

Fair Start Movement Analyzes Harvard Animal-Welfare Baseline Disclosures

Analysis examines Harvard animal-welfare benefit language and how baseline disclosures can clarify public-facing impact claims.

BOSTON, MA, UNITED STATES, May 6, 2026 /EINPresswire.com/ -- Fair Start Movement and

“

What are you doing to assure the conditions in which children born and raised are being improved so as not to undo the benefits of the work you are otherwise doing in the world?”

Fair Start Movement

TruthAlliance.global announced a baseline-disclosure analysis of animal-welfare and public-benefit language used by Massachusetts institutions, including language associated with Harvard’s Brooks McCormick Jr. Animal Law & Policy Program. The analysis examines how public statements about animal protection, institutional activity, and public benefit can be made clearer through plain-language baseline disclosures.

The analysis focuses on whether animal-welfare benefit language gives readers enough context to understand how institutional activities relate to broader statements about

progress, benefit, protection, compassion, or systemic change. The purpose is to make those statements easier to evaluate by identifying the assumptions behind them.

The Harvard example is narrow. Fair Start does not state that Harvard fabricated outputs or acted with bad motive. The analysis concerns whether aspirational institutional language can create a directional impression of progress for donors, students, partners, policymakers, and the public when the background information needed to understand that impression is not stated in plain language.

Read the full story here: <https://fairstartmovement.org/harvard-helped-create-a-fantasy-world-of-social-justice-undone-daily-by-birth-inequity/>

Harvard’s animal-focused program states that it is committed to analyzing and improving the treatment of animals. Harvard’s public animal-program materials also state that the program is trying to prove that better animal welfare is good for everyone.

Fair Start states that those phrases are structured as intent and process statements, not

completed outcome statements. The organization states that the ordinary public impression remains directional: that institutional support, student participation, donor attention, and public trust are attached to forward movement for animals.

“The question is not whether Harvard is doing work,” said Suriya Khan of Fair Start Movement. “The question is whether the public impression of progress is complete when the baseline is missing. If an institution builds trust through benefit language, audiences should be able to see what counts, what is excluded, what conditions may affect the stated direction of travel, and what information would require clarification.”

The analysis also identifies MSPCA-Angell and Humane World for Animals as additional examples. Fair Start states that MSPCA-Angell uses language such as “positively impacts the lives of tens of thousands of animals each year” and “drives meaningful, systemic change,” while its GuideStar profile states that a results metric is “no longer tracked.” Fair Start states that Humane World for Animals uses quantified statements involving plant-based meal transitions and hens affected by cage-free transitions, which may benefit from clearer baseline information to show how reported activities relate to broader statements of progress.

Fair Start’s approach is focused on clarity. Aspirational language is not inherently improper. Output metrics are not inherently incomplete. The issue presented is whether institutions that communicate progress, benefit, protection, compassion, or systemic change should also explain the baseline against which those statements are being understood.

The analysis describes baseline standards that distinguish program outputs from broader outcomes, explain modeling limits and relevant surrounding conditions, identify what populations and harms are counted or excluded, state the time horizon used, and explain what information would require narrowing, correcting, or qualifying benefit language.

Fair Start frames this as a practical clarity pathway, not punishment for imperfection. The proposed approach is straightforward: explain the baseline, separate outputs from broader outcomes, and make public-benefit language easier to evaluate before it shapes public understanding.

“Institutional integrity requires clarity about more than careful verbs,” said Ryan James Jessup

**Inequality and the Climate Crisis:
How did we get here?**

They chose the economy over human rights. A small group of largely wealthy white men chose economic growth rather than equity and democracy-building children's rights in policymaking. Representatives are now getting wealthier faster than the market and the people they represent.

↓
Making the least responsible most affected. This now means that the disenfranchised will suffer the brunt of a crisis for which they were least responsible including violations of their right to have even one child in healthy and safe conditions. And because of basic vote dilution (with 3 times as many voters per representative), voter suppression, and other factors, they will be unable to use democratic processes to protect themselves, and may rationally choose other measures.

↓
Driving the 1/10TH wealth gap Pro-growth policies have not only undone nearly three quarters of attempts to mitigate the crisis, but have also exacerbated the wealth gap between black and white families. Those policies have left black children with 1/10th the wealth that of their white peers.

↓
And causing millions to die. Climate change is now harming fetal and infant health primarily in vulnerable families of color, as heat increases threatens to kill millions in the future.

The real question: What are you doing to assure the conditions in which children born and raised are being improved so as not to undo the benefits of the work you are otherwise doing in the world?

FAIR START MOVEMENT

Question for Orgs

JD/MPA, Institutional Integrity Expert. "If public language creates a directional impression of progress, the baseline should be visible. Clearer explanation helps donors, students, partners, and the public understand what benefit language means and what it depends on."

The analysis also invites animal-welfare institutions to consider a voluntary baseline-reconciliation process using Fair Start's Tell the Truth framework and FalseClaimsChecker.org as screening tools for public-benefit statements.

About Fair Start Movement

Fair Start Movement is a public-interest initiative focused on baseline clarity in public-benefit language. Through research, public education, and plain-language analysis, it examines whether institutions explain the assumptions and standards behind statements of impact, benefit, protection, sustainability, and related outcome-oriented language. FalseClaimsChecker.org is one of its public-facing projects.

Suriya Khan

FairStartMovement.org

+ +1 516-725-3157

[email us here](#)

Visit us on social media:

[LinkedIn](#)

[Bluesky](#)

[Instagram](#)

[Facebook](#)

[YouTube](#)

[X](#)

This press release can be viewed online at: <https://www.einpresswire.com/article/910771742>

EIN Presswire's priority is source transparency. We do not allow opaque clients, and our editors try to be careful about weeding out false and misleading content. As a user, if you see something we have missed, please do bring it to our attention. Your help is welcome. EIN Presswire, Everyone's Internet News Presswire™, tries to define some of the boundaries that are reasonable in today's world. Please see our Editorial Guidelines for more information.

© 1995-2026 Newsmatics Inc. All Right Reserved.