WHAT WILL HAVE THE GREATEST IMPACT FOR ANIMAL PROTECTION?
VOICEOVER:
In February 2020, the Brooks Institute hosted approximately 80 of the most influential actors in the animal protection community to discuss the current state of the animal protection movement. Some of these congress delegates volunteer to respond to big questions. Here are their responses to the question, “What will have the greatest impact for animal protection?”

CAMILLE LABCHUK (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at ANIMAL JUSTICE):
Well, I would say that we need to level the playing field. The interests on the one side of the equation are the industries that profit and make billions and billions of dollars from using animals. They’re able to reinvest a large portion of those profits into lobbying for laws that minimize the interest of animals and marginalize those of us who want to see greater protections. On the other side of the equation, you’ve got passionate, well-meaning animal advocates like those here this weekend, and like those working around the world to effect change, who are operating with such a disparity of resources. So, there's no large industries that are funding this movement, it tends to be driven by compassionate individuals who donate and that leave bequests and legacies behind to make sure that those things can happen. The power disparity right now, is something that needs to be overcome if we're ever going to get meaningful laws and policies enacted, or at least at a bare minimum, to enact our existing societal standards into law.

ANGELA FERNANDEZ (PROFESSOR OF LAW at UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO):
I think it’s also very important to think about the lobbying that Camille’s referring to and how to tame, curb, or try to control it to some extent because it is such a corrupting influence. We have a great example in Canada with our most recent Food Guide; where we have got a very health-friendly, animal-friendly, environment-friendly guide because the political process was restricted to evidence-based online submissions that did not allow for special meetings or special lobbying from industry. We think that’s a very promising example of how you can level the playing field in this way that is so necessary, because of disparity of resources and also because of societal consensus kind of not really quite being there yet. Something like the Food Guide, that’s meant to lead people and help people see - okay, this is a healthier option, this is more of an animal-friendly option, that's really important too. It's really hard to get there when you’ve got those disparities.

SEAN BUTLER (FELLOW, ST. EDMUND’S COLLEGE, UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE):
I think the greatest impact is going to come from a change of awareness. I know that education and information is by no means a sufficient basis for change but it is necessary. Interestingly enough, I suspect the solution may come from a completely different place. It may come from technology like cell-based meat. It could come from environmental concerns. I think all those will roll in together. I think it was J.S. Mill, who said that one of the problems with thinking about the beliefs of our predecessors, our parents, our grandparents, it's not that they held those beliefs, but the greatest problem for us is imagining how they could possibly have believed those things. I think huge transformation is quite possible.
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MANEESHA DECKHA (PROFESSOR & LANSDOWNE CHAIR IN LAW at UNIVERSITY OF VICTORIA):
I think what will have the greatest impact for animal protection change is to concentrate our efforts less on changing the views of adults, which are already formed, especially around agriculture and aquaculture. So much of what we eat relates to ideas of family, culture, childhood, and one’s sense of belonging in the world. So I really feel strongly that the greatest impact would be to reach human beings in their childhood, through elementary and middle school years, by integrating a pathway in a systematic way years before these ideas take hold so they can say “This is a new vision of the world. This is not acceptable and here’s why.”

I think we have an untapped resource in kids. We don’t pay them a lot of attention in society in general and we don’t treat them with respect in that they can hold views and take them forward. If we change that mindset, it relates to how we look at animals. They’re both kind of “othered” in this way. I really do think that there’s a chance for transformative potential in 15 or 20 years.

LEAH GARCES (PRESIDENT at MERCY FOR ANIMALS):
Globally right now there are 80 billion farmed animals that are raised and slaughtered every year. They’re kept in horrible conditions. They’re crammed in cages, and crates, and warehouses, never to see the light of day until they go off to their horrible slaughter. That’s not just a problem for those farmed animals. It’s a huge problem for our planet as well. 1/3 of our arable land is being used to feed farmed animals that are kept in these conditions instead of ourselves directly. And not only that, when you look at all the greenhouse gas emissions that are coming from animal agriculture, it makes up more than all of the planes, trains, and automobiles put together. We also have all this ecologically important habitat that’s being cut down just to feed and house these farmed animals.

