

MARS AND THE INDUSTRIAL PET FOOD EXPERIMENT | ANALYTICAL MEMORANDUM

Childhood Conditioning: What the Meta Comparison Can Carry

A disciplined comparison of behaviour-shaping systems, evidence and legal limits

Publication date: 5 September 2026 | Status: Publication and investigation memorandum

Bottom line: Use Meta to explain how a commercial actor can manufacture the reality within which later 'choices' occur. The PIAS allegation has three linked stages: normalise pet acquisition, normalise industrial feeding, then normalise the resulting disease, pain and treatment. Children carry that reality into adulthood and parenthood. The endpoint is therefore alleged cruelty to dependent animals and deception of consumers, not merely recurring expenditure. Do not claim that pet food is addictive, that PetPEP is equivalent to an algorithm, or that the US consent judgment proves an Australian claim against Mars.

1. Why the comparison is valuable

The Meta proceedings shift attention from isolated content to system design. The multistate complaint did not merely allege that particular posts were harmful. It alleged a business model centred on maximising youth engagement, product features designed to prolong use, knowledge of developmental vulnerability, misleading safety representations and internal research inconsistent with the public message. [21]

That architecture supplies a productive question for PIAS and PetPEP: should the Mars inquiry assess isolated statements, or the complete system through which research, journalists, schools, veterinarians, councils, welfare organisations and take-home materials shaped pet acquisition and continuing household behaviour?

2. The legal status of the Meta matter

- The 2023 multistate complaint contains allegations, not findings. It pleaded unfair or deceptive practices, COPPA violations and common-law theories. [21]

- The August 2026 consent judgment records the states' allegation that Meta used Facebook and Instagram to entice, engage and ultimately ensnare youth and misled the public about danger. [22]
- Meta denied the allegations and liability. [22,24]
- The agreement imposes age assurance, time and night-use restrictions, notification limits, parental tools, independent auditing and substantial payments. [22-24]
- The judgment expressly states that it is for settlement purposes, is not an admission or final adjudication, does not set a standard of care outside participating states and is not international precedent. [22]
- Australian headlines describing about A\$24 billion convert the maximum US\$18 billion across state settlements; the figures include contingent components and a separate Texas agreement. [23-25]

Any publication should preserve these qualifications. They strengthen credibility and prevent an analogy from being misrepresented as a transferred verdict.

3. Childhood conditioning as an operational concept

For this investigation, childhood conditioning should be defined as organised, repeated norm-setting directed through institutions trusted by children and families, with an intended or measured effect on durable behaviour. The concept has four elements:

1. Vulnerability or developmental sensitivity: children are forming habits, identities and expectations.
2. Authority: messages arrive through school, teachers, veterinarians, science communication or welfare language rather than ordinary sales channels.
3. Behavioural objective: the communication is capable of producing, and in PetPEP's case is reported to produce, household requests and acquisition.
4. Long tail: acquisition creates a dependent relationship and recurring expenditure extending well beyond the original intervention.

This definition is descriptive. It does not presume coercion, diagnose a child or establish that every participant was affected.

For PIAS, the operational allegation is not one conditioned preference but an installed sequence of realities: owning a pet is normal; feeding an industrial product under professional authority is normal; and the animal's dental disease, odour, pain, chronic illness and treatment are normal incidents rather than corrective signals. Repetition across schools, homes, media, veterinary practices and public institutions makes the sequence cultural and intergenerational.

