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*GENERAL COMMENT: ALTHOUGH THERE IS A LOT OF SERIOUS CONTENT, THE OVERALL STYLE IS LIGHT-HEARTED PANTOMIME.*

*As AUDIENCE enter. The CLERK is in court, busy with papers and talking to the two BARRISTERS and the USHER. The CLERK knocks with a gavel.*

CLERK: All rise.

*All stand. The JUDGE enters and the CLERK bows to him. He takes his place.*

JUDGE: [*Explains a few things to the audience*]. Please bring the defendant into court.

*DAISY is brought into the dock. Her handler, COWHERD, is with her.*

JUDGE: Why is there a cow in the dock?

COWHERD: [*Mummerset accent*] It’s Daisy, Sir

JUDGE: Daisy who?

COWHERD: Just Daisy.

CLERK: Your Honour, Daisy is the defendant. If you’ve seen the file –

JUDGE: I didn’t know she was a cow. A cow is not a legal person. [*Moo!*]

Prosecution?

PROSECUTION: Yes your honour?

JUDGE: It says here that the defendant is accused of **ecocide**.

PROSECUTION: Yes, your honour. Of crimes against the future wellbeing of the planet.

JUDGE: Ecocide. Is that a crime?

PROSECUTION: Yes your Honour, it is a term introduced by the eminent Jurist Polly Higgins, analogous to **genocide**, which is already recognized in international law. Ecocide refers to global processes that will result in permanent damage to the biosphere, with serious implications for the future of humanity.

JUDGE: Such as?

PROSECUTION: Climate change, loss of wildlife habitats and genetic diversity, excess nitrogen and phosphorus in the biosphere, ocean acidification, and unsustainable freshwater consumption -

JUDGE: You’re telling me this cow is responsible for climate change? [MOO!]

PROSECUTION: Not on her own - Daisy is representative of the whole livestock industry.

JUDGE: I can’t try a cow. Unless there’s some precedent for this, I’m minded to clear

the court -

CLERK: [*Riffling through a large tome*] Your honour, in er….1394, a pig was hanged for eating a consecrated wafer. In 1474, a cock was tried for having laid an egg. In 1480, a number of rats were put on trial, charged with feloniously eating and destroying a barley crop….

JUDGE: Very well. Very well. The trial will go ahead. On this occasion it is appropriate for the general public to be represented by the entire audience. Ladies and gentlemen, you are now collectively the Jury. So please pay close attention to the proceedings. When the main trial is over, you will have an opportunity to ask questions and express your own views. There will then be a secret ballot to determine the Verdict. It will be your task to determine whether the defendant is Guilty or Not guilty. Mr Hawkins, are you prepared to act as Foreman?

HAWKINS [*Stands*] I am, your Honour.

[*To Clerk*] Please read out the charge.

CLERK: Daisy the cow stands accused of crimes against the future wellbeing of the

planet. Of complicity in **ecocide**.

JUDGE: Members of the jury.

You have heard the charge. And that is what you are trying.

This is strictly a matter of environmental impacts. It is not about jobs or livelihoods or animal welfare, and certainly not about **veganism**.

*DAISY becomes distressed.*

DAISY: Moo! Moo!

JUDGE: Please control the defendant!

COWHERD: Sorry Your Honour, the defendant -- is a **vegan**.

JUDGE: Vegan or not, the defendant must settle down in the dock. Does she understand the charge?

COWHERD: Oh, yes, she understands, Your Honour.

JUDGE: So when the Clerk reads the charge, will she tell us how she pleads?

COWHERD: Yes. She will give one moo for guilty and two moos for not guilty.

CLERK: Daisy the cow, you stand accused of crimes against the future wellbeing of the planet. Of complicity in ecocide. Please signal by giving one moo for “Guilty” and two moos for “Not Guilty”. How do you plead?

DAISY: Mooo!

 *Everyone waits. Nothing. The JUDGE looks around. Starts to gather his papers.*

JUDGE: Ah -

DAISY: Mooo!

