

# Routledge Handbook on Men, Masculinities and Organizations

---

Theories, Practices and Futures of Organizing

Edited by Jeff Hearn, Kadri Aavik,  
David L. Collinson and Anika Thym

First published 2024

ISBN: 978-1-032-04515-3 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-1-032-04516-0 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-19357-9 (ebk)

## Chapter 28 Men and Masculinities in Animal Advocacy Organizations and Organizing

---

From men's domination and masculinized strategies  
towards an ethics of care and intersectional activism

(CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0)

DOI: 10.4324/9781003193579-33

The funder for this chapter is Tallinn University, Estonia

# 28

## MEN AND MASCULINITIES IN ANIMAL ADVOCACY ORGANIZATIONS AND ORGANIZING

From men's domination and masculinized  
strategies towards an ethics of care  
and intersectional activism

*Kadri Aavik*

### Introduction

This chapter examines men and masculinities in the context of contemporary animal advocacy organizations and organizing.<sup>1</sup> Questions of how we relate to the more-than-human world have become increasingly pertinent in the Anthropocene, where the human species is radically and destructively altering the Earth's ecosystems and climate (Steffen et al., 2015; IPCC, 2021; Ripple et al., 2020). The most typical relationship humans have with other animals is through consuming them. Raising animals for human food occurs in industrial settings on a massive scale. The number of non-human animals killed annually for food amounts to around 75 billion (Chemnitz & Becheva, 2021).<sup>2</sup> Violence towards factory-farmed animals is standard practice: they are consistently deprived of adequate space, air and light; their new-borns are removed from them; and pain is inflicted on them routinely, through practices such as debeaking and tail-docking (The Humane League, 2021). The systematic and extensive breeding and genetic manipulation of farmed non-human animals have rendered them disabled (Taylor, 2017), implying debilitating and chronic health conditions.

Animal farming for human food is a key driver of climate change (Goodland & Anhang, 2009; Steinfeld et al., 2006), having doubled over the past 20 years (Chemnitz & Becheva, 2021), at a time when countries are failing to meet international climate targets (United Nations, 2021). It is also an increasing public health concern (Landers et al., 2012; World Health Organisation, 2017; Brown, 2004; Chemnitz & Becheva, 2021; Bouvard et al., 2015; Micha et al., 2017). Intensive animal farming disproportionality affects vulnerable groups and communities (Eisnitz, 2006; Sebastian, 2018; Jenkins, 2018), particularly in the Global South (Parks & Roberts, 2006; Roy, 2018) – those least responsible for causing

climate change. Thus, consuming other animals is an intersectional issue of social and ecological justice. Because other animals are part of society and advocating for them addresses issues beyond animal ethics, the animal advocacy movement<sup>3</sup> (AAM) could be considered a social justice movement.<sup>4</sup>

Gender plays an important role in both the exploitation of non-human animals and advocating for their interests. Previous research has highlighted the central role of gender in shaping human–animal relations, patterns of food consumption and climate sustainability (e.g. Modlinska et al., 2020; Inness, 2001; Counihan & Kaplan, 2003). While women and other genders also consume non-human animals, there are several reasons why men’s food practices and masculinities in relation to other animals should be critically examined. The practices of privileged Western white men, as well as masculine values, expressed in “industrial breadwinner masculinities” (Hultman & Pulé, 2018)<sup>5</sup>, have led to human-induced climate change (Moore, 2017) which threatens human and non-human life on a planetary scale. A masculinized technocratic rationality (see Winter & Robert, 1980) continues to be used to justify the mistreatment of human and non-human others, exemplified by the organization of factory farming. The animal–industrial complex (Noske, 1989; Twine, 2012)<sup>6</sup> is overwhelmingly operated by elite men. Men, in particular, white, Western, middle class, remain the key drivers of climate change, for example, as owners and managers of extractive industries (Hultman & Pulé, 2018) and governments and transnational organizations such as the EU which regulate these industries. For instance, the world’s largest factory farms are owned by Western white men (The National Provisioner, 2018). The overall ecological footprint of men is on average much higher than women’s (Räty & Carlsson-Kanyama, 2010; Ripplin et al., 2021), including their footprint from food, as men consume more meat, globally (Nakagawa & Hart, 2019; Prättälä et al., 2007).

Strong links exist between eating animals and constructions of Western masculinities: eating meat remains culturally coded as a masculine practice and consuming animals is a powerful norm for men through which to do masculinity (Ruby & Heine, 2011; Thomas, 2016; Szabo, 2019). Especially privileged men in Western countries are in a favourable position and could be expected to make more sustainable and ethical food choices, as they have more resources than less privileged groups to do so, and can promote more ethical human–animal relations through the institutions they dominate.