4. Mechanism comparison

Question	Meta record	PIAS / PetPEP record	Assessment
What is monetised?	Youth attention, engagement and data	Pet-owning households and downstream category spend	Comparable commercial dependency; different transaction
How is behaviour shaped?	Alleged algorithms, notifications, infinite scroll and social comparison	School education, emotional framing, research claims, media repetition and professional authority	Comparable environment design; no technical equivalence
What is the youth outcome?	Extended platform use alleged	Requests for pets and household acquisition reported	PetPEP outcome is expressly publicised
What role do parents play?	Consent and controls alleged to be inadequate	Parents decide after childhood and household norms have been shaped	Parental choice is not a complete defence to upstream design
What did the company know?	Complaint alleged internal research and concealment	PIAS commissioned research; internal strategy and full results unknown	Evidence gap is central, not permission to assume
What is the claimed harm?	Compulsive use and mental or physical harm	Foreseeable animal cruelty and consumer deception within an allegedly harmful feeding-and-treatment system	Product, causation, knowledge and deception still require proof
What was represented?	Safety and non-manipulation allegedly misrepresented	Autonomous, non-commercial community service and accurate information claimed	Investigate meaning, disclosure and operational reality
What remains available?	Court record and regulated compliance system	Public-facing PIAS corpus largely absent from live web	Archive disappearance raises a separate accountability issue

Table note: the Meta column summarises pleaded allegations or settlement obligations; it does not convert allegations into findings. The PIAS column distinguishes public self-description from outstanding questions.

5. The strongest parallel: design beats the single-message defence

A system can shape behaviour without any single message doing all the work. In the Meta case, the alleged mechanism was an interacting set of product features. In the PIAS inquiry, the potential mechanism is an interacting set of institutional channels:

- research creates apparently objective claims;
- media releases turn claims into repeatable stories;
- journalists and broadcasters confer editorial authority;
- schools confer educational legitimacy;
- veterinarians confer professional trust;
- children carry the desired norm into the household; and
- pet acquisition locks the household into years of dependent care and spending.

This is the most defensible use of the Meta analogy: both inquiries concern whether the commercial actor should be judged only by individual statements or by the behaviour-shaping architecture it designed, funded or sustained.

6. The strongest difference: attention is not acquisition

Meta allegedly sought repeated use of a platform by the child. PIAS and PetPEP operate through a household-acquisition decision. The child may influence the decision, but adults usually acquire the animal and bear the legal and financial responsibility. The moral endpoint is nevertheless the animal, not the transaction. The project alleges a further chain from designed acquisition to normalised processed feeding, inadequate prevention, disease, pain and profitable treatment. If decision-makers knowingly built or defended that pathway despite foreseeable preventable suffering, the conduct would be cruel and unconscionable in the ordinary moral sense. Each link - product, advice, causation, knowledge and institutional response - must be proved.

The publication should therefore use 'conditioning', 'market formation', 'category development' or 'demand pathway'. It should avoid 'addiction' unless referring specifically and accurately to the allegations in the Meta proceeding.

7. Parent responsibility is not a complete answer

The defence that 'parents made the decision' assumes an autonomous chooser standing outside the system. That is the very assumption under examination. Today's parent was yesterday's child, exposed to the same cultural propositions about pets, food, veterinary authority and normal disease. The child's request then acts on an adult whose own baseline may already have been commercially and institutionally formed.

Parents retain agency and responsibility for the animal. But responsibility at the household endpoint does not erase responsibility for designing the upstream choice environment. PetPEP's reported 58% request rate and 20% acquisition rate demonstrate measurable child influence. WHO likewise reports in the human-food context that marketing affects children's food choices, purchase requests to adults and developing consumption norms. [13,33]

The investigative questions are therefore: who designed the child's request; what authority surrounded it; what commercial interest was disclosed; what risks and alternatives were omitted; what assumptions had already shaped the parent; and was either generation given a realistic opportunity to evaluate the system's provenance and consequences?

8. The cybernetic comparison: when harm cannot correct the system

A functioning system uses negative feedback to detect error and change course. Animal pain, common periodontal disease, escalating treatment, consumer expense and professional warning should have

challenged the feeding convention. The alleged architecture instead converted those signals into reinforcement: disease generated treatment, treatment reinforced professional authority, authority validated the food, and reassurance reproduced the same behaviour in the next generation.

