

# PETA, Patriarchy and Intersectionality

---

**Nick P. Pendergrast**

**University of Melbourne**

**Abstract:** *This article explores one of the key issues of debate within the contemporary animal advocacy movement: whether the movement should focus only on animal-related issues or take an intersectional approach, which includes engagement with other social justice issues. This intersectional perspective, highlighting similarities between different forms of oppression and their interlinked nature, is advocated for in Critical Animal Studies and ecofeminist literature. Scholars in these related areas have extended the concept to include nonhuman animals. This theory has an academic background but can also be useful to guide activism, including animal advocacy. The question of whether animal advocates adopt an intersectional approach or not has important implications for the animal advocacy movement, its relationship with other movements and its capacity to bring about change for non-human animals. In this article, I examine this question drawing on an analysis of the campaigns by the United States-based, international animal advocacy organisation People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). My findings suggest that PETA clearly manifests the tendency to retain an animal-only focus and that this has brought about organisational benefits, which are vital for larger, more professionalised organisations. Such organisational factors have often not been accounted for in the writing about intersectionality, which has predominantly occurred within an academic rather than activist framework. However, measuring success in social movements by organisational factors such as donor base is only one way to judge the impact of different campaigns. This article reveals that organisational considerations serve as a barrier to implementing intersectionality in practice in social movements. Taking an intersectional perspective highlights the way that PETA's narrowly focused campaigning hinders successful collaboration with other movements and limits the effectiveness of their message.*

**Keywords:** *Intersectionality, animal advocacy, coalition building, PETA, Critical Animal Studies, social movements*

## Introduction

The animal advocacy movement is a relatively new social movement that has not yet been the focus of much sociological research (Hamilton 130-40; Munro 166-77).<sup>1</sup> Greater scholarly attention needs to be given to this movement, as well as to how it interacts with other movements and issues. A central debate in the contemporary animal advocacy movement is whether it should focus only on animal-related causes or also take a stand against human oppression through an intersectional approach. Intersectionality refers to the way in which ‘all forms of discrimination, including homophobia, racism, sexism, speciesism [discrimination based on species], ageism, disableism and bias based on weight and citizenship status, are rooted in the same system of oppression’, although ‘such systems of oppression intersect differently for different individuals’ (Glasser 53). Despite the ongoing discussion about intersectionality, a lot of animal advocacy continues to be focused solely on non-human animals.<sup>2</sup>

This development is in contrast with dominant perspectives in the emerging academic discipline of critical animal studies, as well as in ecofeminist theory (Alloun, ‘Ecofeminism and Animal Advocacy in Australia: Productive Encounters for an Integrative Ethics and Politics’). Critical animal studies is closely tied with activism, with many theorists in this field assuming the ‘dual identity of activist and academic’ (Taylor and Twine 11). At the very least, research in this area is focused on bringing about social change for non-human animals and other marginalised groups. Critical animal studies highlights the similarities between different forms of oppression and extends this intersectional framework to include non-human animals, a link that has historically been neglected in other fields (Taylor and Twine 2-7; Best 48-49).

In this paper, I investigate these issues drawing on the US-based, international animal advocacy organisation People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA). It is a large and well-resourced organisation that has attracted criticisms for its negative impact on human oppression in its animal advocacy campaigns (Glasser 52). PETA’s campaigns will be analysed from an intersectional perspective, but this paper will also draw on sociology of organisations literature to acknowledge the organisational benefits of this narrowly focused campaigning. The

question of whether animal advocates adopt an intersectional approach or not has important implications for the animal advocacy movement, its relationship with other movements and its capacity to bring about change for non-human animals.

### **Contextual Background: Animal Advocacy in the US and the Non-Profit Industrial Complex**

Social movements generally and animal advocacy specifically are very established in the US compared to some other countries. This longevity has seen a move towards professionalisation, with the dominance of large, well-financed non-profit organisations. Such moves have been accompanied by critiques of the ‘Non-Profit Industrial Complex’, highlighting the way in which larger organisations tend to be heavily focused on organisational considerations such as obtaining funding and maintaining careers in social movements (Smith 10, 15).

Andrea Smith argues that when organisations limit themselves to working on a specific issue, they can lose perspective of larger goals (10-11). She explains that the Non-Profit Industrial Complex promotes a non-collaborative, narrowly focused and competitive culture. Hence, larger organisations are less likely to adopt an intersectional approach and are more likely to be solely focused on their one issue.