In my lifetime, the number of birds, amphibians, mammals, and reptiles have been cut in half because of this destruction of the environment. And it’s largely to do with our consumption patterns around meat, dairy, and eggs. The worst part of that is with human population growth set to go to ten billion by 2050, the United Nations is predicting that we’ll go from 80 billion farmed animals to about 140. So almost double. The impact is mind-boggling. It’s totally mind-boggling. We should have this feeling that this is an urgent problem. It should be like alarm bells going off. But right now it is only philanthropic dollars going to this cause.

There’s $427 billion going to philanthropic work in the United States. Of that, only three percent are going to environment where animals are within that. Animals make up a fraction of that three percent, and farmed animals make up less than one percent of that. So while this should be like alarm bells going off, we don’t have the sense of urgency that we really need. Everyone should be stopping what they’re doing and focusing on this because it really is an existential crisis for not just our planet but for our species.

MARTIN ROWE (PRESIDENT at LANTERN PUBLISHING & MEDIA; CO-VICE PRESIDENT at CULTURE & ANIMALS FOUNDATION):
When it comes to questions of what might have the greatest impact for animal protection, for me, there are many different ways to make change, as you know and see that I work for three different organizations. If I had one commonality that I most passionately believe in, it’s about
stories and narratives that allow us to change. And different factors in society and different individuals in society will require different stories in order to allow them to change.

So while I think cultivated meat and plant-based meat offers an opportunity to destabilize the market, for me, what's most interesting is how farmers, ranches, fisherman, and others will see themselves as stewards of the environment and protectors of the natural world. Through this transition, they transform their identities and their self notions of what it is they are doing and how they have value in the world before change is forced upon them by the climate crisis.

We need to create stories that allow people to change and become something different while retaining their individual sense of who they are and how they bring value and worth to the world. That is the fundamental thing. It's the stories that we can create and tell ourselves about how to transition our economy away from something that is simply not going to be able to exist in its current form within the next 10 to 15 years.

AARON GROSS (FOUNDER and CHIEF EXECUTIVE OFFICER at FARM FORWARD):
I think the greatest impact for changing things for animals is if we can change the default in the way we eat. I see this as kind of an interesting mean between pushing towards an all vegan future, which might be desirable for many of us but is very counter cultural. What we've found is the idea that we could switch our default from the standard American diet to something that is primarily plant-based and just asking for less meat or better meat. This is a place people are ready to go now. Knowing that when they need to or when they want to, they have the choice to do other things. But if we can change what's considered the normal meal, get that to be plant-based so when I order a burger, unless I specify otherwise, it's a plant-based burger. This strikes me as the sort of change we can affect in institutions at a very large scale.

The other thing about changing the defaults, in addition to it having this kind of perfect mean between not pushing too hard and not pushing enough, is that it's both material and has to do with ideas. When you change the default in a large institution, you are changing things very significantly in terms of numbers of animals used. But you're also inviting people to think about things differently. Whereas if I just say less meat, even if we go along with it, it's not necessarily changing the ideas about what it means to have a meal. But if we can change the default, we really can effect a social transformation. Changing the default around food is also a great place to do coalitional work. By changing the default of what we eat to be more plant-based, we're automatically in alliance with folks who are working on climate change.

With care, we can really be an alliance with people working on anti-racism and social justice efforts. We can really push towards a new way of eating, which is a vision that can really inspire people. It's a vision that goes a lot further than just less meat, but it's still a realizable vision.