This is stronger than saying consumers were persuaded. It says the system's error-correcting capacity was corrupted. Harm was normalised; the institutions capable of recognising it were commercially or culturally aligned with the prevailing model; and the disappearance of the PIAS record weakened institutional memory. The system thereby lacked adequate internal negative feedback.

The loop is not metaphysically permanent. It can be broken only by supplying corrective inputs the existing architecture failed to generate or accept: preserved archives, independent research, conflict disclosure, longitudinal outcome data, legal discovery, regulation and culturally visible feeding alternatives.

9. What the comparison says about superior knowledge

The Meta complaint put internal research and knowledge asymmetry at the centre of the alleged misconduct. [21] For PIAS, the corresponding evidence is incomplete. We know PIAS commissioned research and publicly translated pet-benefit claims. We also know the AVA acknowledges that oral disease is painful and potentially systemic, Waltham research describes canine periodontal disease as frequent, and diet-associated warnings reached an AVA professional audience by 1992. [26-29] We do not yet know the complete study portfolio, negative or null findings, internal reviews, strategic objectives or who received and acted on those warnings.

The responsible inference is not that damaging internal documents must exist. It is that Mars, PIAS and the organised profession were uniquely placed to resolve the risk and notice questions. Their records should reveal what was known, when, by whom, and whether expansion and reassurance continued after credible warning.

10. Where the conspiracy allegation fits

A network of aligned interests is not automatically a criminal conspiracy. Under the federal Criminal Code, conspiracy requires an agreement to commit an identified offence, an intention shared by at least two parties that the offence be committed, and an overt act pursuant to the agreement. A journalist or regulator who was genuinely duped is not thereby a conspirator. [30]

The publication can and should state the stronger investigative proposition: the evidence raises a serious question whether separate institutional failures hardened, after notice, into coordinated

protection of a harmful market. Internal communications, funding arrangements, responses to warnings, suppression or marginalisation of contrary evidence, regulatory contacts and archive decisions would determine whether any participant crossed from error or capture into knowing facilitation, fraud or conspiracy.

This distinction is not softness. It prevents the broad accusation from shielding the most culpable actors. Classify each participant as an architect or beneficiary, a knowing enabler, a captured or misled intermediary, or a post-notice defender, and publish the evidence supporting the classification.

11. What the comparison says about disappearance

Meta's settlement creates a public court record, specific obligations and independent auditing. PIAS ended without an equivalent public accounting. That creates an additional problem not dependent on the Meta analogy: a claimed community information service should not be able to shed its archive when the corporate vehicle ends.

The sharp rhetorical question is legitimate: if the advice and research were true, why were they not permanently preserved? The evidence-led formulation is even stronger because it admits all possibilities: valid material should be restored; superseded material should be corrected; misleading material should be disclosed and explained.

12. Publication language: use, qualify, avoid

Use	Qualify	Avoid without new evidence
Mars-funded information campaign	PIAS described itself as autonomous and non-commercial	Mars front organisation
Child-to-household acquisition pathway	PetPEP reports 58% requests and 20% acquisitions	Children were coerced
Childhood conditioning, as defined	An analytical description, not a diagnosis	Brainwashing
Allegedly harmful market creation	Product, causation and knowledge must be shown	Every Mars product was cruel
Potentially unlawful coordinated scheme	Identify offence, agreement, intent and overt act	Proven criminal conspiracy
Abrupt or unexplained public disappearance	Exact cessation date and motive remain unknown	Destroyed to hide wrongdoing
Meta supplies an investigative analogy	Meta denied wrongdoing; consent judgment is non-precedential	Meta proves Mars liability
Archive and disclosure duty	Moral and public-interest claim unless a specific legal duty is established	Admitted legal breach

