6

Diversifying Effective Altruism's Longshots in Animal Advocacy*

An Invitation to Prioritize Black Vegans, Higher Education, and Religious Communities

Matthew C. Halteman

Effective altruism (EA) has a snappy brand and a compelling project. When it comes to two-word phrases that are bound to generate enthusiasm, it'd take big guns like "free pizza" and "TikTok famous" to do better than "effective altruism." And beyond the promising name, the act of doing well at being good is an attractive prospect, too. When you add in nuances like the fact that the *way* we do well at being good is by using *reason* and *evidence* to do the *most* good possible, the prospect looks even better. When it is clear that we can do more good rather than less, all things being equal, who wouldn't choose to do more?

As much as I resonate with the animating spirit of EA, this last question conceals two reservations that keep me from thinking of myself as a card-carrying member, especially where EA approaches to animal advocacy (my main focus here) are concerned. I'll italicize a couple of key phrases to highlight my two reservations:

*This essay is the penultimate draft of Chapter 6 of *The Good It Promises, The Harm It Does,* edited by Carol J. Adams, Alice Crary, and Lori Gruen, Oxford University Press 2023, 76-93. DOI: 10.1093/oso/9780197655696.003.0006

When it is clear that we can do more good rather than less, *all things being equal*, who wouldn't choose to do more?

My first reservation is that it isn't always *clear* that we really *can* do more good by supporting EA-preferred causes, and that in some cases in particular—even where some of the most highly-funded EA projects are concerned—the prospect of actually doing more good seems dim.

My second reservation is that all things are *not* in fact equal, and that in some cases—even if it were possible *clearly* to do *more good* on the aggregate by giving to some EA-preferred cause—the opportunity cost of doing so would be to further entrench systemic injustice, gaining more good on the whole at the expense of groups that already face significant disadvantages.

In what follows, I'll explain each of these reservations and then suggest some exciting new initiatives—institution-building in Black vegan advocacy, higher education, and religious communities—that could mitigate these reservations, energize and diversify the movement, and remain true to the EA method of supporting underexploited but potentially high-impact causes that produce non-fungible goods otherwise unlikely to be funded.

Let's start with the reservation about lack of clarity—that it isn't always clear that giving to EA-preferred causes will do more good than alternatives. "Effective altruism," after all, is more an *aspirational expression* than it is a *success term*. In other words, it's much more like "best grandma ever!" or "world's greatest vegan sandwich" than it is like "Nobel laureate" or "three-star chef." It's a way of saying, "This is what we hope to accomplish!" or "This is what we're striving for!", but it doesn't guarantee that the aspiration is (or even can be) realized by those who adopt the name.

It's important to recognize, too, that—so far, anyway—the people who have adopted the name tend to share a great deal in common. Though the EA movement is not a monolith and

is making strides on becoming more diverse,[1] *Rethink Charity's* 2019 EA Survey of 2,513 participants revealed a concerningly homogeneous culture: 71% male, 87% white, and 86% agnostic/atheist/nonreligious.[2] For some (and certainly for me), this homogeneity raises concern that, among other worries, unchecked implicit bias, gaps in knowledge and understanding of certain demographics, and inadequately diverse methodology might compromise the vetting of preferred causes, despite best intentions. One might wonder, more concretely, how well suited the EA community is, given its current makeup and preferred methods for discerning evidence of impact, to make an accurate assessment, say, of the expected utility of investments in the Black vegan movement or in religious higher education. One might worry, thus, that it is truly unclear—even by EA's own lights—what causes are really the most promising ones to fund.

Another clarity-related worry is that, as prominent effective altruists have acknowledged, any number of the most prized projects in the movement are "high risk/high reward." They may seem far-fetched or unlikely at first, but there's reason to believe they could pan out, and if they do succeed, it'd be huge. In short, EA is out there with some arguably effective stuff (like anti-malaria and anti-hunger campaigns), but there are some longshots in the mix too (like protecting us from asteroids and artificial intelligence). And the longshots are supposedly justified on the grounds that if they work, they'll work in a BIG way.