JOYCE TISCHLER (PROFESSOR of PRACTICE, ANIMAL LAW; CENTER for ANIMAL STUDIES at LEWIS & CLARK LAW SCHOOL):
As an attorney, my reason for getting into the animal movement, the animal rights, animal protection movement 40 years ago, was to bring lawyers to the table for animals. I felt that lawyers who are in a position of power in our society should be at this table representing the interests of animals.
That's what I've devoted my career to, is creating a movement that is now called Animal Law and building an agency that could do that work. I’m the founder of the Animal Legal Defense Fund, and I worked for 40 years to create a playing field where people would come to. Today we have a movement in which there are thousands of attorneys who are devoting time, whether it be pro bono time on the side of their jobs, or full-time working for agencies such as mine, Center for Animal Law Studies, or Humane Society of the US, or some other agency.

These lawyers have been able to bring cases that have changed the way that animals are treated. They've been able to work for laws that create greater protections. It's one part of the movement. It's not the whole movement, but it's a significant part of the animal protection and the animal rights movement.

**SUE LEARY (PRESIDENT at AMERICAN ANTI-VIVISECTION SOCIETY)**
In my experience, one of the things that I think is most important to have an impact is engagement - engagement with opponents and engagement with a broad and diverse group of people that we can bring into the movement. When I was in certain science conferences, I remember realizing that the bio engineering field is a great example of this because that's where a lot of the real growth and science came from, by bringing together the biology and the engineering fields. We've seen some of the greatest micro physiological systems and organ on a chip system come out of that biologically inspired engineering. So I think that cross disciplinary engagement is really key to moving things forward.

**JEFF SEBO (DIRECTOR of the ANIMAL STUDIES M.A. PROGRAM at NEW YORK UNIVERSITY):**
I think that no particular thing is going to, by itself, have the greatest impact for animal protection change. I think that in order to create the change that we want to see, we need a broad pluralistic movement that involves lots of people taking different and seemingly conflicting approaches. We need moderate advocacy. We need radical activism. We need people pursuing social change, institutional change, political change, and technological change all at the same time and people working on those issues from within academia, advocacy, and from a policy perspective. If we can build that kind of pluralistic movement with that many different actors, doing all of those different types of things, then those activities will work together in order to help us make progress on these issues, but none of those things in isolation is going to have the same kind of impact.

**RACHEL MCCRYSTAL (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at WOODSTOCK SANCTUARY):**
Because I work at a sanctuary, I see every day the impact when a human actually gets to meet one of these beings that we call a farmed animal and gets to know them as an individual. At Woodstock Sanctuary we have about 10,000 visitors a year. That means that that's 10,000 people actually meeting a turkey for the first time or meeting a pig outside of a petting zoo or some terrible environment.

The change that happens and the powerful transformative impact that those relationships can have on humans and the animals is really incredible. I think when people can actually meet a 900-pound pig, who would've been killed at six months and is now ten years old and living out
her golden years at a sanctuary, and actually get to know her as an individual and learn that she's weird and funny and stubborn and just like your dog. They can never look at pigs or bacon or pork the same way again.

I think that has the power to transform the whole world. Animal agriculture is one of the reasons that this planet is heading towards catastrophic climate change. Ironically, those that are being victimized also have the power to turn this around and save us. All we have to do is give them a platform.

I truly believe that refocusing on the animals, sharing their stories, and getting people in a space where they can meet them in person or virtually is the most important thing we can be doing right now. Honestly, I'm so lucky to be able to know sheep and I'm so lucky to be able to know cows and call cows my friends because it's a truly magical thing to be able to know these beings. There's no way that I can ever exploit them or look at them as anything else than individuals at this point. And I believe that would be true for most people.

**LEDY VANKAVAGE (SENIOR LEGISLATIVE ATTORNEY at BEST FRIENDS ANIMAL SOCIETY):**

It really is interesting because when Tim Midura was calling the Congress to order, he was talking about Brooks McCormick Junior and his love for dogs and pets and that's why I got into animal law. When I was little, I would run the fields with my dog, Boody, and he went everywhere with me. That instilled an interest in me for all animals. I think that focusing on pets, keeping pets in their family, stopping the killing of dogs and cats in animal shelters throughout the United States is something that we need to strive for.