Organisations focused on just one particular issue tend to ‘develop a larger base of supporters’ and are also more likely to attract resources, funds and political allies (Glasser 51). In contrast, taking a stand on a broad range of issues can be detrimental financially. The organisation INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence found this out after it was offered a half year grant of \$100,000 from the Ford Foundation. Ford reversed the decision because they found out that INCITE supported the Palestinian struggle against occupation (Smith 1). Taking a stand on a broad range of issues decreases the potential for funding from foundations and corporations, as well as from other sources such as the public. In contrast, a single-issue approach maximises the potential donor base from people and businesses (see Glasser 51).

PETA is a 501(c)(3) organisation (Frano), which refers to the status that non-profits must achieve in order to ensure that they are eligible to receive foundational grants and donations made to them are tax deductible (Smith 2, 7). It has an annual revenue of over 34

million dollars, with assets worth over 24 million dollars. It also has 263 paid employees and over three million members (BBB ‘People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals – Financial’; BBB ‘People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals - Governance and Staff’; PETA ‘About Peta’). Due to these resources and organisational size, it is a useful example to explore how these processes Smith identifies can fit with organisations focusing on one particular issue.

## **An Intersectional Approach to Animal Advocacy**

The expectation for the animal advocacy movement to adopt an intersectional agenda originates from several sources. Intersectionality has become an increasingly important academic framework in which to analyse oppression and privilege. The term was originally used to highlight the interlinked nature of oppression for women of colour, who experience both racism and sexism (see for example Hill Collins; Crenshaw). The theory has since been extended to explore the interlinked nature of various other forms of oppression.

Discussions about intersectionality have generally taken place within a human-centric framework. Critical animal studies scholars and others, such as ecofeminists, have attempted to apply the term more broadly. Ecofeminism is a theory that has emerged from feminist scholarship and activism in a range of social movements, including the animal advocacy movement, as well as the environment, peace, labour and of course feminist movements (Gaard 1). Prominent ecofeminist scholar Greta Gaard outlines the theory of ecofeminism, highlighting the strong focus on intersectionality:

Drawing on the insights of ecology, feminism, and socialism, ecofeminism’s basic premise is that the ideology which authorizes oppressions such as those based on race, class, gender, sexuality, physical abilities, and species is the same ideology which sanctions the oppression of nature. Ecofeminism calls for an end to all oppressions, arguing that no attempt to liberate women (or any other oppressed group) will be successful without an equal attempt to liberate nature. (1)

This extension of intersectionality to include non-human worlds means that it is potentially a useful framework to guide animal advocacy. Intersectionality has mainly been used in an

academic context, in order to shed light on multiple oppressions and privileges, in the context of contributing to a scholarly understanding of social inequality. However, social movements could also use the concept to assist with building solidarity and alliances with other movements. Such coalitions are more easily theorised than put into practice, however, as social movements obviously have different priorities, leading to possible conflict and risks (Reagon; Glasser 51).

These more practical difficulties can serve as barriers to an intersectional approach for all kinds of organisations, including more professionalised as well as more grassroots organisations. This means that even those who might theoretically support an intersectional approach may end up pursuing more narrowly-focused animal advocacy based on practical considerations, such as the context in which their activism takes place (Alloun, 'Fur Peta's Sake! The Politics of Animals in the Zionist State'). For larger organisations like PETA, there are also organisational barriers to adopting such an approach. It would mean forgoing the benefits referred to above, such as a larger resource base, which derive from focusing only on one particular issue.

## Research Design and Methods

PETA was chosen as the organisation to focus on for this analysis for a number of reasons. Firstly, it represents a long-established and large organisation, which means it is particularly suited for analysis in terms of how organisational considerations can effect campaigning. Secondly, the ideologies, promotional practices and campaigning of this organisation are considered by some to be contentious: they have generated considerable attention and attracted criticism (see for example Francione, 'The Abolition of Animal Exploitation' 60-74; Glasser 58-63; Torres 137-40). Although there have been some previous studies of PETA (see for example Beers; Francione, *Rain without Thunder*; Glasser), academic accounts of this organisation are limited, and most of the existing research was not carried out using an intersectional or sociological lens.

There are exceptions, such as analysis of PETA's campaigns from intersectional feminist perspectives by Maneesha Deckha and more recently Stephanie Baran. These are both insightful

contributions that will be drawn on in this paper. However, this paper will add to this existing literature by bringing in organisational dimensions to the analysis. Another reason that PETA has been chosen is because while it is a US-based organisation, it has an international reach through its many branches around the world and through worldwide media coverage of its campaigns (PETA 'Homepage').

There is substantial information available on PETA. Primary information accessed from publically-available documents include finances, membership, staffing, purposes of the organisation, and outlines of their actions and activities. Secondary sources were also accessed to provide a more thorough analysis. This existing information was analysed from an intersectional perspective and was also compared against the literature on the sociology of organisations. This data and analysis was complemented with an interview with Ashley Fruno, a Senior Campaigner for PETA Asia, which was conducted by the author.