This chapter looks at men and masculinities both in formal AAM organizations and beyond organizational structures. As an example of the latter type of organizing, I examine men’s veganism.<sup>7</sup> I explore how masculinities – for example, masculinized values and strategies – manifest themselves in the AAM and the implications of these for meeting the AAM’s goals and for building a more inclusive movement. While foregrounding gender, I consider how its intersections with other categories, such as race and class shape the movement’s exclusions. I end the chapter by arguing for the importance of intersectional activism and building alliances with other progressive social movements. While advocating for other animals has historically occurred and continues to take place across the world, this chapter mainly focuses on the AAM in Western contexts, largely due to lack of research on the AAM elsewhere.<sup>8</sup> In this chapter, I use the term “organization” in a broader sense, referring to not only physical and formal AAM organizations (local, international, transnational) but also the entire AAM, encompassing variously positioned and affiliated individuals, groups and networks organizing in diverse ways for other animals both offline and online.<sup>9</sup>

## **Gendered dimensions of animal advocacy organizing**

The origins of the AAM in the West, widely regarded as a new social movement,<sup>10</sup> are typically traced to the animal protection movement in nineteenth-century England, termed as first-wave era of the AAM (roughly up to the civil rights period), followed by second- and third-wave activism, beginning in the mid-twentieth century and in the 2000s,<sup>11</sup> respectively (Wrenn, 2019). Each wave is characterized by a focus on specific issues and tactics, shaped by the social and historical contexts in which they unfolded.

Gender has always shaped animal advocacy organizing. Women – typically white, middle- and upper-class – have been disproportionately represented among the movement’s activists in the West since its inception (Wrenn, 2019, p. 62; also see Gaarder, 2011). Already in the nineteenth century, several prominent suffragettes and other women were leading figures in campaigns against animal cruelty (Wrenn, 2019, p. 34), for example, anti-vivisection activism. Historical associations of madness and hysteria with women stemming from norms of masculinity have led to animal advocates being pathologized for caring about non-human animals by the medical establishment and in cultural constructions more broadly (Gruen & Probyn-Rapsey, 2018; see also Beers, 2006). Animal advocacy organizing on the whole continues to be perceived as a feminized activity (Wrenn, 2019, p. 201; Gaarder, 2011), due to its associations with feminized emotions, compassion and plant-based diets (Wrenn, 2016c, p. 150). This has implications for the movement’s legitimacy, ability to acquire funding and reach its goals, as well as for men’s involvement and masculinities in the AAM.

Existing research on gender in animal advocacy organizations and organizing has tended to focus on women. Men and masculinities have received less attention. In the following sections, I examine how men’s activities and masculinities shape animal advocacy organizing and organizations.

### **Men’s involvement and masculinities in animal advocacy organizing**

#### *AAM’s composition, structure and division of work*

Animal advocacy organizations, akin to others in the non-profit sector, exhibit gendered and other hierarchies (for an overview of gendered organizations, see Hearn & Collinson, 2018), for example, gendered divisions of labour and assigning different value to the work of different genders. The movement in the West consists primarily of educated, white, middle-class women (Wrenn, 2019, p. 199; Wrenn, 2016c). While their work has been central to the AAM, white privileged men typically enjoy greater visibility and dominate the higher ranks of the movement (Wrenn, 2019, pp. 62–66; Kemmerer, 2018, 2023), in particular, as leaders of larger and more prominent AAM organizations in North America (Gaarder, 2011; Kemmerer, 2018). As typical in organizations generally, women are disproportionately found in care and administrative roles and perform other types of supportive work which remains less valued and visible (Wrenn, 2019, p. 201). The belief of many activists that men’s greater involvement would boost the movement’s legitimacy leads them to promote men to leadership positions (Wrenn, 2016c, p. 150), a strategy that retains men’s privilege in the AAM. Male privilege and organizational structures modelled according to masculine values have been linked to sexism in the movement (Kemmerer, 2023).

The aforementioned insights apply primarily to the AAM in North America, particularly in the United States. In other contexts, where the AAM has a shorter history and there has

been a lack of other progressive movements to pave the way, such as in post-socialist Europe, where civil society activism in general remains undervalued, animal advocacy organizing is typically even more marginalized and highly feminized (see Aavik, 2019). In these settings, where animal advocacy organizing tends to include only a few paid positions and is done largely on a voluntary basis, men's participation in the movement is low, including in its leadership, as evidence from Estonia suggests (Aavik, 2019).