I actually think dogs and cats can be a gateway to empathy for farm animals and for wildlife. I think that it is the personal relationship that you have with an animal that opens a gateway for you to really understand how important these creatures are.

**KATHY HESSLER (ANIMAL LAW CLINIC DIRECTOR at LEWIS & CLARK LAW SCHOOL):**

I think there are a number of things we can do to have a really great impact on animal protection change. A lot of people are already working on wonderful things. I think one of the things that we can do is expand our horizons. All of us in animal protection have been doing all of that work in different ways. People have sometimes tended to work in silos in really specific areas and that's great because they can work really deeply in that area. But I think working more broadly and bringing in more voices so that more kinds of people can bring in more perspectives, more experiences so that we can understand how to communicate with people who want to advocate for animals.

I also think we should include people who are engaged in working with animals in ways that people don't like. That includes ranchers, farmers, researchers, etc. We need to be talking with them so that we're not just dismissing them or disrespecting them. We need to bring them into the conversation, and help them understand our perspectives, understand their perspectives, and see where we can meet to do what everyone wants to do. We want good research, we want good food, and so if we can do that without harming animals, we need to be able to have those conversations in a respectful way.
We need to bring those folks into the conversation and not just be opposing them or speaking out against them all the time. And then I also think we need to be thinking more broadly about the kinds of animals that we are working with and for.

That's part of the reason we started the Aquatic Animal Law Initiative because they were a group of animals that people don't really see. Literally, you don't see them and it's hard to then understand what their needs are or understand where the gaps in protection, legal, and social policy protection are for them. We want to raise them up to the visible level so that we can have conscious and constructive conversations about what their needs are and how that can be harmonized with the environmental and human needs in other capacities. And then using that strategy as a blueprint for other animals. We don't tend to talk about insects or reptiles. So trying to figure out how we can broaden the tent, if you will, I think that's what will help us move forward the best.

**CYNTHIA BATHURST (CO-FOUNDER and CEO at SAFE HUMANE CHICAGO):**
I think the greatest impact on animal protection change is two-fold. First, it's being able to facilitate and embrace diversity. By having diversity, we'll have better reporting and we'll have better research. We need to do it in our language, we need to do it in our programming so that we have a multi-dimensional approach. If we can do that, then we'll have a large impact. But in order to do that, we must do what Dale Jamieson said earlier in the program about owning the language. We really need to be able to get to the person on the street, as it were, to the general public or the majority. We do so by incorporating all kinds of diverse language, but also by having a language that truly reflects our values of the movement.

The reason why we need to think about language is that language reflects values and it reflects habit, not thought. We need to work up and develop the habit of using language of animal protection for the general public.

**CAMILLA FOX (FOUNDER and EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at PROJECT COYOTE):**
I think, and I mentioned this earlier today, that I've worked in both the environmental and animal protection movements and I think we need to get out of our silos. We really need to look at how we can bridge between movements. We need to see what the overlaps between social justice movements are that include animal protection, environmental conservation, and indigenous rights. I'm a real believer that there's a lot of common ground to be had, that we haven't yet really sought and worked to find that common ground and see where we can work together. I think we're much stronger when we work together. We're at a time where there's something called nature-deficit disorder, where kids are basically disconnected from wild nature. I think that's very dangerous for the planet, especially at a time when we are truly suffering from climate change.

If we have a young populous that has been disconnected and doesn't know what it's like to be out in nature, hasn't connected with a wild animal, whether that's a bird or a coyote, I think that's very dangerous because we don't work to take care of what we don't know and what we don't love. I think reaching youth and educators is absolutely critical and that's part of what we try to do with Project Coyote.
WHAT WILL HAVE THE GREATEST IMPACT FOR ANIMAL PROTECTION?