DEFENCE: My client pleads “Not guilty”, your honour.

JUDGE: Very well.

Prosecution, do you want to tell the jury about this case?

PROSECUTION: Thank you, your Honour.

Members of the Jury, I prosecute this case.

As we know from the charge, this case addresses crimes against the planet on which we all depend.

We are here to try Daisy **as a representative of the livestock industry as a whole**. The issue of livestock and meat has become a very important one.

There are strongly held views on both sides – on the one hand that Daisy and other livestock are beneficial to us and our planet, and on the other, that her presence threatens life on earth as we know it.

This is not merely a question of climate change. Livestock also have disproportionate influence on biodiversity, land appropriation, fresh water supplies, and excessive pollution from nitrogen and phosphorus.

*DAISY shakes her head. [Moo]*

COWHERD: Poor cow.

JUDGE: Silence in court!

PROSECUTION: I’d like to call Professor Stuart Reynolds

CLERK Professor Reynolds!

 *SR, already in the AUDIENCE, takes the witness box.*

PROSECUTION: You are Stuart Reynolds, Emeritus Professor of Biology in the University of Bath? REYNOLDS: Yes.

PROSECUTION: Author of many learned papers, and an authority on food and climate change

REYNOLDS: Yes.

PROSECUTION: Professor Reynolds, climate change is probably the greatest problem humanity will

face this century. It is reported that we have fifteen or twenty years left to reduce greenhouse gas emissions to a very low level before the risks of irreversible harm rise significantly. What role does the livestock sector play in climate change?

REYNOLDS: Climate Change is largely driven by the emission of greenhouse gases, mostly from human activities. Currently about twenty five percent of that is attributable to agriculture, when both direct emissions and agriculturally induced deforestation are taken into account. Livestock contribute about fifteen percent of the global total.

*DAISY does a big burp. The JUDGE looks round.*

COWHERD: Sorry, sir – she’s a bit unsettled.

JUDGE: Please continue.

PROSECUTION: Thank you, your honour. Professor, could you tell us more about how livestock contribute to climate change?

REYNOLDS It is partly from land cleared of forest to produce feed., Partly from fertilisers needed to produce the feed, Partly from manure, and partly from methane release by grazing livestock.

PROS So grazing livestock – like Daisy – [MOO!] are rather special?

REYNOLDS: There are two kinds of farm animals. Some – like pigs and poultry and farmed fish – eat food crops from land that, in principle, could feed us. They compete with us for field space.

Other animals – grazing livestock or ruminants, like sheep goats and cattle [*Pause*: MOO!] are able to eat grass that we cannot eat, and turn it into meat and milk.

PROS So these ruminants are really good then? [MOO!]

REYNOLDS Well yes, but there’s a catch. In turning grass into meat and milk they emit methane, a very powerful greenhouse gas [BURP]. And they take up a lot of space [MOO!].

JUDGE [to cowherd] Will you please keep the defendant quiet!

COWHERD Sorry your honour. [to Daisy], There there, girl.

JUDGE Proceed.

PROS Don’t the other livestock emit methane too?

REYNOLDS Not so much, mostly from their manure. To give you some idea of the proportions, the emissions from producing a kilo of beef steak are about **ten times** more than from a kilo of chicken.

PROS Really? That is a very substantial difference. What about the space needed?

REYNOLDS Producing beef and lamb – and cheese – takes about **three times** more land than producing pork and chicken [MOO!]

PROS But, if I understand correctly, this is grassland -- that cannot be used for other purposes.

REYNOLDS Yes, if you think that the purpose of all land is to produce food.

PROS What other uses are there?

REYNOLDS Grassland occupies more than half of the UK’s area. We could use it better for sustainable energy production, for raw materials, for carbon sequestration, and as habitat for maintaining biodiversity. [*Animals wave placards and shout slogans*]

JUDGE Silence in court!

PROS Are you saying then, that we should eat less beef, lamb and dairy products, and more eggs and poultry?