A number of scholars have critically examined the AAM in the West from critical race and whiteness, Indigenous and decolonial perspectives (Harper, 2010; Polish, 2016; Ko&Ko, 2017; Wrenn, 2019; Robinson, 2013), pointing to the privileged position of most animal activists in the social hierarchy and noting the scarcity of less privileged people, for example, activists of colour in the movement. Such omissions in the AAM are not just simple issues of diversity in participation but concern the movement's core conceptual commitments and strategies, ultimately inhibiting efforts to diversify the movement, including its theoretical foundations. The construction of, and indeed change in, masculinities has an important role to play here, as will be explored in the next section.

### *Tactics, strategies and factions*

Beyond the structure and division of labour in the AAM, the movement's conceptual basis and approaches to animal activism are significantly shaped by masculinity, as several feminist scholars have critically noted (Gruen, 1993; Wrenn, 2019; Donovan, 1990). The dominant narrative that is typically produced about the movement (also to itself) features a few elite white Western men as "founding fathers", akin to retrospective canon-making about many fields – an inevitably selective process shaped by gender (see Connell, 1997 on masculinity and the construction of the sociological canon). As feminist scholars have argued, elevating the intellectual ideas of a few prominent men has produced a masculine epistemology and rationality of the movement (Wrenn, 2016b, pp. 105, 114).

Two key men typically regarded as the intellectual founders of the movement are philosophers Peter Singer and Tom Regan whose thought continues to shape the strategies of significant parts of AAM. A number of feminist scholars who have critically engaged with their work have pointed out that both Singer (1975) and Regan (1983) explicitly sought to disentangle emotions and advocating for other animals, appealing for a "rational" approach to animal activism (for a critique of this, see Gruen & Probyn-Rapsey, 2018; Donovan, 1990; Wrenn, 2019). As Wrenn (2019, p. 77) notes, the continued influence of the ideas of these elite men in AAM means that to this day, "affective frameworks for addressing speciesism were (and still are) heavily stigmatized in the highly rationalized movement culture". Ecofeminist scholars have provided extensive critique of these reason-based arguments, pointing out how the neglect of an ethics of care and emotions in how we relate to non-human animals stems from and reproduces a masculinized rationality, dismissing important ways in which we could engage with and advocate for other animals (Adams & Donovan, 1995; Gaard, 2002; Donovan & Adams, 2007; Gruen, 1993; Gruen, 2015).

One of the most significant divisions and sources of ideological conflict within the AAM concerns the main goal of animal advocacy organizing – whether we should entirely end the use of other animals for human purposes or continue to permit this, as long as attention is paid to their welfare. Broadly, the contemporary AAM is divided into two ideological factions based on this disagreement – abolitionism and welfarism, respectively (see Wrenn, 2019, p. 18). Hegemonic ideals of masculinity and privileged men's practices shape both

factions. The welfarist side typically draws on the utilitarian philosophy<sup>12</sup> pursued by Singer and his followers, arguing that actions that bring the most happiness or well-being to the greatest number of non-human animals should be chosen over others (see Singer, 1980). Utilitarianism forms the conceptual basis of effective altruism, an increasingly popular social movement organization strategy, “using evidence and reason to figure out how to benefit others as much as possible, and taking action on that basis” (MacAskill, 2017, p. 1). Effective altruism has become a key strategy used by the welfarist segments of the AAM and by far the most funding that the AAM receives goes to such types of organizations. From feminist perspectives, this approach has been critiqued as “business-like, data-driven [and] outcome-oriented” and “[h]ierarchical in its decision-making structures and patterned after patriarchal social relations” (Herro & Obeng-Odoom, forthcoming). In the context of animal advocacy, such utilitarian tactics lead to the “quantification of suffering”, drawing from “a rationalist, calculative mode of moral reasoning” (Donovan, 1990, p. 358). For example, such positions typically lead to prioritizing certain types of animal advocacy (such as helping factory-farmed animals due to their sheer numbers) while deeming others less “effective” and thus not worth pursuing, such as animal sanctuary work which involves a small number of non-human individuals, but foregrounds close relationships of care, modelled according to feminist ethics, and thus has great potential to model and rethink human–animal relations (see Leth-Espensen, forthcoming; see also Adams et al., 2023 for a critique of effective altruism in animal advocacy from feminist, critical race and other critical perspectives).