## **Analysis and Findings**

PETA demonstrates concern for non-human animals but mostly neglects to take a stand on human rights issues (Baran 47). This type of attitude is not uncommon amongst larger animal advocacy organisations. However, PETA not only neglects to take a position against sexism, but actually directly engages in it through its campaigns. It operates within a patriarchal society that treats women as sexualised objects (Adams 304-08). Rather than challenging this, PETA regularly 'rely on the sexualization' of women 'to sell their message' (Glasser 58). This advertising is now quite central to PETA's campaigning (Deckha 46; Freeman 107-08). The desire for media attention drives this choice of campaign strategy, as is highlighted by Fruno:

We often do outrageous things to get the word out about animal abuse, because, sadly, the media usually do not consider the facts alone 'interesting' enough to cover. Colorful and controversial gimmicks, on the other hand – like having activists 'bare skin rather than wear skin' – consistently grab headlines, thereby bringing the animal rights message to audiences around the country and, often, the world.

In her analysis of PETA's campaigns, Baran found that it is mainly women who are featured in naked or semi-naked PETA campaigns, with men far more likely to be fully clothed (52). When PETA vice-president Dan Matthews was interviewed on the popular political podcast *Citizen Radio* (Kilstein and Kilkenny), he explained that the rationale behind this decision is that people are more interested in seeing women rather than men naked. This approach of giving people 'what they want' is typical of PETA's campaigning, which tends to work within, rather than challenge, dominant societal attitudes. PETA president Ingrid Newkirk is very upfront about this, stating in response to an interview question about the 'perfect' body type represented in their campaigns that: 'We do play the game from within the system. That is what we have chosen to do' (cited in Deckha 53). In a response from PETA to accusations that some of its campaigns are sexist, the organisation explained that:

PETA does make a point of having something for all tastes, from the most conservative to the most radical and from the most tasteless to the most refined, and our campaigns have proved extremely successful. In the three decades since PETA was founded, it has grown into the largest animal rights group in the world, with more than 2 million members and supporters worldwide. (PETA, cited in Glasser 64)

From an organisational point of view, when benefits such as the number of members attracted are considered, there is no doubt that PETA's 'campaigns have proved extremely successful' (PETA, cited in Glasser 64). As mentioned above, there are organisational benefits to campaigning just on one particular cause, as it attracts the broadest range of financial support. However, organisational considerations such as the number of members are only one way in which to measure success in social movements (Deckha 56). Moreover, the organisational benefits of this approach can come at the expense of harming other groups.

Newkirk has defended campaigns that rely on sexualised representations of women's bodies as 'harmless antics', although feminist critics, such as Jean Kilbourne, suggest otherwise. PETA uses female nudity much as it is used to sell any commodity in the advertising world (Baran 43, 48; Torres 108). As is shown in Figure 1 and referred to above, this includes PETA's preference for the socially constructed 'ideal' or 'perfect' body type for the women taking part in its campaigns (Baran 43, 47; Deckha 53; Gaarder 120), which is very 'thin and fragile'

(Kilbourne 397).<sup>3</sup> This ideal ‘is unattainable to most women, even if they starve themselves’ and only approximately the thinnest five per cent of women reach this ideal (Kilbourne 396). According to Kilbourne, the constant use of this female body type in advertising leads to women hating their bodies and hating themselves, resulting in ‘feelings of inferiority, anxiety, insecurity, and depression’, as well as playing a role in the increased prevalence of eating disorders (396, 398). Baran points out that PETA campaigns specifically continue the struggle that women and girls face with their bodies by drawing on and contributing to established social norms about ‘presentable’ bodies (47).



*Figure 1 (Ad Punch): PETA’s ‘Lettuce Ladies’ and the ‘Ideal’ Body Type*

When discussing these campaigns, it is important to acknowledge that PETA is predominantly a female-led organisation, with six of eight Vice Presidents being women, and many staff members identify as feminists (Animal Charity Evaluators; Deckha 56). As a result, PETA (cited in Animal Charity Evaluators) claim that they would not contribute negatively to the numerous important issues women face, issues that many of PETA’s staff would likely be all too aware of (Baran 49). PETA (‘Why Does PETA Sometimes Use Nudity in its Campaigns?’) point out that it ‘believes that women—and men—should be able to use their own bodies as political statements’. This element of choice and agency for the staff and volunteers taking part in



PETA's campaigns featuring female nudity, and the fact that some women who have taken part in such campaigns have expressed that they 'loved' taking part as a form of political activism (Davison), should certainly be acknowledged in the language used and analysis of this issue (Deckha 60; Germov and Hornosty 7-8). For example, I have attempted to avoid language such as 'the women used' in PETA's campaigns, which neglects this agency, instead opting for language such as 'the women taking part'.

