already was enough existing knowledge and training to create such a set of ethical tools, and that doing so would benefit the broader field of Animal Studies significantly.

Several participants underscored a drastic need for exactly such a framework, given that many graduate students currently are “making up the ethical guidelines as they go

along.” Others cautioned that even after these types of guidelines are developed, often the issue then becomes one of having them gain traction or acceptance. Some accordingly suggested that the Brooks Institute would be perfectly positioned not only to support the creation of this set of ethical commitments, but subsequently to make them a requirement for any future research it decides to underwrite. The NIH was mentioned as an example of how funding entities can be in the best position to drive ethical innovation on how research gets done. Many then agreed that the Brooks Institute could play a significant leadership role in this “really hot area” by providing a model for others to follow.

Some took the idea a step further and suggested that the Brooks Institute actually could host multi-method training for scholars and students interested in doing research that takes animals seriously as interlocutors. This too would be something “utterly unique” to the Brooks Institute and also function to circulate faculty and graduate students through the Institute as a gateway to such work.

9. Animal Law Pedagogy

Similarly, with respect to teaching in the legal realm, one participant recommended convening a workshop on Animal Law pedagogy to collaborate on shaping the intellectual contours of what academic faculty deem to be the core Animal Law training they believe students should receive. Many of the Animal Law scholars present agreed this would be very useful and beneficial to the field. As one part of developing such pedagogy it further was suggested to create an “Animal Law Stories” volume as part of West Publishing’s “Stories” series. Another participant added that there may be value in developing a different type of Animal Law casebook that is more interdisciplinary and not just a survey of cases in a traditional sense.

10. Climate Change & Coalitions

Some participants felt that by not drawing strong distinctions between the moral consideration of human and other species of nonhuman animals the potential mass deaths of animals due to climate change effectively could be framed as the most extraordinary genocide in the history of the planet. One way to accomplish this would be to expand the concept of animals needing protection to all animals, not just domesticated ones. It further was suggested that there would be great value in bringing the planetary health and animal welfare communities together to explore common ground through workshops, conferences, and the like. A few themes the group thought would be particularly relevant for such discussions were:

- Human Exceptionalism (that it’s not okay to treat animals as objects).

-
- Meat Reduction (both in terms of climate impact and crowding out other species and habitat).
 - Applying the Ethics of Care on a global, ecological, or even spiritual level.
 - Impact of biodiversity loss / animal extinctions on human well-being.

Some added that important research could be done to demonstrate the societal cost of the damage to living systems through the impacts it has on public health, public psychological and mental health, child development, child psychological health, etc.

11. Personhood

Several participants voiced critiques of recent attempts to win legal personhood for particular species or categories of animals with some noting that personhood can reinforce existing notions of power and exclusion. One participant suggested an approach that might be more focused on relationality and vulnerability, while another pointed out how sentience and having a conscious interest seem to have gotten lost in all the focus on legal personhood. In response, one scholar mentioned how their current research is very much focused around thinking about frameworks or approaches to exploring ideas associated with sentience, and what kind of guidelines could be used to help society decide which animals we want to take into consideration. It then was mentioned that one irony of focusing on autonomy and independence from a planetary health perspective is that we're all fundamentally entangled and thus no living beings really have complete autonomy or independence.

With regard to existing attempts to win legal personhood for captive animals, one participant reminded the group that even if such lawsuits eventually are successful in the courtroom the animals will not be granted any sort of "freedom" per se, but instead simply will be transferred from one captive setting to another (such as a sanctuary). And while it is important to recognize sanctuary work as valuable, wonderful, interesting, imaginative, and generative, it still is a form of captivity for those animals.

12. Animal Wellbeing

Summit participants brought up the point that while so much of the animal welfare focus is on pain, suffering, and distress, very little attention is paid to animals' wellbeing—what makes them happy, what gives them pleasure, how they want to live their lives, what kinds of environments are ones in which they flourish. Not that suffering isn't vastly important and needs to be alleviated as urgently as we can, but that such an exclusive focus can lead to a flattened or one-sided view of animality. These issues are even starting to be talked about in the animal welfare science community. Some agreed that the animal rights movement has been extremely good at documenting

all the bad things we do to animals and pointing out what's wrong in our relationships with animals, but has not spent much time on what relations with animals *should* look like or what kinds of relationships with animals are desirable and legitimate.