A more descriptively accurate phrase for the aspiration behind this diverse collective of causes, then, might be something like "Probably Effective Altruism" (PEA) or—where some of the higher risk projects are concerned—even

[1] The Effective Altruism Forum threads on Diversity and Inclusion show that awareness of the problems associated with demographic homogeneity and the value of a having more diverse EA movement are both very much under discussion and somewhat contentious among members of the EA community. See online at https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/tag/diversity-and-inclusion (accessed on 21 September 2021).

[2] For analysis and commentary on these numbers, check out Dullaghan 2019.

"Possibly Effective Altruism, If Lucky" (PEAL). And where the application of EA methods to animal advocacy is concerned—especially now that EA money is flooding into food tech R&D for alternative protein in hopes of hastening the demise of animal agriculture—we might even need to consider something like "Venture Altruism" (VA). However promising tech miracles like "real meat without animals" may seem (full disclosure: I'm excited about their potential, support organizations that promote them, and am married to a person who works in the sector), the reality is that our ability to bring such products to scale is presently unknown and faces significant hurdles.[3]

Acronyms like PEA, PEAL, and VA, if perhaps more accurate, have decidedly less appeal than EA. But they call attention to something important: when enveloped by the confident aura that can emanate from seeing "effective altruism" as a success term, it's easy to lose track of the fact that aspiring to be maximally effective at doing good in this way is apparently compatible with taking *huge* risks—even longshots. And taking longshots always involves accepting significant opportunity costs.

In 2017, for example, the EA-based Open Philanthropy Project funded the mitigation of "potential risks from advanced artificial intelligence" to the tune of $43M, second only to the $118M awarded to global health and development projects.[4] The hope here is to mitigate important but often neglected "longtermist" concerns about "suffering risk" or "s-risk"—the risk of astronomical suffering and death that a future misaligned AI or other runaway technology could inflict on untold numbers of human beings, animals, potential

[3] For an overview of these hurdles, see 'Food Technology' 2020.

[4] This passage and the associated numbers are cited in Todd 2020 from an unpublished essay by Will MacAskill titled 'The Definition of Effective Altruism'.

sentient life from other galaxies, and potential sentient digital life.[5]

It's *possible* that this $43M will play a catalyst's role in preventing the immense suffering of hundreds of billions of future sentients at the hands (artificial neural networks?) of a misaligned AI. But it's maybe just as likely—perhaps more likely, but who can say? —that this $43M will make little difference except to the short-term career-development of the grantees (most of whom, given the demographic realities of this sector, are likely to be highly educated, relatively affluent men). A reasonable person could be forgiven, it seems, for judging the opportunity costs associated with possibly foiling a misaligned AI in 50 years to be too high, and for suspecting that these millions of dollars could be better invested elsewhere. (I should add that the same reasonable person might simultaneously conclude that it is nonetheless wise to devote some resources to mitigating s-risk; my intent here is not to trivialize these serious risks, but to emphasize that significant investment in their potential mitigation, however important, is nonetheless a longshot with present opportunity costs worth keeping in mind).[6]

The question of where such funding should go instead is made all the more acute by the second reservation noted above—that the folks most likely to bear these opportunity costs are those who already face disadvantages associated with systemic injustice.[7] One might object that it is morally

[5] For a helpful FAQ on s-risk, see Baumann 2017. For engaging introductions to longtermist concerns about existential risk more broadly, see Bostrom 2014 and Ord 2020. I am grateful to Dan Hooley, Caleb Parikh, Dominic Roser, and Zak Weston for helpful input on this topic.

[6] Thanks to Dominic Roser for helping me to see the complexity of this problem through the lens of intergenerational justice. Though it is tempting, given the pressing concern of inequitable cause prioritization, to weigh the opportunity costs of funding such tech longshots only in terms of the interests of *presently* disadvantaged communities, there are also the interests of *future* disadvantaged communities to consider. For a survey of the issues at stake here, see Roser and Seidel 2017; Part II of the book (55-96), titled 'How much do we need to do? Intergenerational justice', is especially helpful.