While this element of choice is an important part of the discussion on the topic, it should also not be the end of the conversation. It is widely understood that individual choices do not occur in a vacuum but rather are shaped by the society in which that individual finds themselves (Baran 45, 51; Germov and Hornosty 7-8). Particularly relevant to this issue is the fact that 'our choices have impacts beyond ourselves' (Hills). This means that the feminist analysis outlined above and below, which highlights the broader, structural implications of the individual choice to take part in these campaigns is also an important consideration when analysing these campaigns (Deckha 55-56). This is a complex issue, highlighting sociological debates about structure versus agency (Germov and Hornosty 7-8), as well as disagreements between different waves of feminism (Deckha 54-55).

Deckha (55-66) explores these debates and shares many of the same concerns about the gendered representations in PETA's campaigns that are outlined in this paper. However, she points out that such critiques do not apply equally to all of its campaigns featuring sexualised representations of women. In fact, she makes the case that occasionally such campaigns can be effective in challenging both speciesism and sexism, citing PETA's 'Milk Gone Wild' parody as an example. Deckha's analysis is nuanced and convincing, although it does not undermine the arguments made throughout this paper. Even if not all of PETA's campaigns featuring sexualisation are equally damaging to women, and at least one may actually challenge gender inequality in some respects, as Deckha argues, the fact that any are damaging is concerning from an intersectional standpoint. Also, even the campaign that Deckha argues is subversive in some respects still predominantly focuses on social change from within. Deckha cites this campaign as an example of 'working within a system of oppression while simultaneously critiquing it' (Pace, cited in Deckha 58). Many of PETA's campaigns do not offer such a critique and are far more

‘clear cut’ in terms of their negative impact on gender inequality. Examples include campaigns glorifying sexual assault and domestic violence, as well as others shaming women about their body hair and weight (Baran 46, 49; Deckha 44-45).

PETA has gone beyond just contributing to the damaging idea of the ideal body type for women outlined above by actively denigrating those who do not fit this ideal (Freeman 106). PETA also carried out a controversial billboard campaign, which is shown in Figure 2. The billboards featured a large woman in a bikini, which read ‘Save the Whales, Lose the Blubber: Go Vegetarian’. This campaign has been blasted as ‘fat-shaming’ on the prominent feminist website *Feministing* (cited in Goldstein). While Newkirk (cited in Goldstein) correctly pointed out the problem of ‘America’s obesity epidemic’, her comment that ‘the majority of fat people need to have some discipline’ ignores structural issues that contribute to obesity, such as class and ethnicity (O’Dea). This billboard, and PETA’s explanations of it, disregard health concerns. PETA’s press release for this billboard reads:

Going vegetarian can be an effective way to shed those extra pounds that keep them from looking good in a bikini... Anyone wishing to achieve a hot ‘beach bod’ is reminded that studies show that vegetarians are, on average, about 10 to 20 pounds lighter than meat-eaters... ‘Trying to hide your thunder thighs and balloon belly is no day at the beach,’ says PETA Executive Vice President Tracy Reiman.  
(cited in Goldstein)



Figure 2 (Goldstein): PETA's 'Save the Whales' Billboard

After widespread public outrage, PETA took down the billboard and replaced it with one that read: 'GONE: Just like all the pounds lost by people who go vegetarian' (Goldstein). Even so, the fact that it ran the billboard in the first place demonstrates PETA's willingness to participate in some of the more troubling aspects of the advertising industry's representations of women. Advertising often features just parts of women, who are far more likely to be featured in parts. This reduces them to certain consumable body parts that are sexualised and used to sell products, rather than complete people (Baran 45). Feminist scholars have shown how this objectification in advertising can act to create a social climate that is dangerous for women (Bongiorno, Bain and Haslam 5). PETA campaigns that draw on these dominant representations of women in advertising cannot be said to directly cause violence, but they do contribute to a culture that views women as sexualised objects, which can be linked to violence against women (Jean Kilbourne, cited in Gill 255). The dangerous implications of PETA campaigns relying on representations that commodify and objectify women are significant, even if the sexualisation is experienced as empowerment for the individual women participating in the campaigns (Deckha 55-56).