As typical in other social movements, welfarist AAM organizations tend to be more professionalized, corporatized and bureaucratized, and increasingly focused on obtaining donations. This has involved toning down more “radical” messages to appeal to a broader public and to potential donors, reflecting the increasingly market-oriented nature of many segments of the AAM (Wrenn, 2019, p. 21). Typically, effective altruist strategies exclude intersectional activism (Wrenn, 2019; Aavik, 2019), as it appears more “rational” (e.g. easier, more profitable) to focus on a single issue. Such masculinized tactics cannot only be associated with men in the AAM, as many organizations led by women have also embraced such strategies.

The welfarist faction includes one of the largest and highly feminized sectors of AAM – companion animal advocacy. Men’s participation in this type of activism is exceptional. Their involvement in such advocacy, however, does not necessarily emasculate them, as might be expected, but on the contrary, might boost their masculine capital, celebrity status and income,<sup>13</sup> as examples from cat advocacy in North America attest (see Joki, f.c.).

In sharp ideological disagreement with the welfarist faction, abolitionist groups are typically smaller, less professionalized and more grassroots, and many feature white men as key activists and leaders (Wrenn, 2019, p. 192). Such groups are typically more open to embracing intersectional approaches to activism, that is, seeing animal abuse as entangled with intra-human injustices. Yet, while claiming to endorse intersectional activism, this does not always translate to practice (Wrenn, 2019, p. 192) and ultimately, strategies shaped by privileged white male perspectives often prevail. A notable example of this is the US legal scholar and prominent animal activist, often regarded as a key figure of abolitionist animal advocacy organizing, Gary Francione, who campaigns for intersectional activism but has also been accused of white and other forms of privilege, for example, by not showing enough contextual sensitivity towards less privileged humans for whom adopting veganism might be difficult (Wrenn, 2019, p. 192; see also Francione, 2021).

The abolitionist faction includes organizations such as the Animal Liberation Front, known for their “radical” tactics, such as hunt sabotages, freeing animals from factory farms,

intercepting illegal fishing vessels, undercover investigations, destruction of property of animal abusers and other similar kinds of direct action which can lead to legal issues. These highly visible activities are associated with masculinities (Kemmerer, 2018, p. 266) and men's practices, with strong links to male heroism (Frisk, 2019). In many Western countries, a typical "radical" abolitionist animal activist is an educated white middle-class man. Such men tend to be overrepresented among those convicted and serving prison sentences for animal activism. This is one of the rare examples where the judicial system is disproportionately harsh towards white privileged men, due to the controversial nature of animal rights in mainstream society and recent laws in several Western countries restricting several kinds of animal activism to protect the interests of animal enterprises. This includes classifying several kinds of animal activism as terrorism in some countries.<sup>14</sup> A notable example of this is the Stop Huntingdon Animal Cruelty (SHAC) campaign against Huntingdon Life Sciences, the largest animal testing laboratory in Europe. The campaign, which operated in the United Kingdom and the United States between 1999 and 2014, ended with key activists, most of whom were privileged white men, convicted as domestic terrorists (in the United States) and imprisoned for non-violent protest which resulted in lowering the economic value of the company (see Gazzola, 2015; Potter, 2011). Such legislation has the effect of suppressing animal activism and making many forms of activism more difficult and riskier, leaving such action more available for the most privileged, such as educated middle-class white men who have the resources to navigate the legal system.

Several feminist, critical race and critical animal studies scholars have critiqued white, middle-class and male privilege of the animal advocacy movement and its dominant tactics. For example, they have addressed the common assertion by many white animal and vegan activists in the West that the movement should only be focused on non-human animals and not concern itself with issues of race and/or gender. This privileged position dismisses the fact that racialized people and groups continue to be animalized<sup>15</sup> and that constructions of race, gender and species are intertwined (Ko&Ko, 2017; Deckha, 2012; Harper, 2010, 2011, 2012; Polish, 2016). This has material implications for the ability of less privileged people, for instance, racialized individuals to participate in the AAM. For example, in societies where racism runs deep, such as the United States, given the still disproportionately high incarceration rates of Black men (Carson, 2020), it is likely that Black men involved in more "radical" animal activism would face extremely harsh prison sentences.

