Lisa Kane, JD, studied and practiced law in Madison, Wisconsin, for 31 years before relocating to Boulder, Colorado in 2007. She began her legal career as counsel to the Wisconsin Department of Agriculture, specializing in animal health and meat inspection issues. In 2004, she founded the Coalition for Captive Elephant Well-Being, an ad hoc group composed of zoo industry professionals, veterinarians, animal behaviorists, academics, field scientists, animal welfare experts and law professionals. The group’s purpose is to disseminate science-based analysis and recommendations for institutions holding elephants in captivity. The Coalition issued two white papers in 2005: "Optimal Conditions for Elephants in Captivity," by Lisa Kane, JD, Debra Forthman, Ph.D., and David Hancocks; and "Best Practices by the Coalition for Captive Elephant Well-Being," edited by Lisa Kane, JD, Debra Forthman, Ph.D., and David Hancocks. (Both documents are available on the Protocols, Manuals, and Standards page at http://www.elephantcare.org/protoman.htm under Management.)

In 2006, the Coalition co-sponsored a two-day symposium, “A Symposium on Captive Elephants: Science and Welfare” with the Center for Animals and Public Policy at Tufts University. An Elephant in the Room: The Science and Well-Being of Elephants in Captivity, edited by Debra Forthman, Ph.D., Lisa Kane, JD, David Hancocks and Paul Waldau, JD, Ph.D., is scheduled for publication by Tufts University Cummings School of Veterinary Medicine’s Center for Animals and Public Policy in Spring 2008. The book will include papers presented at the symposium and the Coalition’s white papers.

Lisa describes her ASI project: I will research and write a book length manuscript addressing: how to accelerate the assimilation of science into policies affecting elephants in captivity by applying the precautionary principle to common practices and assumptions of institutions, notably zoos, that hold elephants. Building on my work on both Coalition documents and my chapter in the Tufts book, I will suggest a pioneering effort to bring systematic cross-institutional knowledge to bear on the critical task of defining captive elephant well-being. Based on my years of experience with the zoo industry, I will argue that we must put welfare of
elephants at the core of our efforts or institutions holding them will content themselves with incremental change in perpetuity, all the while claiming to be doing their best. In order to jump-start the process, I will outline the science-policy gap characterizing industry and governmental standards and the assumptions upon which they are built. I will summarize the evidence suggesting that this gap accounts for measurable suffering of elephants in captivity. I will argue that the most significant obstacles to reconciling the science-policy gap are found in the zoo industry's lack of economic capacity and its cultural insularity. I will contend that these economic exigencies and cultural isolation explain the zoo industry's non-scientific vision and fuel its suspicion of innovation, its intolerance of failure or risk, and its dysfunctional relationship to scientific knowledge.

The second half of the book will explain and apply the precautionary principle to key issues of captive elephant welfare debate, whether that captivity is found in manmade parks covering thousands of acres in South Africa or tiny enclosures in urban North America. Because the public is most familiar with zoos, I will spend a significant amount of time on two readily understandable zoo issues: space, and the continued endorsement of corporal punishment by zoos and similar enterprises as a means to train and control elephants. I intend to demonstrate the precautionary principle's usefulness as an analytic tool to manage and define a future in which elephants may flourish whether we lack hard data, as we do on elephant space needs, or whether we enjoy encyclopedic empirical knowledge, as we do on stress and distress experienced by sentient creatures when physical punishment is utilized as a training or management tool. I intend that the book present sufficient detail and precision to ignite deeper debate on elephant conservation in the professional community while employing an engaging style permitting a college-educated general reader to readily absorb the magnitude of the crisis elephants face: suffering followed by premature death in zoos unable to deliver adequate welfare to them or to save their kin in the wild.