PETA's campaigns featuring sexualised representations of women have been successful in attracting substantial media coverage (Animal Charity Evaluators; Deckha 37), including

articles in places like men's magazine *FHM*, which would otherwise be unlikely to include stories about PETA. From an organisational point of view such campaigns are beneficial in terms of spreading awareness of PETA and increasing the potential to attract more donors and members. However, such magazines are extremely problematic in terms of gender equality. Psychologists from Middlesex University and the University of Surrey recently found that the descriptions of women taken from the most popular men's magazines (including *FHM*) are indistinguishable from comments about women made by men convicted of sexual assault (Horvarth and Hegarty).

Media coverage in these magazines is not only negative in terms of gender equality, but is even doubtful in terms of encouraging individuals to make changes to their habits concerning other animals. Fruno explains that PETA aims to 'grab people's attention and even shock them in order to initiate discussion, debate, and, of course, action' and its 'goal is to make the public think about the issues'. Media stories on PETA's campaigns featuring sexualised representations of women, however, do not seem conducive to people discussing their obligations towards other animals and making changes to their behaviour, because the coverage is more about PETA and its tactics. For example, both the content of the article in *FHM* and the comments after it focused on whether PETA's explicit Super Bowl advertisement 'Vegetarians have Better Sex' should have been banned or not, rather than on the ethical implications of eating other animals. Similar themes have been identified in analysis of other controversial PETA advertisements, with the discussion all about the appropriateness of the advertisement rather than non-human animals (Deckha 57).

There is a real danger of people viewing the spectacle but not thinking about 'the meaning behind the spectacle' (Baran 49). In response to such concerns, PETA points to 'countless people' visiting its website as a result of such campaigns and its site is much more focused on raising issues of animal oppression and less focused on sexualised representations of women ('Why Does PETA Sometimes Use Nudity in its Campaigns?'). However, media coverage is not a positive in itself: how the organisation is portrayed is also important, as the legitimacy of organisations can be undermined by certain representations (Kruse 69).

The potential benefits from media coverage such as that described above would have to be weighed against the possibility that PETA's 'publicity-grabbing activism that values attention

above all else' turns people away from the movement and from considering other animals in their daily lives (Torres 90-91). A study conducted in the US by sociologist David Nibert (122-23) found a strong link between concern for other people and support for the idea of non-human animals having some rights. Torres (90-91) maintains that PETA's activism 'has managed to alienate activists in other communities' advocating for causes such as human rights.

Such activists are more likely than most people to consider the interests of non-human animals, due to the similarities between different forms of oppression, a point which is highlighted by an intersectional perspective. PETA's campaigns relying on objectifying portrayals of women undermine its case when it highlights the similarities between animal oppression and other forms of oppression. This is something that has been done relatively frequently by PETA, including campaigns comparing animal exploitation and slaughter to the Holocaust and human slavery, both of which have received considerable public backlash (Deckha 37). Also, in its responses to frequently asked questions on its website, other social movements such as women's and African American's rights are frequently referred to (Williams 27). In addition, PETA released the booklet: *All Animals are Equal or Why Supporters of Liberation for Blacks [sic] and Women Should Support Animal Liberation, Too*. In this booklet, there is a section called 'Animal Rights: A Feminist Issue'.

This claim demonstrates an awareness of intersectionality; however, activists in other social movements are likely to question PETA's sincerity when it draws on human oppression to advance concern for animals while not only refusing to take a stand against sexism, but directly participating in it through its campaigns (Glasser 52). These campaigns challenge PETA's ability to successfully link different forms of oppression in a way that connects animal advocacy to other social justice movements. While coalition-building with other movements can run the risk of confusing an organisation's agenda (Hensby, Sibthorpe and Driver 815; Munro 176), sociologist Lyle Munro proposes that 'in the case of the animal movement, this may be a risk worth taking as it seems unlikely that a relatively small and unique movement could prosecute its campaigns globally without initiating common cause with like-minded activists' (176).

PETA's use of sexism also reinforces speciesism, as both forms of oppression are built on a similar logic of commodification (Deckha 55-56; Glasser 58-63). Glasser contends that 'all

oppressions are interlocking and when any oppression is embraced all oppressions are strengthened' (52). Such views are reinforced in recent research by Renata Bongiorno, Paul Bain and Nick Haslam, which found that PETA's sexualised advertising is ineffective because seeking 'to increase moral concern for some living things, such as animals, is inconsistent with and likely to be undermined by sexualized imagery that diminishes moral concern for others (e.g. by dehumanizing women)' (1). In both of the studies they conducted for this research, one focusing on young men and the other a mixed-gender community sample, sexualised advertising reduced their intention to support PETA and to make changes to their behaviours that would be beneficial to animals (Bongiorno, Bain and Haslam 4).