A notable example of a masculinized strategy in AAM (typically in the professionalized welfarist faction) is the use and sexualization of women's bodies (in particular, young, white and thin) in naked protest as a tactic by some major AAM organizations, notably by People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) (for a critique of this from a gender perspective, see Wrenn, 2016a, 2019). This strategy is deemed by organizations using it as "effective" and intended to appeal to audiences of heterosexual men. Critics have termed this strategy "social movement prostitution" (Wrenn, 2016a) and "the pornification of veganism" (Wrenn, 2016b, p. 102; see also Wrenn, 2013). Wrenn (2016a) associates this tactic with the increasing corporatization and neoliberalization of animal advocacy activism seeking fundraising, despite lack of evidence of the effectiveness of such tactics (2016b, p. 100). At the same time, gender stereotypes are sometimes used to market veganism to men, asserting that veganism boosts men's sexual performance and that the consumption of animal products is emasculating (Wrenn, 2019, pp. 201–202). A notable example of this is the popular US film *Game Changers* (Psihoyos, 2018). Such tactics illustrate how the movement (or at least some segments of it) "exploits racism, sexism, mental health stigma, fat stigma, and disability

stigma in its bid to promote nonhuman interests in a competitive political arena” (Wrenn, 2019, p. 195).

Finally, in a similar way to how the feminist movement consists of activist and academic strands, interlinked with civil society animal advocacy activism are its academic counterparts, notably, vegan ecofeminism (e.g. Adams, 1990) and a relatively recent field of academic inquiry known as critical animal studies (CAS) (e.g. Taylor & Twine, 2014). Many academics in CAS position themselves as scholar-activists. CAS draws significant theoretical inspiration from ecofeminist scholarship and is committed to intersectionality, aiming to challenge speciesism alongside oppressions in human society (sexism, racism, etc.). It is typical of men in CAS to position themselves as profeminist, challenging gendered power relations, hegemonic masculinity and embracing intersectional justice in the movement and in their academic work (see Nocella II et al., p. xxii; Francione, 2009), although not all work in CAS lives up to these ideals.

### **Men, masculinities and animal advocacy organizing through veganism**

Contemporary animal-based food production systems have been critiqued from various perspectives beyond animal ethics, highlighting their social implications. The rationality behind industrialized food production and consumption is aptly captured by the idea of “McDonaldization of society” (Ritzer, 1993). Drawing on Max Weber’s ideas on bureaucracy founded on scientific rationality, within the mechanistic paradigm, the concept describes contemporary societies and social processes as increasingly organized according to five principles: efficiency, calculability, predictability, standardization and control, exemplified by the operation of the ubiquitous fast-food chain. The notion of McDonaldization has been applied to industrial food production in agricultural systems (Currey, 2011) and to the mass production of animal products for human consumption (Wilkie, 2017). The logic of McDonaldization resonates with the ideal of hegemonic masculinity, also in organizational contexts. Work organizations running according to these principles tend to be highly masculinized.

Critical race, Indigenous and decolonial scholars have argued that industrial animal farming and animal-based diets are a form of corporate neocolonial imperial power – imposing animal-based diets on racialized people constitutes a form of colonial violence, termed dietary colonialism (Chu, 2019, p. 189). Western diets high in meat are naturalized as the most appropriate diet for humans, “thus reinforcing a particular, historically white Western model of the ‘human’” (Twine, 2014, p. xx) – a category shaped by the lives and practices of privileged white men and cultural ideals of hegemonic masculinity. In this context, racism, colonialism, capitalism, classism, speciesism and male supremacy intersect, as non-human animals and racialized low-income groups, in particular women, are disproportionately affected by food injustice and factory farming (Bower et al., 2014; Mirabelli et al., 2006; Roy, 2018).

Veganism<sup>16</sup> – the practice of contesting human use of other animals, particularly as sources of food – could be considered one way of moving towards more sustainable human–animal relations, mitigating the climate crisis and contributing to social justice goals. Veganism can also be thought of as resistance to the masculinized rationality and neocolonial implications of meat-producing processes. Established evidence of the multiple harmful effects of eating animals has prompted a number of prominent international health, sustainability and animal advocacy organizations to call for a reduction in or elimination of animal-based foods from human diets (e.g. Willett et al., 2019; Whitmee et al., 2015; Wiseman, 2008). Compared

to other diets, the vegan diet has the smallest ecological footprint (Chai et al., 2019). Plant-based diets have been deemed by the world's leading nutrition organizations as appropriate for humans (British Dietetic Association, 2017; Melina et al., 2016). Thus, transition to plant-based diets constitutes a promising path to more ethical human–animal relations, planetary and human health.