13. Investigative propositions generated by the analogy

1. Did Mars or PIAS identify children as a high-value route to long-term household formation?
2. Were PetPEP acquisition rates reported internally as commercial or strategic outcomes?
3. Did funding, staff incentives or annual plans target household penetration, category growth or pet-friendly policy?
4. What research on children, family influence, attachment, pet acquisition or lifetime spending was commissioned?
5. What did Mars, PIAS, the AVA and participating practices disclose to schools, parents, journalists and researchers?
6. Did any internal evidence challenge public health-benefit, nutrition, dental-health or welfare messages?
7. Which actors received dietary-harm or periodontal-disease warnings, and what did each do after notice?
8. Did any institution coordinate a response intended to marginalise contrary evidence, reassure the public or preserve commercial and professional interests?
9. What governance protected educational and scientific independence?
10. Why was PIAS wound up, and why was its public corpus not transferred to a permanent archive?

14. Recommended placement

Keep the Meta comparison subordinate to the PIAS evidence. The full investigation paper should contain a concise comparative section and a link to this memorandum. The website feature should use a short sidebar headed 'What Meta teaches us - and what it does not'. This prevents a contemporary case from overwhelming the historical documentary record or making the page dependent on future litigation developments.

Conclusion

Childhood conditioning is a strong angle because it connects purpose, mechanism, moral harm and duration. PIAS's charter included encouraging ownership; PetPEP's own material calls children future owners, records household conversion and promotes local practice marketing. The alleged system then extends beyond acquisition: it normalises industrial feeding and teaches each generation to interpret foreseeable disease, pain and treatment as ordinary. The Meta proceedings show why investigators should examine the designed environment, not merely the literal words of one advertisement.

But rigor is the force multiplier. The analogy becomes most persuasive when its limits are stated in the same breath: different product, different harm pathway, different jurisdiction, no transferred finding

and no present proof of addiction. What remains is a formidable public-interest question - whether a Mars-funded system used trusted childhood institutions to create lifelong market conditions for an allegedly harmful feeding system; whether trusted intermediaries became knowing defenders after notice; and whether the disappearance of the record has prevented the community from finding out.

Corrections, documents and right of reply

This paper is a public-interest investigation based on sources available as at the publication date. It is not a judicial or regulatory finding. Mars, PIAS's former officers and staff, the Australian Veterinary Association, the ABC and any other named person or institution are invited to identify factual errors, supply missing records and provide a response for publication. Material corrections should be dated and preserved rather than silently substituted.

References and public sources

- [2] PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL). [About PIAS](#)
- [3] PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL). [Pet information and research for socially responsible pet ownership](#)
- [4] PetNet / PIAS (legacy URL). [International Association of Human-Animal Interaction Organisations: Who is PIAS?](#)
- [12] Australian Veterinary Association. [PetPEP Coordinator Training](#)
- [13] Australian Veterinary Association / Vet Voice. [Benefits of getting involved](#)
- [21] United States District Court, N.D. California. [Multistate Complaint for Injunctive and Other Relief](#)
- [22] United States District Court, N.D. California / New York Attorney General. [Meta and State Attorneys General Consent Judgment and Settlement Agreement](#)
- [23] Office of the New York Attorney General. [Attorney General James secures up to \\$17.1 billion and reforms from Meta](#)
- [24] Reuters. [Meta agrees to pay \\$18 billion to settle US lawsuits](#)
- [25] ABC News Australia. [Meta to pay \\$23 billion and update Facebook and Instagram](#)
- [26] Australian Veterinary Association. [Guidelines for dental treatment in dogs and cats](#)
- [27] Journal of Small Animal Practice / PubMed. [A review of the frequency and impact of periodontal disease in dogs](#)
- [28] Australian Veterinary Journal / PubMed. [Diet and periodontal disease in dogs and cats](#)
- [29] T. Lonsdale - address to the AVA Metropolitan Practitioners Branch. [Pandemic of Periodontal Disease: A malodorous condition](#)
- [30] Federal Register of Legislation. [Criminal Code Act 1995 - section 11.5 Conspiracy](#)
- [32] World Health Organization. [Commercial determinants of health](#)
- [33] World Health Organization. [Policies to protect children from the harmful impact of food marketing](#)