Baran calls on PETA to realise the importance of adopting an intersectional approach that challenges patriarchy and supports human rights generally (47, 53). Such requests from academics and activists are important and worth pursuing. However, it is also worth keeping in mind that this is not purely an ideological discussion; organisational considerations also play a part. PETA's campaigning demonstrates the organisational benefits of focusing just on one particular cause. Their campaigns, which often rely on dominant, damaging representations of women, have ensured a great deal of media coverage and more widespread awareness about PETA. However, taking an intersectional standpoint highlights the way in which these campaigns are not only harmful in contributing to sexist attitudes, but this sexism also undermines their effectiveness in challenging speciesism.

## Conclusion

In this paper, I examined the question of the scope of campaigning in the contemporary animal advocacy movement, focusing on PETA. My findings suggest that PETA not only displays a lack of engagement with other social justice issues, but in fact actively promotes sexist messages, thereby conflicting with the agendas of many feminist organisations. As noted at the beginning of this paper, the tendency to focus on animals only in organisational work is also in conflict with the conceptualisations of intersectionality in academic literature, and some of the central tenets of 'academic activism' in the form of critical animal studies and ecofeminism.

This conflict can be partially explained by the complex nature of putting this theoretical perspective into activist practice (Alloun, 'Fur Peta's Sake!'). More specifically, the theoretical focus of intersectionality research may not have given enough attention to the organisational benefits of a more narrowly focused approach to activism. Taking on a number of different causes and issues means possibly shrinking the donor base. This seems to suggest that more grassroots activism has greater capacity to be intersectional, as foregoing these organisational benefits is not likely to be as big of a factor as it is for organisations needing to maintain adequate resources for ongoing costs such as paid staff and physical office space.

This is a significant topic for future research that explores intersectionality in practice and how the concept may be more consistent with some organisational forms than others. It is important to investigate a wide range of animal advocacy organisations, including drawing on the voices of animal advocates and other activists, to see the extent to which they take an intersectional approach, in order to shed light on the important topic of what intersectionality looks like outside of academia. This is consistent with the activist-focused critical animal studies approach, which emphasises 'the importance of learning from and with activists' (Best 13).

In response to critiques from those coming from an intersectional perspective, PETA has pointed to its large number of members (cited in Glasser 64). However, organisational factors such as the donor base are merely one way to measure success in social movements (Deckha 46). While these resources are central to larger, more professionalised organisations, there are certainly many other important considerations when discussing the impacts of animal advocacy campaigns. One implication of my findings is that the tendency to neglect or even work against the aims of other social justice movements, such as the feminist movement, while undoubtedly bringing about organisational benefits, might hinder collaboration with other movements. This reduces the effectiveness of calls by animal advocates for people to change their attitudes and behaviours towards non-human animals.

## Notes

<sup>1</sup> The term ‘animal advocacy movement’ is used in this paper, rather than ‘animal rights movement’, which is widely used in the academic literature on this topic. This is because this movement includes a broad range of activist approaches, many which do not come from a rights-based perspective (Bourke 131).

<sup>2</sup> Throughout this paper, the terms ‘non-human animals’, ‘other animals’ and ‘animals’ were used interchangeably; however, the importance of the terms ‘non-human animals’ and ‘other animals’ rather than ‘animals’ is certainly accepted, as using the term ‘animals’ to refer only to non-human animals reinforces the idea that humans are somehow separate to other animals, rather than simply being one species of animal. The decision to refer to non-human animals in this way was made in recognition of the practicalities of readability when the term was being used so often (for more on the term ‘animals’ and speciesist language, see Yates 15-16; Dunayer 10).

<sup>3</sup> This ‘ideal’ body type presented in advertising generally and PETA’s campaigns specifically is also racialised, with a preference for white women. When people of colour are featured in PETA campaigns, they are also presented in different ways to white people, often drawing on and contributing to racist stereotypes and narratives (Baran 50-51; Deckha 50-51). These campaigns could be analysed through many other lenses, including race, however, the analysis was restricted to an analysis of gender due to space constraints.