[7] Saccoccio 2021 is a good starting point for considering the question of "how philanthropy in farmed animal advocacy reinforces white bubbles" (53) and Graham 2021 approaches this general concern with EA explicitly in mind. For more input on how using data to guide funding decisions can inadvertently contribute to systemic injustice, visit the website of We

ill-advised—maybe even fanatical[8]—to invest tens of millions of dollars in tech longshots that *might someday* have a huge impact on the world at large while failing to combat intimately-related systemic injustices *that are doing disproportionate damage right now* to already at-risk communities.

To make this worry more concrete in the context of the animal-focused applications of EA under discussion in this book, consider the disproportionate toll that the ascendance of industrial animal agriculture has taken on communities of color in the United States, and in particular, Black communities. These communities have been unjustly made to endure a system of food apartheid that treats them as second-class, having both much less access to the benefits of the system and much greater risk of being harmed by its costs.

Black farmers are much less likely to receive government subsidies (Castro and Willingham 2019). Black and brown workers disproportionately bear the burdens associated with the highest-risk jobs in slaughterhouses and processing plants (Pachirat 2011). Black neighborhoods are more likely to be food-insecure, with many more opportunities to consume animal-product-heavy fast-food and many fewer opportunities to learn about and purchase affordable fresh produce. And Black people suffer disproportionately from diet-related illnesses like diabetes, obesity, hyper-tension, heart disease and stroke, and generally have less access to affordable healthcare to treat these conditions (McQuirter 2010).

Notwithstanding this system of food apartheid, civil rights pioneers like Dick Gregory and Coretta Scott King were among the first to see the concerns of human and animal liberation as intertwined. Members of the Black Panthers were

All Count, an equity training organization which offers online workshops on the Foundations of Data Equity: https://weallcount.com/workshop-landing-page.

[8] In an unpublished manuscript for the Global Priorities Working Paper Series titled 'In defence of fanaticism', Hayden Wilkinson acknowledges this problem but argues that the costs of abandoning expected value theory to avoid such fanaticism are too high to bear. See Wilkinson 2020.

among the first to promote plant-based diets as the foundation of food autonomy and bodily health in their free breakfast programs (Mercer 2021). Black vegans like Nekeisha Alayna Alexis, Tabitha Brown, Christopher Carter, Breeze Harper, Aph and Syl Ko, Michelle Loyd-Paige, Christopher Sebastian, Tracye McQuirter, Brenda Sanders, Bryant Terry, and many others are doing what is, to my mind, some of the most holistic and provocative work in the food and animal justice movements. And Black celebrities and artists like Oprah Winfrey, Lizzo, KRS One, Wu Tang Clan, Beyonce, and others have influentially centered these issues in their work. Given all this productive ferment, those paying attention won't be surprised to learn that African Americans are the fastest growing vegan demographic in the United States, with 8% identifying as such (while just 3% of the general population do) (Reiley 2020).

To people who have become convinced that human and animal liberation are fundamentally intertwined (as I have been, in significant part by the work of Black vegans), it may seem morally dubious to allocate tens of millions of dollars to research and development for alternative protein (that may never come to scale) while influential Black vegans struggle to fund conferences and community events that seem poised to make a big impact on a variety of related fronts, from worker and environmental justice, to public health, to justice for animals. Moreover, though I focus in this chapter on EA's food tech longshots, it is important to observe that people concerned about inequitable cause prioritization may have similar reservations about EA support for incremental corporate campaigns within industrial animal agriculture (cage free, Better Chicken Commitment, etc.), given unintended consequences for farm workers and small farmers in the U.S. and throughout the Global South who are Black, Indigenous, or People of the Global Majority (BIPGM) (Braverman, Channin, Gross, et al, this volume).