REYNOLDS Relatively perhaps, but even the non-grazing livestock emit far more carbon – and take more land – than most crop products, typically **five times** more. So in a world that needs to decarbonise quickly, a sustainable diet would need very substantial reductions of **all** livestock products.

PROS Thank you, no further questions.

JUDGE Defence?

DEF Thank you, your honour. Professor Reynolds, you claim that lower levels of livestock would produce a sustainable diet. But is it not the case that in a growing world we need all the food we can get? It does not sound sensible to abandon a significant sector of the food supply.

REYNOLDS On the contrary, livestock production is intrinsically inefficient. So inefficient in fact, that reducing livestock and eating crops directly actually **increases** the total quantity of food. We would achieve greater, not less, food security.

DEF Surely, Professor, you are neglecting the **quality** of the food. Do we not get all our protein from livestock?

REYNOLDS Currently we get about half, but that half is easily replaced by vegetable proteins of equivalent quality, with lower emissions and less land.

DEF What about the nutritional balances? Surely you could not claim that a low-livestock diet is more healthy?

REYNOLDS I could. There is strong scientific evidence that a low-livestock diet improves human health in the long term. Admittedly meat is tasty, which is why we eat it, but it is not nutritionally necessary.

DEF Would you say, Professor Reynolds, that your vision of a low-livestock food system is more easily contemplation by **vegetarians**?

REYNOLDS I suppose it might well be.

DEF Are you in fact a vegetarian yourself?

PROS Objection, your honour: this is not relevant to the main argument.

JUDGE Objection overruled.

DEF: Well, Professor?

REYNOLDS [*Slowly*] Yes, I am a vegetarian.

DEF [*Raises eyebrows, meaningful look at the audience/jury*] No further questions, your honour.

PROSECUTION: I’d like to call a further witness your Honour. A Hedgehog.

CLERK: Call Ms Hedgehog.

*A HEDGEHOG comes from the audience, leaving her* *animal friends there. They yell encouragement, and slogans. Cleaner rivers for fish! More ponds for ducks! More jam for wasps! She takes her place in the witness stand*

JUDGE Silence in Court. Please proceed.

PROS You are, if I understand it, Madame l’Herisson, an official of the Hedgehog Union in France, currently travelling in the United Kingdom.

HEDGE That is correct.

PROS May I call you Ms Hedgehog?

HEDGE You may.

PROS Thank you. In the light of your observations in this country, do you have any views on British agricultural practices that you would like to tell the court?

HEDGE Mais oui! I have been visiting my cousins here in Britain and they have nowhere to live! The pressure from agriculture is really terrible. There are no homes left.

[*Racket from animals in audience, slogans, placards waving*]

JUDGE Silence in court!

PROS Ms Hedgehog, would you say that grazing has affected your cousins’ livelihoods?

HEDGE Of course it has. Grazing takes up so much space. And so-called Improved Grassland is rubbish for wildlife – hardly any grubs or worms to eat. It affects all us wild creatures. We used to get along pretty well, but now it’s put us against each other. For example, what you call them – blaireaux – **badgers**. In the old days, we ate our insects, they ate theirs. But now they eat **us**!

BADGER [In audience, with placard] More setts for badgers!

JUDGE Who said that?

BADGER [*Stands]* I did. More setts for Badgers!

JUDGE I will not have such lewd remarks in my court. Usher, please eject that animal.

CLERK [*Aside to audience*] He’s a deaf old coot. [*To Judge*] Your honour, I believe this member of the jury was calling for Setts, S-E-T-T-S, not….

JUDGE Oh, very well, proceed. [*Badger sits down, cursing*]

PROS No further questions you honour. [*to Defence Counsel*] Your witness.

DEF Ms Hedgehog, is it not the case that the loss of homes you report is largely due to the removal of hedgerows to facilitate **ploughing**, rather than to expand pastures?