PAMELA FRASCH (PROFESSOR OF LAW and ASSOCIATE DEAN at LEWIS & CLARK SCHOOL; BROOKS MCCORMICK JR. SCHOLAR OF ANIMAL LAW and POLICY):
So much is happening today in animal protection and animal rights. I think the challenges are huge and they’re interdisciplinary and they’re overlapping. What we need are well-trained advocates who can jump into a variety of different areas. I’m in academia and so my focus tends to be how can we train more advocates effectively to go out there and change the world for animals. I think the biggest change that we can make for animals is to make sure that we have a lot of people that are educated, trained, and ready to hit the ground running to do things for animals in a variety of different disciplines.

SHARON NUNEZ (PRESIDENT and EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at ANIMAL EQUALITY):
My viewpoint on the relationship between factory farming and climate change is that in order to address climate change, we need to be talking about factory farming and the devastating impact it has on the environment. The United Nations is saying that 14.5 of the methane produced is coming from factory farms. We know that it’s polluting the water, we know that it’s polluting the soil, so it really has a devastating effect. But I also think that there’s room to be hopeful because what we’re seeing through award season is that a lot of these awards shows decided to opt for a plant-based diet. And we even had Joaquin Phoenix in the Oscars, who’s a vegan, talking about the relation between climate change and veganism.

I think it’s really important that we have this discussion about climate change when we see activists like Greta Thunberg, who’s a vegan, and she’s a vegan for a reason. She’s a vegan because she understands the devastating effects of animal agriculture. It’s an important discussion that we can bring as an animal protection movement and I think it’s something we really need to focus on.

KATHY STEVENS (FOUNDER and EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at CATSKILL ANIMAL SANCTUARY):
What will have the greatest impact for animal protection is when, A: We human beings stop acting as if we are the only ones who matter and who then, B: Understand that the greatest impact we can have in terms of number is to stop eating animals who want their lives as much as we do, who experience every emotion we do, who experience pain and suffering, and who are as individual as we are.

STEPHEN WELLS (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at ANIMAL LEGAL DEFENSE FUND):
Well, it’s hard to say what the greatest impact will be, but I do think that fundamental to the long-term success of the animal protection movement is we have to change our laws. Our laws are a codification of our values as a society. As long as we have our laws saying that animals are essentially things without interests or rights that shouldn’t be represented and protected in law, I think we’re fighting a losing battle.

I think to have the greatest impact, the animal protection movement really has to fundamentally change the way our law views and treats animals. So right now, our laws essentially tell us that animals are things more like a couch or the chair I’m sitting on than living, sentient beings who really have the same capacity to feel pain and fear and joy that we have. I think it’s essential that
we reform our laws so that they recognize that animals are indeed feeling, sentient beings. Until we reach that point, I think it's going to be very difficult for us to say we've succeeded in our broader mission.

DAVID CLOUGH (CO-FOUNDER of CREATURE KIND; PROFESSOR of THEOLOGICAL ETHICS at UNIVERSITY OF CHESTER):
Over the course of the summit that we've had here, one of the fundamental questions has been the narratives that shape our understanding of the relationship between humans and other animals. In my work with Christians, I'm really aware that religious narratives about how we understand animals are fundamental to how we think about the ethics of what we're doing to animals.

The animal movement has been neglecting to engage with religious people about animal issues. It's largely been unable to have a sense of what it means to engage with religious people in their own language. The organization I set up four years ago called Creature Kind is really trying to engage Christians with faith-based reasons for concern for other animals. I think that's a major challenge and opportunity for the movement to engage with religious constituencies for the first time about why they might have faith-based reasons for being concerned about animals and rethinking their practice.

CHERYL LEAHY (EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT at ANIMAL OUTLOOK):
I think we are in a moment of cultural opportunity. I think right now we are seeing that we truly have the potential to make vegan a mainstream concept and to actually move the cultural needle in that direction. I mean not just behavioral change around eating habits but also raising a cultural literacy around this topic. I think we can see with the recent uptick in the interest of it and the convergence of a number of different reasons for people coming to the issue that we have that opportunity. I think being able to understand what motivates the mainstream and how to do this will actually be the thing that across the board helps all animals.