In such cases, skeptics might have one or both of two different worries: that EA has done the expected value

calculations incorrectly (or maybe not at all) for lack of adequate understanding of the situation and potential of Black vegan communities and advocacy work; or that, even if they've done the calculus correctly, there is more than general goodness of outcome to consider where combatting entrenched institutional injustice is concerned. As Brooke Haggerty, executive director of Faunalytics, has written, "white animal advocates have an obligation to make the animal protection community an equitable space. This is our obligation not because the data tell us that doing so will increase our impact, but because our commitment to fighting oppression should not be limited to nonhuman animals" (2021: 131-132).

So though both alternative protein and Black vegan advocacy seem like high priority causes that could be big winners from the standpoint of doing good, the latter may strike some as having a big advantage: even if the longshot scenario doesn't obtain, the achievement of significant non-fungible good (including progress toward the great good of social justice) is a sure thing.

Let's say, for instance, that crack teams of Ivy League STEM grads get an EA cash infusion, with the hope—if they're lucky—of inventing amazing new alt-proteins that vastly reduce the carbon footprint of producing these foods and capture 30% of the market for animal products by 2050. And let's say they make some significant strides but ultimately cannot produce these proteins quickly and cheaply enough or perhaps struggle to convince the public to get on board, and philanthropists stop funding their development before the products come to scale.

What will EA have accomplished? *Some* good will have been done, as the exciting buzz around needed alternatives to animal agriculture and the rise of pioneering scientists and entrepreneurs in the sector will have energized elements of the movement. But it's not clear that the world will have become a significantly better place. This buzz and reputational gain are fungible, after all—there are other, similar ways those net

positives could have been achieved. And the world will certainly *not* have become a more *just* place by virtue of this work, given that all these resources went, all too predictably, into the pockets or reputations of already relatively affluent and influential people, arguably at the expense of marginalized people with many fewer opportunities.

Consider, instead, that leading Black vegans get these EA philanthropic resources with the hope—if they're lucky—of spearheading a movement that makes going vegan fully mainstream, not just in Black communities but across the culture at large where the work of Black intellectuals, politicians, activists, athletes, and artists is increasingly ascendant. Let's say that these efforts make significant headway, but do not result in the hoped-for vegan revolution.

What will EA have accomplished? It'll certainly have made the world a better place because the vegan ferment in Black communities will surely do *some* good and likely even a *significant* amount of non-fungible good in the lives of the individuals reached (the relevant health benefits and expanded animal consciousness, for instance, are two significant goods that are not easily achievable by other means). But EA will also have supported Black vegan work that is often unfairly undervalued and excluded from the movement despite its significant originality, value, and promise, thus making the world a more just place, too.

My point here is that if EAs are comfortable with taking longshots—as efforts like foiling the extermination of humankind by a misaligned AI, avoiding obliteration by asteroid, and normalizing animal-free meat clearly seem to be[9]—then why not take some longshots in areas that have a fighting chance to make the world both much better *and* more just *even if they don't fully realize their seeming potential*?

[9] In a recent op-ed in *The New York Times*, Ezra Klein calls this effort a "moonshot", but suggests that it is one that should be launched by governments rather than philanthropists. See Klein 2021.

Supporting Black vegan efforts is one of the longshots that seems most promising now.

Two other longshots that seem well worth exploring are efforts to make food systems education mainstream in colleges and universities and efforts to engage and educate religious communities. These suggestions may seem counter-intuitive, given the perception among some prominent EAs and EA-sympathizers that education-based advocacy hasn't succeeded, despite four decades of effort, in bringing about the necessary food revolution. This perception has even driven some leaders in the movement to adopt a different theory of change altogether. The best way to end industrial farm animal production, on this new outlook, is not to educate people in hopes that they will boycott the system and push for better alternatives, but rather to transform the system from the inside using the mechanisms of technology and market capitalism to speed the obsolescence of animal products until they are supplanted by cheaper, better-tasting, more sustainable plant- or cell-based alternatives.