HEDGE I don’t know all the details. All I know is that habitats are disappearing and there are fewer and fewer of us wild creatures anywhere. I also know that more than half the land of Britain is taken up by [sharp look at Daisy] cows! [MOO!]. We’re not fussy where we live and we’re not fussy what we eat --- beetles, slugs, caterpillars. But even these are disappearing!

JUDGE: Is this entirely relevant to the case in hand?

HEDGEHOG: [*To audience as a whole*] Would it be relevant to you if eighty percent of the shelves in Waitrose were empty?

DEF No further questions.

JUDGE Thank you Ms Hedgehog, you may stand down.

HEDGE No your honour, I have something more to say, on behalf of wildlife everywhere. Do you know that farm animals now outweigh us wild mammals by **ten to one**? It’s not just hedgehogs, it’s sloths, pandas, koalas, tigers, lemurs, rhinos, dolphins, polar bears: we’re all under threat because of what you humans are doing to the planet… [*pandemonium among the animals, slogans etc*]

JUDGE Silence in court. Silence! [*Gradually calms down*]. You are behaving like…animals!

[*to Hedgehog*] Please stand down. This is not strictly necessary.

HEDGE Well, are **you** strictly necessary? The planet could survive without judges, but not without biodiversity.

JUDGE Stand down or I’ll have you in contempt of court.

*[Hedgehog glowers at Judge, perhaps some kind of “French” gesture. As she leaves the witness box, she gives the clenched-fist salute to the animals. They cheer].*

*JUDGE Silence in court. We will proceed with the case for the Defence.*

 [*DAISY moos and moos.*]

JUDGE: Quiet!

COWHERD: Your honour! I’m afraid Daisy needs to go to the little cow’s room

  *[FX, REPEATED FARTS, DREADFUL DIARRHOEA NOISES]* Oh, too late!

JUDGE: What is that awful smell?

COWHERD: Has anyone got a bucket?

JUDGE: Bucket for the defendant please. Quickly!

[*The USHER brings a bucket. Business, farts, moos*]

JUDGE: May we now please proceed with the case for the Defence.

DEFENCE: Thank-you, your honour. First, I would like to call Dr BROWNE.

 [*Browne takes the stand.*]

DEFENCE: You are Dr Jasper Browne, formerly Professor of Agricultural Science at

Cotswold University, and are now CEO of Feedalot, a major supplier of feedstuffs for livestock?

BROWNE: I am.

DEFENCE: It has been suggested that livestock numbers should be reduced and that people should eat less meat and dairy products. We have even heard that such diets might bring better health. Would you agree?

BROWNE: It is a fact that as societies develop and get richer, people want to eat more meat. People demand meat, we supply it – it’s not up to us to tell people what to eat.

If government or society decide it’s wrong, so be it, but it’s not up to farmers or even Daisy to decide. Can you imagine Wales without sheep? Denmark without pigs? China without chickens?

DEFENCE: Do you agree that there should be much lower levels of livestock?

BROWNE: The level comes from market demand, and there’ll be more demand as the population grows and the world gets richer, it’s a natural process.

DEFENCE: What do you say to the claim that livestock are responsible for fifteen percent of greenhouse gas emissions?

BROWNE: Scientists are always changing their minds about these things. Even if methane is a problem, which is disputed, there are technologies in development that could solve it. Feed containing charcoal and various kinds of seaweed for example. Let’s simply invest in these new techniques.

DEFENCE: What about nitrous oxide, which is an extremely potent greenhouse gas?

BROWNE: Nitrous oxide is mostly released from soils. Emissions from land used for

crops are much higher than emissions from grazing land. Grazing is good.

DEFENCE: Are there any other comparisons between arable land and crops on the one

hand, and pasture and grazing livestock on the other?

BROWNE: Yes. Erosion – the loss of soil – is much greater from arable fields than from

Pasture, precisely because arable is constantly tilled. So the difference in greenhouse gas emissions between arable and pasture-based production is much less than some people suggest. The balance might even **favour** pastureland and grazing livestock.