From a strategic point of view, some participants believe that while many people become motivated by suffering and injustice, others need to be encouraged by a more positive image of what a better future with animals might look like. Accordingly, the animal rights movement should focus on finding out how animals actually *want* to relate to us, and asking what kinds of relationships domesticated animals want to have with us. Answering those questions then could lead to developing a legal framework that would enable animals to have those types of relationships with us.

Others pointed out that might not be so easy to aggregate and generalize, and that doing so could occlude the individuality and variety of preferences among animals even of the same species. It was posed that a great many animal welfare scientists are working on more basic questions of what certain animals prefer with regard to environments, etc. While many agreed that much of that animal science work is important, they would like to explore more fundamentally whether there are entirely different ways of living with animals.

13. Humane Education & Children

One participant suggested several areas of potential further inquiry related to what is collectively referred to as “humane education.” These included:

- a) How do humans as children learn to empathize with animals? Is it the same way that they learn to empathize with other humans? When do anthropocentric and gendered cultural teachings start eroding this empathy in Western societies? By what age are children the most amenable to learning about why it is wrong to exploit animals?
- b) What education models/modules/strategies have proven effective in teaching children about social justice? How essential has reaching out early to children been in effecting transformative social change?
- c) How are youths/teenagers influenced? What are the most effective stimulants/agents of behavioral and attitudinal change? How influential are codes of masculinity at this stage and how can the influence of these codes be diluted (consider campaigns to teach about violence against women as possible point of comparison)?

Another participant followed up with a question about whether anyone has studied how children go from reading books about animals to eating them? It then was pointed out

that Denver University is considering doing a literature review on this topic and already has a program called Raising Compassionate Children, which is a professional development certificate program for teachers, educators, and parents.

14. Community Impact of Factory Farming

One question raised during the Summit was, how do the people who live immediately adjacent to CAFOs experience their living environment? What are their first-hand accounts of being in such close proximity? The group discussed the work of Amy Fitzgerald on crime rates in slaughterhouse communities and the Sinclair effect, but noted the need for more empirical work. Others added that the personal stories of people living in CAFO communities are having a substantial impact in the successful North Carolina lawsuits against hog farms and the nuisance/pollution they produce.

15. Consumption Patterns

It was suggested that while we know a lot about meat consumption patterns around the world we know less about *why* those norms are that way. With so much marketing by meat producing nations into other regions that historically have not eaten much meat, the group felt that figuring out the “why” would be extremely helpful. One participant mentioned a current project of theirs that is looking at meat and dairy consumption in China. That research is determining that while there isn’t a preexisting cultural preference for beef and dairy consumption in China, the U.S. is working hard to develop it as an export market for those products. There thus could be an opportunity to prevent the creation of modernist food preferences in such places, as opposed to combating 5,000 years of tradition trying to change existing preferences in meat eating countries.

16. Concluding Reflections

The Animal Legal and Policy Studies Summit was a unique, first of its kind, event that successfully achieved the aspirational goals of the Brooks Institute and its Scholars Committee. The conversations over the course of the three days of charitable sequestration in Northern California generated much to ponder among the participants and hosts. Equally as important to the ideas engendered were the relationship-building and sense of fellowship and that occurred. The Summit provided the perfect, neutral, and relaxed environment to foster exactly that type of interchange. And while many of the participants knew several of the other attendees, no one individual previously had met everyone else before. Accordingly, each participant benefitted from connecting face-to-face for the first time with several other like-minded scholars. It is hard to overstate the value (and rarity) of that—along with all the resultant exchange of knowledge and sparking of ideas for potential cross-disciplinary collaboration.

Views Expressed Disclaimer

The Brooks Institute is advancing animal welfare (inclusive of dignity, well-being, protection and other rights of consideration) through the collaboration of many, diverse, interdisciplinary, and intersectional subject matter experts. Other than a passion for advancing non-human animal welfare and a willingness to collaborate with mutual respect and congeniality, it is not expected for our collaborators to share the same or common world views, philosophies, theologies, or ethics. While all our studies are conducted through gold standard methodologies, they very well may have majority, minority, and even conflicting views in the search for better and best intelligence. Therefore, individual views and opinions expressed by the Brooks Institute, its employees, Scholars, Fellows, Advisors, and other collaborators must be viewed as being independent of one another and not as a reflection on another.