There's something that we always hear about the numbers and the acute nature of the suffering that's coming to the farm animals, which is a strong argument. I think we can take this a step further, which is, well, we are still eating animals, not necessarily you and I, but as a culture, and it remains a cultural norm. We cannot really move the needle for animals in a meaningful way. It's about internalizing those ethics and bringing the sense of right and wrong to the mainstream and stopping eating animals is a vehicle to do that.

DAVID CASSUTO (DIRECTOR at BRAZIL-AMERICAN INSTITUTE for LAW and ENVIRONMENT, PACE UNIVERSITY):
I am looking at the notion of animal suffering as an environmental harm. As I mentioned earlier, animals are part of the environment. I have yet to meet anyone who doesn't acknowledge that animals are part of the environment. We have laws including the National Environmental Protection Act, which says that federal agencies have to disclose any harms and potential harms to the environment from agency actions. If we say that animals are part of the environment, and suffering is harm, two things that are virtually undeniable, then animal suffering must be an
environmental harm, and therefore it should have to be disclosed in an environmental impact statement. If we think about that for a moment, you realize, Oh my God, how industrial agriculture operators, CAFO operators will have to say exactly how many hundreds of thousands of chickens they’re going to torture and kill every year. Once that information is out there, the law requires them to discuss alternatives to it. When more people know, if one trusts that most people are actually not interested in harming other beings gratuitously, which again, is my experience, then we have an opportunity to actually give people information that can change their way of thinking about how they live in the world with animals.

The same thing goes for wild animals because if we have for example, a predator call, well, those animals suffer. They suffer when you trap them, they suffer when you poison them. So rather than talking about the effects on the ecosystem, which everybody already does as it's extremely important, let’s talk about the actual agony that these animals endure as an environmental harm.

**BECCA FRANKS (VISITING ASSISTANT PROFESSOR at NEW YORK UNIVERSITY):**
I think the greatest impact for animal protection change is too big a question for myself. I have to focus on what my contribution can be. I’m a big believer in understanding what you as an individual can do and what your strengths are, and then bringing those strengths forward to the world and trying to make the world a better place. For me, I have sort of a scientific bent to the way I think about the world. One of the things that I'm really interested in, is how science can be a positive influence rather than being a negative influence.

I think that one of the things that I've noticed across my career is that the hidden values that are built into science are part of what is stopping science from doing good work, in particular, science with animals. The values that are embedded in science that I think are particularly destructive, are human supremacy. The science that we do with animals is always with respect to ourselves and with respect to the idea that we are somehow better than animals. Animals are individuals who are extracted from their world, extracted from their social networks, and then there’s us, accepting and promoting using animals, exploiting them, putting them into systems to serve us, and understanding them within those systems rather than on their own terms.

I think that one of the things that we need to do in the movement is to use science that has rejected all of those values and instead embrace a horizontal, embedded, networked systems way of seeing the world where empathy plays a big role, personal connections play a big role, personal relationships play a big role, and re-embrace and re-discover our relationship with animals and with nature. And have that play a central role in the science that we’re doing to reflect back where we need to be, which is loving animals, loving the planet, and loving our place in the world. That is something to be celebrated rather than something to be questioned, rejected, or denied.

**LORI MARINO (FOUNDER and PRESIDENT at WHALE SANCTUARY PROJECT; FOUNDER and EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at KIMMELA CENTER for ANIMAL ADVOCACY):**
I think the biggest impact for animal protection change is going to be in rights-based legislation. The reason I say that is because I think that there is a very deep seeded reason why we treat
animals the way we do and I'm not sure that that's tractable. We're still living under a "scala naturae" viewpoint of nature where humans are on top and are qualitatively different than other animals. I think that's where we're going to keep all the other animals because it's convenient for us. My view of the way forward is to put in place protections, animal regulations, legislation, rights-based policies that actually protect the other animals from us.