Though I find these matters intriguing, I am less interested than most of my EA friends in debating which theory of change is the right one. I'm of the persuasion that none of us knows what the right one is or even if there is just one. Letting a thousand flowers bloom in our approaches to advocacy (or at least a hundred reasonably well-tended ones?) can be a good way to meet folks where they are and get as many people into the movement (with their diverse outlooks, motivations, talents, and gifts) as we can. But I do think it is worth pointing out that there is a way to see *certain kinds* of education-focused advocacy work as deeply consonant with the EA method of looking for underexploited but potentially high-impact areas that produce non-fungible goods that are otherwise unlikely to be funded.

What I have in mind here by education-focused advocacy is not the typical model of sending a compelling vegan emissary from the outside into institutional spaces that are often culturally unfriendly to going vegan in hopes of

generating a small percentage of converts. Once upon a time, when the ethics, science, and spirituality supportive of vegan commitments were less mainstream, this external approach to education-based advocacy was likely the best (and perhaps the only) way to go. But in an era of increasing ethical, scientific, and spiritual consensus among experts that a radical transition away from an animal-based food system is urgently requisite, it is now possible to imagine viable infrastructure-building for comprehensive vegan education *within* the relevant institutions, such that one cannot escape popular culture, college, or church without being thoroughly sensitized to and educated about these matters by one's own cultural heroes, teachers, and spiritual mentors.

Take higher education, for example. A recent study by Schwitzgebel, Cokelet, and Singer suggests that ethics classes can move students to eat less meat (2020). And from surveying broader cultural trends in the evolution of public opinion on matters of gender, race, and other matters of justice, it seems intuitively plausible that views normalized in institutions of higher learning can have a profound shaping effect on the attitudes and actions of tens of millions of young people.

Those tempted to doubt the potential impact of higher education for transforming our food system need only reflect upon how successful the meat industry has been at shaping the values of generations of students at ag-funded universities. After graduation, their work as meat-friendly businesspeople, medical professionals, veterinarians, public health officials, and politicians has helped to build our animal-centric food system and shelter it from well-deserved criticism and reform.[10]

How many lives—human and other-than-human—might be changed for the better if wide access to cutting-edge instruction around the need to transform our food system

[10] I am grateful to Jennifer Channin for calling to my attention to this important example of higher education's profound ability to shape our food system (if not always for the better).

became the educational air that college students breathe, precisely at the formative time when they are establishing the values and consumer habits that will govern their adult lives for decades to come?

Most colleges and universities these days have existing faculty scattered throughout the arts and sciences who have both relevant scholarly expertise and pedagogical interest in teaching on food ethics and intermeshed disciplines such as animal ethics, animal law, climate science, nutrition science, public health policy, supply chain management, worker justice, gender studies, and anti-racism. What these institutions often lack is the funding to empower such faculty to offer these courses regularly or, better still, to join forces as a collective to develop interdisciplinary centers, institutes, specialized majors, certificates, and graduate programs that could both thrust these issues into the educational mainstream and propel institutional changes in catering policy, dining hall food sourcing, and the use of animals in scientific research.

At a time when many institutions of higher learning are facing financial pressures that make them more receptive than ever to mission-targeted external funding, there is a real opportunity for the EA movement to make strategic institution-building gifts to colleges and universities that could influence the behavior of generations of students—gifts that, very importantly, are not likely to be made by traditional funders who are often skeptical of or even opposed to such efforts, if they are aware of them at all.

The recent explosion of food studies programs at colleges and universities across the globe demonstrates that students want these courses, professors want to teach them, and universities want the prestige and market share they generate.[11] What's more, the causes of animal welfare and rights, especially explicitly vegan perspectives on them, still

[11] For an ever-expanding list of opportunities to do food studies in higher education, visit Food Culture.Org: https://www.food-culture.org/food-studies-programs/ (accessed 21 September 2021). For more on the rise of food studies programs in the U.S., see Cosgrove 2015.

tend to be underrepresented within these programs, which gives animal advocates all the more reason to fund their development.[12] EA should strike while the iron is hot for the best chance at shaping these trends.