Existing studies on the links between men, masculinities, eating non-human animals and veganism (e.g. Potts & Parry, 2010; Rothgerber, 2013; Sumpter, 2015; Greenebaum & Dexter, 2017; Mycek, 2018; Aavik, 2021; Aavik & Velgan, 2021) indicate that cultural constructions of masculinity are key to understanding reasons why men consume animals. Studying men's veganism and its relationship to ideals of masculinity helps to understand changing masculinities and men's roles in activism. Men's relationship to the environment and to non-human others is likely to change in the context of climate change, potentially challenging existing ideals of hegemonic masculinity. Some recent research provides evidence of men's declining attachment to meat consumption, along with critical attitudes towards cultural associations of meat with masculinity (De Backer et al., 2020). Amid the current environmental crisis and humanity's unsustainable ways of life, along with more flexibility in gender practices, veganism practised by men no longer poses a threat to their masculinity, as earlier research has suggested (e.g. Rothgerber, 2013). This applies particularly to privileged men, who may even benefit from veganism to reinforce their privileged position (Aavik, 2021, 2023). My previous research involving privileged vegan men in Finland and Estonia has demonstrated that transitioning to veganism, men started to increasingly practise care towards (non-human) others and the self (Aavik, 2021, 2023; Aavik & Velgan, 2021), offering possibilities for the emergence of more ecological (Hultman & Pulé, 2018) and caring masculinities (Elliott, 2016).

Veganism practised by men could be examined through the lens of activism, and seen as a form of everyday activism (Mansbridge, 2013).<sup>17</sup> Through their vegan praxis, men act as role models to other men, challenging damaging health behaviours and eating patterns associated with masculinity, for example, by sharing vegan health and nutrition advice with other men in everyday social interactions (Aavik & Velgan, 2021). This is easier for privileged vegan men whose social position facilitates communicating such knowledge to others (Aavik & Velgan, 2021; Aavik, 2023). In such a way, vegan men can act as change agents on a micro-level (Mansbridge, 2013, p. 1). Through such microactivism, men can help transform broader cultural ideals of masculinity with regard to human–animal relations.

### **Conclusions: towards intersectional activism and organizing**

This chapter has explored the role of men and masculinities in contemporary animal advocacy organizing and how these shape the movement's strategies and outcomes. It has been noted that in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries activism for non-human animals was interlinked with other social causes, such as poverty and women's suffrage and as such, was more intersectional than much contemporary non-human animal activism (Wrenn, 2019, p. 65).<sup>18</sup> For both dominant factions in the AAM – the professionalized welfare organizations and abolitionist ones – intersectional activism and collaboration with other movements has proved difficult (Wrenn, 2019, p. 195), due to their ideological positions and tactics, linked with masculinities, as this chapter has explored.

Scholars studying the animal advocacy movement and its tactics argue for the importance of developing intersectional and feminist approaches to activism (Wrenn, 2016b; Wrenn,

2019; Pellow & Brehm, 2015; Herro & Obeng-Odoom, forthcoming; Aavik, 2018). As alternatives to masculinized strategies such as effective altruism, activist tactics drawing on feminist ethics of care have been proposed, foregrounding “contextuality, relationality and gender-equitable structures of care” (Herro & Obeng-Odoom, forthcoming). To challenge animal exploitation, it would be beneficial for animal advocates to form intersectional alliances (Hancock, 2011, p. 119) with other movements and activists around issues of common interest. For instance, it would be in the interests of both vegans and feminists to challenge the ideal of hegemonic masculinity, which is partly constructed around dominating, hunting and eating animals and arguably associating femininity with animals and nature (Aavik, 2019).

While the dominant and more visible segments of the AAM in the West tend to feature the problems described in this chapter, alternative kinds of organizations and activism exist, which challenge the strategies outlined earlier and aspire towards intersectional organizing. Some examples of such organizing include animal advocates collaborating with the LGBT+ movement, however such collaboration tends to be fleeting and unsystematic (Wrenn, 2019, p. 205; Aavik, 2018). Curiously, to this day, there is relatively little collaboration between animal advocacy and climate/environmental movements. Barriers to such collaboration include activists’ fears about losing supporters, particularly in more conservative societies, as well as wanting to remain focused on their messaging, reflecting masculinized effective altruist approaches (Aavik, 2018).