Soils hold more carbon than there is in the atmosphere and all the world’s forests combined. So we need to keep that carbon in the soil, and the best way to do that is to keep land in grass and the only way to get food from that land is to graze it with animals and then consume the meat and the milk.

DEFENCE: It has been suggested that many livestock products can be substituted with products made directly from plant materials. What do you think of this?

BROWNE: Meat is a natural product made from grass, soil and sunshine. Artificial ‘meats’ are highly processed factory products. There isn’t enough information to be sure yet but my hunch is we’ll find it’s like biofuels - when you add up all the inputs, you get less energy out than you put in.

DAISY: [Moos approval]

JUDGE: Silence in court!

DEFENCE: The prosecution have suggested that livestock are implicated in many other global environmental problems, not only climate change but loss of biodiversity, water supply, land appropriation and excess nitrogen in the biosphere. Do you have any comments?

BROWNE: All forms of food production have had negative effects on the natural world –

not just livestock. But when it comes to ruminants, like Daisy, I’d say that on balance they’ve done less harm than commercial soya or veg production, because twenty five percent of all biodiversity is in healthy soils and the soils under grass are a lot healthier than those under crops. In addition, if you take a look round the countryside, you’ll see there are a lot more hedgerows and trees round grass fields with cows in than around fields growing vegetables. That’s because hedgerows provide a boundary to keep the animals from straying. In contrast, hedges and trees get in the way of crop farming and delay ripening, which is why many crop farmers have grubbed them up.

ANIMALS: Save our homes! More hedges for hogs! More setts for badgers! More trees for sloths!

DEFENCE: Thank you, no further questions. Your witness. [*Returns to seat, Prosecution takes his place*]

PROSECUTION: Dr Browne, isn’t it true that farm animals are in direct competition with

humans for grain, and that we wouldn’t need so much if this was fed directly to people instead of animals?

BROWNE: We do use a lot of grain for pigs and poultry, and for dairy cows like Daisy. [Moo!] But you’re comparing chalk and cheese. A lot of the grain in our feed is what you might call reject grain: wheat that’s not suitable for bread-making. You wouldn’t want to eat it.

PROSECUTION: Dr BROWNE, the company of which you are CEO uses large quantities of

soya meal from Brazil and palm oil from Malaysia, doesn’t it, both of which

have resulted in substantial tropical deforestation?

BROWNE: I accept that soya meal and palm oil are important components of the feeds sold to intensive livestock farmers by my company. But these products are also used in foods consumed directly by people. We have already spoken of the so-called meat substitutes. What are they made of? Soya meal! Those vegans have a lot to answer for.

PROSECUTION: Is it not the case that 75% of global soya production is fed to livestock, while only 6% is actually for human use, mostly in the far east?

BROWNE: I don’t have the exact numbers in front of me.

PROSECUTION: If the population is growing and everyone wants to eat meat at current Western levels, Dr Browne, don’t you agree that this will mean more feeding of grain to cattle, pigs and poultry?

BROWNE: Well…

PROSECUTION: And finally, can you tell us whether it’s correct that the rearing of Livestock

requires more land than the growing of crops, meaning that in total there is less set aside for other purposes, such as nature – for wildlife?

BROWNE: Yes, but –

ANIMALS: Save our homes! Save our homes! More setts for badgers! etc

PROSECUTION: Yes or no will suffice.

BROWNE: Yes.

PROSECUTION: Thank you, no further questions. [*He sits down*]

DEFENCE: My next witness is Ms Grass.

CLERK: Ms Grass to the stand.

 *Ms Grass goes to stroke Daisy. Gets nuzzled and grazed. Daisy moos.*

JUDGE: Could you tell me your age, Ms Grass?

MS GRASS: I became widespread one hundred and twenty million years ago.

JUDGE: Right.

JUDGE: Do you have a religion?

MS GRASS: I follow the sun and the seasons. [Judge rolls his eyes]

DEFENCE: Ms Grass, you are a member of the Poaceae family. And can I clarify that you

go back one hundred and twenty million years, even before the existence of

cows?