**NORA KRAMER (FOUNDER and EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at YEA CAMP):**

When I first learned about what was happening to animals, I knew that I wanted to get involved and do something and I had no idea what to do. I think we, as a movement, put a lot of information out there and do inspire people to think, Oh, I want to do something. But aside from “go vegan”, or “don’t go to the circus”, or “boycott products tested on animals”, I don't think that we, as a movement, really provide a lot of support for people to get more involved. There are so many barriers to entry to becoming an activist in some way and that's why I started Yea Camp. I really see Yea Camp as an intervention for someone who knows that they want to do something, but they don't know what, they don't know how, and they don't really know where to begin.

When you're in that kind of space, it's very tempting and easy to just kind of default to our societal narrative of, “I'm just one person. I'm busy. I have a job. I don't have that much money to just donate. I'm just one person. What can I really do?” It's just such an easy default. And there's so many challenges to becoming an activist from psychologically of taking a position on something, opening yourself up to criticism, dealing with the heartbreak of putting your whole effort into something that's going to be really hard.

I think one of the key things that we do at Yea Camp is train people in the full gamut of resources that they need to get active on a cause that they care about. Our whole curriculum is based on building knowledge, skills, confidence, and community. I think as a movement, we focus on knowledge. We have Facebook, or Meetup, or whatever, and events like this certainly build community but we don't do very much on skills, and we certainly don't do much on confidence. Getting active on a cause that you care about can almost be a nonstarter if you don't really see a path for how you can get involved. What does that look like?

Especially with changes within a lot of the movement's strategy has changed in recent years so that for years it was like leafleting, like go out and leaflet. The movement has shifted away from that. That's not the main thing that we're pushing for. I'm not really sure organizationally what the main volunteer push that animal groups are striving for at this point. I think it's hard for people to locate how to get involved. They can donate, they can post something on social media, they can boycott this product but I think we have a lot of people who would do more if we mobilized them better and provided support and resources to help them get involved in whatever ways would inspire them.

**GENE BAUR (PRESIDENT at FARM SANCTUARY):**

I think one of the most important ways that we can stop animals from suffering and from being exploited, is to change how we relate to them in the food system. When people shift from eating animals and start eating more plants and plant-based foods, I think we can save billions of animals over time. I think animal protection is a people issue and what we eat has profound impacts on other animals.
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BRENDA SANDERS (EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR at AFRO-VEGAN SOCIETY):
Collaboration will have the greatest impact. We can't just all work in our own little universes and not bring these ideas together. Folks working in different areas have to share ideas and share information with each other. That has been made very apparent this weekend, that we have to share ideas. I've learned so much. People have told me that they've learned so much from me. So in order for us to gain momentum and move things forward, we have to share with each other.

DELCIANNA WINDERS (ASSISTANT CLINICAL PROFESSOR and ANIMAL LAW LITIGATION CLINIC DIRECTOR at LEWIS & CLARK LAW SCHOOL):
I think that looking at issues of enforcement holds a lot of promise for changing the world for animals. We're in a really pivotal moment for our relationship with non-human animals right now. Public concern and public opinion is really swaying in favor of animals and in favor of treating them better than we do and that's despite huge resources being spent by industries that exploit them. We're starting to see that translate into our laws. Some recent examples include bans on the most intensive confinement of animals, bans on the retail sales of pets, and bans on the use of wild animals for entertainment. But we can have the best laws in the world and if they don't have a really good enforcement mechanism, they're not really worth the paper that they're written on.

I've been in the animal advocacy movement for a quarter century. I've been an animal law professor and practitioner for more than a decade and what I've seen over and over again is that you have laws that are supposed to protect animals and seem to provide meaningful protections, but they don't have meaningful enforcement mechanisms. I think we really need to be focusing our attention on that.

(The video was concluded.)