Even more exciting is that there is nothing nefarious or manipulative about seeking such influence among students. Indeed, the kind of shaping influence I'm talking about here is just what an education is supposed to provide, according to most college admissions departments: exposure to and training within the best, most scientifically and ethically sound, most transformative curriculum for the purposes of grounding one's personal and vocational flourishing and contributing to the common good.

Outreach to religious communities is another important opportunity—one that is increasingly already understood within some ranks of the EA movement to have significant potential.[13] With 5.8 billion people on Earth self-identifying as religious, it's hard to imagine that the urgently needed global transition to a plant-based food system can be carried off without the aid of religious institutions. And as Sophie Ritchie has observed in the Effective Altruism Forum, there are surface indicators that a groundswell of enthusiasm for the cause among religious audiences could be influential, given the evidence that religious people tend to give more and more often to charitable causes (2015).

Until recently, the big hurdle to achieving widespread influence among religious communities has been that the requisite institutional infrastructure for offering authentic *internal* food systems education has been lacking. Instead of

[12] Thanks to Alice Crary for pointing out that the current underrepresentation of explicitly vegan perspectives in influential food systems programs is a feature rather than a bug when it comes to substantiating the need for funding such positions.

[13] In Ritchie 2015, Sophie Ritchie surveys this promising if complex nexus with reference to the specific prospects of engaging Jewish and Christian audiences. At the end of the post, she notes the existence of a Facebook group for "Christian effective altruists that has around 80 members, but isn't hugely participative or proactive beyond the online discussion space." Five years later, the group has 500 active members, a full-time director, three part-time staff, and a pending registration with the charity commission of the United Kingdom; read more about their work online: https://www.eaforchristians.org.

receiving consistent, coherent spiritual formation from trusted authorities working within their places of worship and educational communities, adherents of faith traditions have had to rely on the honorable but inherently limited *external* efforts of activists beyond these hallowed halls offering a humane society pamphlet here, a targeted video there, or a newsletter from the nearest affiliated vegetarian association.

I have supported and engaged in this kind of *external* advocacy work for the past fifteen years. As reading the annual reports of pioneering non-profit organizations such as CreatureKind, Jewish Initiative for Animals, Sarx, and Shamayim confirms, these kinds of efforts produce groundbreaking and important results.[14] On my view, they well deserve our support. The hard work of committed advocates fighting uphill battles to engage religious cultures that can be quick to chasten new ideas and slow to adopt them deserve much credit for the fact that there is now more and more rapidly expanding potential than ever before for achieving widespread and lasting institutional headway in religious communities.

But at the same time, it seems likely that the kind of *internal* spiritual formation work I've done in collaboration with my colleagues and students at a Christian university and with leadership and fellow lay educators in local churches is more effectual (and more *potentially* effectual, if replicated on a grander scale in religious institutions generally) than external advocacy work could be. Spiritual formation work that is internal to religious institutions, after all, is not just about the disinterested adoption *à la carte* of this or that single-issue social cause. Rather, it molds the motivations and shapes the lives of adherents much more profoundly and

[14] To learn more about CreatureKind, visit https://www.becreaturekind.org. To learn more about Jewish Initiative for Animals, visit https://www.jewishinitiativeforanimals.com. To learn more about Sarx, visit https://sarx.org.uk. To learn more about Shamayim, visit https://www.shamayim.us. For the sake of full disclosure, I should add that I am a member of the board of directors of CreatureKind and the advisory boards of Sarx and the National Interfaith Animal Welfare Initiative in partnership with Shamayim.

lastingly than even the most compelling pamphlet, speaker series, or webinar ever could. What is at stake is nothing less than a rigorous, sustained communal endeavor to live out a holistic religious vision of the world through the adoption of concrete discipleship practices. And this ambitious task, it turns out, is one that the best readings of our sacred texts and religious ethics suggest cannot be done compellingly without profound changes in the way we view and treat animals, break our daily bread, and collectively feed the world.