MS GRASS: Yes, it all started with dinosaurs, but I’m very adaptable.

*DAISY gives a big belch.*

DEFENCE: But surely you don’t actually **relish** being eaten.

MS GRASS: I don’t mind, it doesn’t kill me. It’s more like having a haircut. I grow from the bottom, not the top. I have a good relationship with Daisy – I feed her and she gives me nutrients. [MOO!]

DEFENCE: What do you think of the conditions here in Britain?

GRASS: Paradise! I cover half of it. If it wasn’t for me, it might turn into forest!

DEFENCE: Are you saying that grazing can actually increase biodiversity?

GRASS Yes, in some places grazing maintains an ecological balance that produces a

huge variety of wildflowers and butterflies.

DEFENCE: It is sometimes claimed that you and the grazers together can actually take carbon dioxide out of the air and store it in the soil, helping to counteract global warming. Is this really the case?

MS GRASS: Yes. My roots can go deep down into the soil, and as I grow new roots each year and my old roots die off die off and decompose into a stable form of carbon called humus which I later take up again to help me grow. The grasslands contain far more carbon than those pathetic ploughed fields.

DEFENCE: I have no further questions, your honour. [*Sits, replaced by PROS*]

PROSECUTION: Ms Grass, you claimed that in some circumstances grazing can increase

biodiversity. However, is it true that most grazing in Britain consists of just a few grass species and very little biodiversity at all?

GRASS Sadly, yes: the humans involved could do a lot better.

PROSECUTION: So on the whole, biodiversity has not been increased by the existence of livestock?

GRASS: No, it has not, but that is hardly the fault of the livestock.

PROS Finally Ms Grass, could I ask whether the carbon sequestering effects of grazing could equally be achieved by mowing?

GRASS: Well, in principle, yes, but I’d prefer to be nuzzled by the gentle snouts of ruminants than scalped by great smelly, soil-compacting machines.

PROSECUTION: Thank you, no further questions.

JUDGE: Please stand down.

 [*The GRASS leaves the witness stand, via a last smooch with Daisy. Daisy grazes her back and she wriggles with ecstasy*]

JUDGE: Defence, have you further witnesses to call?

DEF No, your Honour

JUDGE: Prosecution, would you please make your closing remarks?

PROSECUTION: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, I would like you to consider what you see,

when you look at the defendant in the dock. “Poor cow” you may think. But here is no simple cow, this cow is representative of a worldwide industry that is driving the biosphere beyond its sustainable limits.

*DAISY moos and shakes her head – COWHERD comforts her.*

Historically, eating meat has been for the rich. In our modern world, almost everyone wants to do it. And why shouldn’t they? Because eating meat is an unnecessary luxury that is destroying our planet.

*DAISY moos mournfully.*

JUDGE: Can I please ask that the defendant restrains herself? Continue.

PROSECUTION: Consider the smoking of tobacco - once seen as pleasant and even health-

giving. When evidence started to prove that smoking is dangerous and addictive, the tobacco industry fought to prevent policies that would reduce its harm, using every trick possible. Even smokers themselves have been reluctant to give up.

The global meat industry and its products are very similar. It would be wrong to say that meat-eating is as harmful to human health as tobacco – but it is harmful to our planet. And that is what we are concerned with here today. And the consequences of that on humankind and on every living thing who shares this world.

ANIMALS: Here here! Here here! Homes for wildlife! Setts for Badgers! Trees for sloths! Etc etc

JUDGE: Silence in court!

PROSECUTION: We cannot continue to gamble the lives of future generations, of plants and

animals, for a few burgers and kebabs. We must stop.

The global meat industry is complicit in life-threatening trends. Complicit in Ecocide. Representing that global industry, the defendant is clearly guilty. [MOO!]