Direct collaboration between movements is not always possible or practical, however, activists can display solidarity with each other’s causes in alternative ways, for example, by cultivating awareness of various (invisibilized) injustices in their field of activism and making sure not to reproduce existing hierarchies. It is important to recognize the similar structural and systemic roots of various oppressions. Ecofeminist, decolonial, critical race and whiteness scholars have highlighted how white Western bourgeois masculinity has been set as a normative standard and rendered superior over all other human beings as well as over non-human animals (Harper, 2010; Polish, 2016; Ko & Ko, 2017; Chu, 2019). This ideology manifests itself through masculinized, racist, speciesist, neocolonial, capitalist and neoliberal social institutions and structures which exploit various marginalized human and non-human beings.

To challenge these systems, we need to move away from masculinized mechanistic paradigms, towards ecological justice (Baxter, 2004) which integrates environmental, animal and social justice into one holistic framework. Intersectional approaches have the potential to enhance the AAM’s capacity to advocate for other animals, as well as challenge hierarchies, masculinized values, strategies and men’s leadership within animal advocacy organizing and organizations. Men play a significant role in this context. As an important step, developing a greater self-reflexivity about their own privilege (see Pease, this volume) and an increased sensitivity towards the values and interests of marginalized groups and beings would be essential.

## Notes

- 1 In this chapter, I understand the animal advocacy movement as “a collective effort to advance the interests of nonhuman species on the grounds that these animals are inherently worthy of equal consideration, not as human resources, but as persons in their own right” (Wrenn, 2019, p. 35). I consider the vegan movement as part of the AAM, as these are interlinked and overlap.
- 2 This figure only includes land animals.

- 3 I use the term “animal advocacy movement” (AAM) over other terms (e.g. “animal rights”, “animal liberation”) that describe the movement of people advocating for non-human animals, to cover a diverse range of perspectives and forms of activism, “not all of which can be grounded in a rights-based approach” (Bourke, 2009, p. 131).
- 4 According to Sorenson (2010, p. 16), the AAM shares “fundamental elements of other progressive social movements: a sense of compassion and fairness, a focus on power relations and a critique of domination, inequality and hierarchy, along with efforts to alleviate conditions of exploitation”.
- 5 Industrial/breadwinner masculinities refer to “a category of men who have long been (and still are) enmeshed with industrial-scale extractive processes and services reliant on energy-intensive, profit-consolidating, ecologically destructive and fossil fuel-dependent processes that have been historically created and maintained through colonisation, engineering and technology, neoclassical economic theories and under-challenged social practices” (Hultman & Pulé, 2018, p. 42).
- 6 The animal–industrial complex is “a partly opaque and multiple set of networks and relationships between the corporate (agricultural) sector, governments, and public and private science” (Twine, 2012, p. 23).
- 7 I focus on veganism, as opposed to meat reduction or vegetarianism, because the former fully rejects human use of animals and thus constitutes a more radical challenge to current exploitative human–animal relations and animal-based food systems.
- 8 In the transnational context, this reflects the hegemony of Western AAMs whose agendas and activities tend to be more visible and imitated in other parts of the world. Some non-Western religions such as Hinduism, Buddhism and Jainism, practiced by millions of men, promote compassion and non-violence towards all living beings and therefore, vegetarian or fully plant-based eating. Although these religions are not considered part of the AAM, their practitioners challenge perceived essentialist links between men, masculinities and meat consumption.
- 9 For an overview of complexities pertaining to defining an “organization”, see Hearn & Collinson, 2018.
- 10 For a discussion on new social movements, including critique of New social movement theory, see Buechler, 2013.
- 11 For an overview of the history of the AAM, see Wrenn, 2019; Nocella II et al., 2013; Beers, 2006.
- 12 For an ecofeminist critique of utilitarianism, see Donovan & Adams, 2007; Donovan, 1990.
- 13 Joki (forthcoming) discusses how a US-based audio engineer Mike Bridavsky became an online celebrity for caring for a now deceased disabled cat LiL BUB and how his performance of a caring heterosexual masculinity along with his whiteness boosted his masculine capital, earning him the status of an eligible bachelor in some online cat communities.
- 14 Since the early 1990s, “AG-Gag” laws have been passed in many countries, criminalizing undercover investigations of animal abuse (including photos and videos) in animal facilities, such as farms, slaughterhouses and laboratories, preventing the public from accessing information about the treatment of non-human animals in these facilities (see Shea, 2014; Wrock, 2016). These laws and subsequent convictions raise broader legal and philosophical questions about what constitutes legally protected speech and its social implications (see Potter, 2011, Gazzola, 2015, Lazare, 2020; Shea, 2014). These laws are an example of how governments, as part of the animal–industrial complex, protect the interests of the animal industry. The Animal Enterprise Terrorism Act was adopted in the United States in 2006 which classifies as terrorism “interfering” with the operations of animal enterprises – a vague wording which can be used to easily prosecute animal activists, even for non-violent protest. For instance, if as a result of animal activists’ activities, stock value of the company falls or the sales of their animal products declines, this could be interpreted by courts as damage done to the enterprise and therefore criminalized (for an overview, see Potter, 2011; Gazzola, 2015). In the United Kingdom, the Serious Organised Crime and Police Act of 2005 introduced new offences for various “animal rights crimes”.
- 15 Deemed closer to non-human animals in the “Great chain of being”, a racist, sexist and speciesist hierarchy; and regarded as more animal-like than Western white able-bodied men in particular, who are placed at the top of the hierarchy.
- 16 A bulk of existing literature has used the terms “veganism” and “plant-based diets” interchangeably. One of the most often used definitions of veganism is the one provided by The Vegan Society: “Veganism is a philosophy and way of living which seeks to exclude – as far as is possible and practicable – all forms of exploitation of, and cruelty to, animals for food, clothing or any other purpose” (The