## Works Cited

- Ad Punch. 'Peta's Unethical Treatment of Advertising.' 2010. <http://www.adpunch.org/peta-s-unethical-treatment-of-advertising.html>
- Adams, Carol. 'Why Feminist-Vegan Now?' *Feminism & Psychology*, vol. 20, no. 3, 2010, pp. 302-17.
- Alloun, Esther. 'Ecofeminism and Animal Advocacy in Australia: Productive Encounters for an Integrative Ethics and Politics.' *Animal Studies Journal*, vol 4., no. 1, 2015, pp. 148-73.
- . 'Fur Peta's Sake! The Politics of Animals in the Zionist State.' *Animal Liberation Currents*. 2017. <https://www.animalliberationcurrents.com/fur-petas-sake/#more-1628>
- Animal Charity Evaluators. 'People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA).' 2017 <https://animalcharityevaluators.org/charity-review/people-for-the-ethical-treatment-of-animals-peta/#exploratory-review>
- Baran, Stephanie. 'Visual Patriarchy: PETA Advertising and the Commodification of Sexualized Bodies.' *Women and Nature?: Beyond Dualism in Gender, Body, and Environment*. Edited by Douglas A. Vakoch. and Sam Mickey. Routledge, 2017, pp. 43-56.
- BBB. 'People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals - Financial.' *BBB Wise Giving Alliance*. 2012. <http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/people-for-the-ethical-treatment-of-animals-in-norfolk-va-1160/financial>
- . 'People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals - Governance and Staff.' *BBB Wise Giving Alliance*. 2012. <http://www.bbb.org/charity-reviews/national/animal-protection/people-for-the-ethical-treatment-of-animals-in-norfolk-va-1160/governance-and-staff>
- Beers, Diane L. *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States*. Shallow Press, 2006.
- Best, Steven. 'The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: Putting Theory into Action and Animal Liberation into Higher Education.' *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, vol.7, no.1, 2009, pp. 9-52.

- Bongiorno, Renata, Paul G. Bain, and Nick Haslam. 'When Sex Doesn't Sell: Using Sexualized Images of Women Reduces Support for Ethical Campaigns.' *Plos One*, vol. 8, no.12, 2013, pp. 1-6.
- Bourke, Deidre. 'The Use and Misuse of "Rights Talk" by the Animal Rights Movement.' *Animal Law in Australasia: A New Dialogue*. Edited by Peter J. Sankoff and Steven White, The Federation Press, 2009, pp. 128-50.
- Crenshaw, K. 'Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics.' *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, vol. 140, 1980, pp. 139-67.
- Davison, Rosanna. 'Rosanna Davison: Why I Posed Naked for a Cause I Believe in.' 2013. <https://www.thejournal.ie/readme/rosanna-davison-naked-vegan-healthy-lifestyle-1059269-Aug2013/>
- Deckha, Maneesha. 'Disturbing Images: Peta and the Feminist Ethics of Animal Advocacy.' *Ethics & the Environment*, vol. 13, no. 2, 2008, pp. 35-76.
- Dunayer, Joan. *Animal Equality: Language and Liberation*. Ryce, 2001.
- FHM. 'Vegetarians Have Better Sex.' 2009. <http://www.fhm.com.au/vegetarians-have-better-sex.htm>
- Francione, Gary. 'The Abolition of Animal Exploitation.' *The Animal Rights Debate: Abolition or Regulation?* Edited by Gary Francione and Robert Garner. Columbia University Press, 2010. 1-102.
- . *Rain without Thunder: The Ideology of the Animal Rights Movement*. Temple University Press, 1996.
- Freeman, Carrie Packwood. 'Stepping up to the Veggie Plate: Framing Veganism as Living Your Values.' *Perspectives on Human-Animal Communication: Internatural Communication*. Edited by Emily Plec, Taylor and Francis, 2013, pp. 93-112.
- Fruno, Ashley. 'Personal Interview.' 23 February 2011.
- Gaard, Greta. *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature*. Temple University Press, 1994.