JUDGE: Defence?
DEFENCE: Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, it is not really Daisy who is in the dock

today, but the entire global livestock industry, which the prosecution have painted as a monolithic monster intent on destroying the biosphere. In reality, this industry is made up of thousands - millions - of honest farmers, farm workers, feed & equipment manufacturers, vets, slaughtermen, renderers, milk-tanker drivers, makers of cheeses and sausages, even the local butcher, all working hard to bring us low-cost, safe, nutritious food that we really want to eat.

Livestock products are a vital part of our diet: the most nutritious, the tastiest, the easiest to prepare, the cornerstone of any meal. The industry provides all this in abundance, just as public demand requires. No subsidies, no moral grandstanding - the invisible hand of the market gives you exactly what you want.  As for Daisy’s supposed environmental impacts, we have heard how some of these are actually positive. We have also heard how technology can reduce other impacts to levels we can live with. A combination of market forces and technology will both bring home the bacon, and deliver us from evil.

What is the alternative? [*Sneering delivery*] Turnips. Beans. Brussels sprouts. Veggie burgers. And soya milk imported from Brazil and palm oil from Malaysia, where it’s the demand from vegans that’s wrecking the rainforests, not just cattle.

The Britain we want is one where cows and sheep graze contentedly, where crops and livestock complement each other to provide the great British diet: the Full English with bacon and sausages, the lamb with mint sauce, the roast beef and Yorkshire pudding. If Daisy is guilty, it's goodbye to all this. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Jury, acquit her.

JUDGE: Members of the jury. You are responsible for weighing up the evidence and deciding the facts of the case. The Court will now adjourn, and you will have a short period of discussion when you can make points and ask questions. You will all be given ballot papers. You may contribute your decision by placing a tick under one of two boxes marked Guilty or Not Guilty. On this occasion, the Court considers a majority verdict sufficient to convict or acquit.

 We will reconvene in due course.

CLERK: All rise.

 *All rise and the JUDGE exits.*

*The JURY /AUDIENCE have time to discuss the evidence. They will then conduct a secret ballot. The ballot papers will be delivered to tellers, who will count them up and convey the result in writing to the Jury foreperson.*

**THE VERDICT.**

COURT REASSEMBLES FOR THE VERDICT

CLERK: All rise.

[*Judge enters*]

CLERK: Please be seated.

JUDGE: Ladies and gentlemen of the Jury, have you considered your verdict?

FOREPERSON We have, your Honour.

JUDGE: And what is the verdict? Is the defendant Guilty, or Not Guilty?

[*Dramatic pause? Two possible versions*.]

A: Guilty, your Honour.

JUDGE: Daisy the Cow, you have been found guilty of the most egregious crimes against the biosphere. In passing sentence I would like to ask the defence Counsel whether there are any mitigating circumstances.

DEF: [*Hamming it up*] Your Honour, the defendant was orphaned at a very early age [*aaah!*] She was subject to continual sexual exploitation, and had all her children forcibly removed, causing great distress [*oooh!*]. Her diet is strictly controlled, with a vicious cocktail of drugs mixed in in to her feed [*tut tut*]. She is subject to involuntary euthanasia [*oh no!*]

JUDGE: There is no need to milk it…. [*groans*]

DEF: I was going on to say your Honour, that she is a productive and respected member of her peer-group, and from a very good family. I believe her mother was the cow with the crumpled horn, and her father was the Bull in the China Shop….

JUDGE: [*Interrupting*] Thank you, Defence, that is quite enough Bull from you. [*more groans*] However, in view of the defendant’s unfortunate history the Court considers a Community Sentence to be appropriate.

[Portentously] Daisy the Cow, you are sentenced to spend the rest of your days amusing children on a City Farm.

[Daisy is led away to start her sentence, mooing mournfully]

The court is adjourned.

CLERK: All rise.

[*Judge exits, court breaks up*]

*Or the result could be: B*:

FOREPERSON: **Not Guilty**.

DAISY: Moo! Moo! [Wild cheering]

DEF: Your Honour, may I ask that my client be released?

JUDGE: The defendant is free to go.

*[Daisy does a lap of honour, with garlands, mooing, all the animals make up a wild conga*]