Within my own religious tradition, Christianity, it is exhilarating to imagine what might be possible if already existing denominations and institutions of higher learning had the resources, infrastructural bandwidth, and personnel to start catechizing, teaching, and feeding their congregations, seminarians, college students, and day school children in harmony with the best already existing theological and ethical work.

What if a significant number of the world's 1.1 billion Catholics adopted the eating and consumer habits that follow from taking seriously the discipleship implications of Pope Francis' recent encyclical on care of creation, *Laudato Si'* (2015)? What if a good-sized swath of the 620 million evangelical Protestants on the planet adopted the attitudes and actions outlined in *Every Living Thing,* an evangelical statement on responsible care for animals signed by hundreds of church leaders?[15] What if interfaith collaboration among the many religious and spiritual traditions that promote peace and justice led to widespread changes in the attitudes and actions of adherents from many faiths?

Admittedly, such grand cultural transformations are longshots. But so are preventing the advent of misaligned AIs, averting would-be asteroid apocalypses, and supplanting industrial animal agriculture by making meat without animals.

[15] This statement's full title is *Every Living Thing: An Evangelical Statement on Responsible Care for Animals* and it can be read in full and signed online at https://www.everylivingthing.com/sign-the-statement (accessed 21 September 2021).

Some solid indications point to a reasonable hope that EA philanthropy can help to transform the meat industry by making targeted gifts to empower scientists and entrepreneurs who couldn't otherwise do so to discover and normalize the technology and markets that will power the alt-protein revolution and save untold billions of human and other-than-human lives.

Might EA philanthropy also reasonably hope to spur the transformation of religious attitudes and actions toward animals by making targeted gifts to empower denominations, universities, and religious leaders who couldn't otherwise do so to pioneer and normalize the religious visions and discipleship practices that will lead billions to support the transition to a plant-based food system? Might it reasonably hope to help foment similar revolutions in higher education more broadly and in the Black vegan circles whose gathering momentum seems poised to catalyze widespread cultural change?

If all goes well, EA's prioritization of the causes of alt-protein and institution-building in Black vegan advocacy, higher education, and religious communities could work in tandem to make the world a significantly better place. But even if the hoped-for longshots of total cultural transformation in these three latter arenas do not obtain, each nonetheless demonstrates *reliable* results in motivating people to change their diets and moving institutions to change their food policies—the problem is that we haven't invested enough to scale those results.

These institution-building efforts, after all, are not rocket science (or novel alt-protein science, as the case may be). They are matters of community organization (Black vegan advocacy and religious advocacy) and knowledge dissemination (higher education)—tried and true methods of achieving social change that are well-researched and well-understood. Let's see to it that they soon become well-funded, too, perhaps diversifying and expanding the EA movement

and helping it to address some key weaknesses in the process.[16]

References

Baumann, T. (2017), 'S-Risk FAQ', *Effective Altruism Forum*, 18 September. https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/MCfa6PaGoe6AaLPHR/s-risk-faq

Bostrom, N. (2014), *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castro, A. and C. Willingham (2019), 'Progressive Governance Can Turn the Tide for Black Farmers', *Center For American Progress*, 3 April. https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/economy/reports/2019/04/03/467892/progressive-governance-can-turn-tide-black-farmers

Cosgrove, E. (2015), 'The Rise of Food Studies Programs', *The Atlantic*, 1 June. https://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/06/the-rise-of-food-studies-programs/394538/

Dullaghan, N. (2019), 'EA Survey 2019: The Community Demographics & Characteristics', *Rethinking Charity*, 5 December. Available online: https://rethinkpriorities.org/publications/eas2019-community-demographics-characteristics