- Gaarder, Emily. *Women and the Animal Rights Movement*. Rutgers Press, 2011.
- Germov, John, and Jennie Hornosty. 'Imagining Health Problems as Social Issues.' *Second Opinion: An Introduction to Health Sociology*. Edited by John Germov, Oxford University Press, 2009, pp. 3-24.
- Gill, Rosalind. 'Supersexualise Me! Advertising and the "Midriffs."' *Gender, Race and Class in Media: A Critical Reader*. Edited by Gail Dines and Jean M. Humez. Vol. 3. SAGE Publications, 2011, pp. 255-60.
- Glasser, Carol L. 'Tied Oppressions: An Analysis of How Sexist Imagery Reinforces Speciesist Sentiment.' *The Brock Review*, vol 12, no. 1, 2011, pp. 51-68.
- Goldstein, Katherine. 'Peta's New "Save the Whales" Billboard Takes Aim at Fat Women.' *Huffington Post*. 26 Aug. 2011. [http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/08/26/petas-new-save-the-whales\\_n\\_261134.html](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2009/08/26/petas-new-save-the-whales_n_261134.html)
- Hamilton, Paul. 'Animal Liberation: A View from Political Science.' *The Brock Review*, vol 12, no.1, 2011, pp. 129-43.
- Hensby, Alexander, Joanne Sibthorpe and Stephen Driver. 'Resisting the "Protest Business": Bureaucracy, Post-Bureaucracy and Active Membership in Social Movement Organizations.' *Organization*, vol. 19, no. 6, 2011, pp. 809-23.
- Hill Collins, P. 'Toward a New Vision: Race, Class and Gender as Categories of Analysis and Connection.' *Race, Sex and Class*, vol. 1, no. 1, 1993, pp. 25-45.
- Hills, Rachel. 'Choice May Be Sacred, But it's Not Always Empowering.' *Sydney Morning Herald*. 29 Dec. 2007. <http://www.smh.com.au/news/opinion/womens-choices-are-not-always-empowering/2007/12/28/1198778699739.html?page=fullpage#contentSwap1>
- Horvarth, Miranda, and Peter Hegarty. 'Are Sex Offenders and Lads' Mags Using the Same Language?' *University of Surrey*. (2011). [http://www.surrey.ac.uk/mediacentre/press/2011/69535\\_are\\_sex\\_offenders\\_and\\_lads\\_mags\\_using\\_the\\_same\\_language.htm](http://www.surrey.ac.uk/mediacentre/press/2011/69535_are_sex_offenders_and_lads_mags_using_the_same_language.htm)

- Kilbourne, Jean. 'Still Killing Us Softly: Advertising and the Obsession with Thinness.' *Feminist Perspectives on Eating Disorders*. Edited by Patricia Fallon, Melanie A. Katzman and Susan C. Wooley. The Guildford Press, 1994, pp. 395-418.
- Kilstein, Jamie, and Allison Kilkenny. 'Citizen Radio on Btw.' *Breakthru Radio*. (2010). <http://www.breakthru radio.com/#/post/?blog=12&post=59&autoplay=1>
- Kruse, Corwin R. 'The Movement and the Media: Framing the Debate over Animal Experimentation.' *Political Communication*, vol. 18, no.1, 2001, pp. 67-87.
- Munro, Lyle. 'The Animal Rights Movement in Theory and Practice: A Review of the Sociological Literature.' *Sociology Compass*, vol. 6, no. 2, 2012, pp. 166-81.
- Newkirk, Ingrid. 'A Pragmatic Fight for Animal Rights.' *The Guardian*, 22 Jan. 2010. <https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/cif-green/2010/jan/21/peta-animal-rights-campaign>
- Nibert, David. 'Animal Rights and Human Social Issues.' *Society & Animals*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1994, pp. 115-24.
- O'Dea, Jennifer A. 'Gender, Ethnicity, Culture and Social Class Influences on Childhood Obesity among Australian Schoolchildren: Implications for Treatment, Prevention and Community Education.' *Health & Social Care in the Community*, vol. 16, no.3, 2008, pp. 282-90.
- PETA. 'About Peta.' *People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*. 2013. <http://www.peta.org/about/index.asp>
- . *All Animals Are Equal or Why Supporters of Liberation for Blacks and Women Should Support Animal Liberation, Too*. People For the Ethical Treatment of Animals, 2003.
- . 'Homepage.' *People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*. 2017. <http://www.peta.org/>
- . 'Why Does PETA Sometimes Use Nudity in its Campaigns?' *People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals*. 2017. <https://www.peta.org/about-peta/faq/why-does-peta-sometimes-use-nudity-in-its-campaigns/>

- Reagon, B. J. 'Coalition Politics: Turning the Century.' *Homegirls: A Black Feminist Anthology*. Edited by B. Smith, Kitchen Table/Women of Color Press, 1983, pp. 343–55.
- Smith, Andrea. 'Introduction: The Revolution Will Not Be Funded.' *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex*. Edited by INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, South End Press, 2007, pp. 1-20.
- Taylor, Nik, and Richard Twine. 'Introduction: Locating the "Critical" in Critical Animal Studies.' *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: From the Margins to the Centre*. Edited by Nik Taylor and Richard Twine. Routledge, 2014, pp. 1-16.
- Torres, Bob. *Making a Killing: The Political Economy of Animal Rights*. AK Press, 2007.
- Williams, Cary. 'The Framing of Animal Cruelty by Animal Advocacy Organizations.' University of Maine, 2012.
- Yates, Roger. 'Language, Power and Speciesism.' *Critical Society*, vol. 3, 2010, pp. 11-19.

## Acknowledgements

I would like to thank Ashley Fruno from PETA for agreeing to be part of my research. Thanks also to Kadri Aavik for some fruitful discussions on gender, intersectionality and animal advocacy. These discussions greatly helped in putting together this article.