Preventing Animal Suffering Lock in: Why Economic Transitions Matter

Inputs	Activities	Outputs	Short-term impact	Mid-term impact	Long -term impact	Goal
Interdisciplinary research structure (economics, policy, systems thinking, animal ethics)	Map animal inclusion gaps across three economic paradigms	Research papers in paradigm journals (*citations, co-authorships*)	Paradigm communities recognise animal inclusion gap (*survey/interview data*)	Animal welfare standard consideration in paradigm development (*references*, *curriculum inclusion)*	Economic paradigms systematically include animal welfare (*policy analysis*)	To reduce the scale and intensity of animal suffering by influencing how economic paradigms evolve and by identifying high-leverage policy and advocacy strategies that anticipate systemic shifts
Funding and time	Map policy intersection opportunities: identify non-animal policies with major animal implications	Animal-inclusive economic models (*adoption by researchers*)	Key economists integrate animal considerations (*content analysis*)	Paradigm research institutes adopt animal-inclusive frameworks (*institutional policy adoption*)	Reduced animal suffering through direct and indirect policy channels (*outcome tracking*)	
Access to paradigm communities (degrowth, AI economics, resilience)	Develop animal-inclusive frameworks for each paradigm	Policy intersection database (*number of high-leverage policies identified*)	Animal advocates engage non-animal policy processes (*strategy shifts*)	Animal advocates routinely engage with transition policy processes (*strategy shifts at major organisations*)	Prevent moral catastrophe through value lock-in prevention (*civilisational resilience*)	
Academic collaboration opportunities	Build relationships within paradigm communities	Academic collaborations (*ongoing partnerships*)	Policymakers recognise co-benefits (*policy document references*)	Policy evaluations include animal co-benefits (*government impact assessment frameworks*)		
Network building within EA/longtermist communities	Test frameworks and intersection strategies with key actors and adapt based on feedback	Leverage analysis for advocates (*adoption by advocacy organisations*)				
Skills development in systems analysis and institutional design	Engage with EA/longtermist research community					

Key actors

Paradigm leaders: E.g., Tim Jackson, Kate Raworth, Erik Brynjolfsson, Rob Hopkins

Policy actors: working on transition policies (e.g., UBI pilot schemes, 4-day week coordinators)

Academic Programs: Alternative economics course leaders

EA/Longtermist: Rethink Priorities/ Sentience Institute researchers

Assumptions (to test)

Paradigm communities open to moral expansion → *Early interviews*

Academic influence shapes paradigm development → *Historical analysis*

At least one paradigm gains policy traction → *Trend analysis*

Non-animal policies can deliver significant animal benefits → *Impact modelling*

This research has counterfactual impact → *No other researchers in this space*

Risks and mitigation

Communities reject animal focus → *Environmental/co-benefit framing*

Academic work doesn't influence practice → *Direct policy engagement*

Policy intersections smaller than expected → *Focus on direct inclusion*

Research becomes too theoretical → *Regular stakeholder feedback*

Low tractability → *Focus on highest-leverage intersections*

Advocates struggle to engage with non-animal policy processes → Develop specialised training materials

Feedback loops

Quarterly stakeholder check-ins on framework relevance

Annual assumption review based on paradigm evolutio

Policy impact modelling to test intersection opportunities

Adaptive research design responding to findings

Karen Singleton

Version 2 | 31.07.25