'Food Technology' (2020), *The Farmed Animal Protection Movement: Common Strategies for Improving and Protecting the Lives of Farmed Animals*, 27-31, San Diego, CA: Farm Forward Publications. Available online: https://res.cloudinary.com/hyjvcxzjt/image/upload/v1614024915/resource/farm-forward-publication-philanthropy-farmed-anima-3fd7.pdf

Francis (2015), *Laudato Si': On Care for Our Common Home*, Rome: The Vatican. http://www.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/encyclicals/documents/papa-francesco_20150524_enciclica-laudato-si.html

Graham, M. (2021), 'How Racism in Animal Advocacy and Effective Altruism Hinder Our Mission', in J. Singer (ed.), *Antiracism in Animal Advocacy: Igniting Cultural Transformation*, 165-175, New York: Lantern.

Haggarty, B. (2021), 'Using Research and Data to Create an Inclusive Animal Rights Movement', in J. Singer (ed.), *Antiracism in Animal Advocacy: Igniting Cultural Transformation*, 128-139, New York: Lantern.

Klein, E. (2021), 'Let's Launch a Moonshot for Meatless Meat', *The New York Times*, 24 April. https://www.nytimes.com/2021/04/24/opinion/climate-change-meatless-meat.html).

[16] I am grateful to Carol Adams, Nekeisha Alayna Alexis, JD Bauman, Andrew Chignell, David Clough, Alice Crary, Aaron Gross, Lori Gruen, Susan Halteman, Dan Hooley, Michelle Loyd-Paige, Caleb Parikh, Dominic Roser, Christopher Sebastian, Zak Weston, and Megan Halteman Zwart for helpful conversations on these topics and/or feedback on drafts of this essay. I am especially grateful to Tyler Doggett, who read and offered very helpful feedback on several drafts, and to Jennifer Channin, whose extensive commentary significantly shaped the final product.

McQuirter, T.L. (2010), *By Any Greens Necessary*, Chicago: Lawrence Hill Books.

Mercer, A. (2021), 'A Homecoming: The imagery of veganism propagated by the wellness industry erases the long — and often radical — history of plant-based diets in the Black diaspora', *Eater.com Longform*, 14 January. https://www.eater.com/22229322/black-veganism-history-black-panthers-dick-gregory-nation-of-islam-alvenia-fulton

Ord, T. (2020), *The Precipice: Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity*, New York: Hachette Books.

Pachirat, T. (2011), *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*, New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Ritchie, S. (2015), 'Effective Altruism and Religious Faiths: Mutually Exclusive Entities, Or An Important Nexus to Explore?', *Effective Altruism Forum*, https://forum.effectivealtruism.org/posts/zY2jLwfdXENm6mGQP/effective-altruism-and-religious-faiths-mutually-exclusive

Reiley, L. (2020), 'The fastest growing vegan demographic is African Americans', *Washington Post*, 24 January. https://www.washingtonpost.com/business/2020/01/24/fastest-growing-vegan-demographic-is-african-americans-wu-tang-clan-other-hip-hop-acts-paved-way/

Roser, D. and C. Seidel (2017), *Climate Justice: An Introduction*, New York: Routledge.

Saccoccio, M. (2021), 'How Philanthropy in Farmed Animal Advocacy Reinforces White Bubbles', in J. Singer (ed.), *Antiracism in Animal Advocacy: Igniting Cultural Transformation*, 53-57, New York: Lantern.

Schwitzgebel, E., B. Cokelet, and P. Singer (2020), 'Do ethics classes influence student behavior? Case study: Teaching the ethics of eating meat', *Cognition*, Volume 203, October, 104397.

Singer, J., ed. (2021), *Antiracism in Animal Advocacy: Igniting Cultural Transformation*, New York: Lantern.

Todd, B. (2020), 'Misconceptions About Effective Altruism', *80,000 Hours*, 7 August.https://80000hours.org/2020/08/misconceptions-effective-altruism/

Wilkinson, H. (2020), 'In defence of fanaticism', Global Priorities Working Paper Series. https://globalprioritiesinstitute.org/hayden-wilkinson-in-defence-of-fanaticism/