Vegan Society, n.d.). Plant-based eating is a key manifestation of veganism, although people might follow a plant-based diet for reasons other than animal ethics.

- 17 Everyday activism has been defined as “talk and action in everyday life that is not consciously coordinated with the actions of others but is (1) to some degree caused (inspired, encouraged) by a social movement and (2) consciously intended to change others’ ideas or behavior in directions advocated by the movement” (Mansbridge, 2013, p. 1).
- 18 Although it relied on and reproduced class and race biases and inequalities (Wrenn, 2019, pp. 196–197).

## References

- Aavik, K. (2018). The animal advocacy movement in the Baltic states: Links to other social justice issues and possibilities for intersectional activism. *Journal of Baltic Studies*, 49(4), 509–527. doi: 10.1080/01629778.2018.1473263
- Aavik, K. (2019). The rise of veganism in post-socialist Europe: Making sense of emergent vegan practices and identities in Estonia. In L. Wright (Ed.), *Through a Vegan Studies Lens: Textual Ethics and Lived Activism* (pp. 151–170). Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.
- Aavik, K. (2021). Vegan men: Towards greater care for (non)human others, Earth and self. In P. Pulé, & M. Hultman (Eds.), *Men, Masculinities, and Earth: Contending with the (m)Anthropocene* (pp. 329–350). London: Palgrave Macmillan. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-54486-7\_15
- Aavik, K. (2023). *Contesting Anthropocentric Masculinities Through Veganism: Lived Experiences of Vegan Men*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aavik, K., & Velgan, M. (2021). Vegan men’s food and health practices: Arecipe for a more health-conscious masculinity? *American Journal of Men’s Health*, 5(15), 1–14. doi: 10.1177/15579883211044323
- Adams, C. (1990). *The Sexual Politics of Meat: A Feminist-Vegetarian Critical Theory*. New York: Continuum.
- Adams, C., & Donovan, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Animals & Women: Feminist Theoretical Explorations*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Adams, C. J., Crary, A., & Gruen, L. (Eds.). (2023). *The Good it Promises, the Harm it Does: Critical Essays on Effective Altruism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Baxter, B. (2004). *A Theory of Ecological Justice*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Beers, D. (2006). *For the Prevention of Cruelty: The History and Legacy of Animal Rights Activism in the United States*. Athens: Swallow Press.
- Bourke, D. (2009). The use and misuse of ‘rights talk’ by the animal rights movement. In P. Sankoff & S. White (Eds.), *Animal Law in Australasia: A New Dialogue* (pp. 128–150). Sydney: Federation Press.
- Bouvard, V., Loomis, D., Guyton, K. Z., Grosse, Y., El Ghissassi, F., Benbrahim-Tallaa, L., Guha, N., Mattock, H., & Straif, K. (2015). Carcinogenicity of consumption of red and processed meat. *The Lancet Oncology*, 16(16), 1599–1600. doi: 10.1016/S1470-2045(15)00444-1
- Bower, K. M., Thorpe, R. J. Jr., Rohde, C., & Gaskin, D. J. (2014). The intersection of neighborhood racial segregation, poverty, and urbanicity and its impact on food store availability in the United States. *Preventive Medicine*, 58, 33–39. doi: 10.1016/j.ypmed.2013.10.010
- British Dietetic Association (2017). British Dietetic Association Confirms Well-planned Vegan Diets Can Support Healthy Living in People of All Ages. British Dietetic Association (BDA): <https://www.bda.uk.com/resource/british-dietetic-association-confirms-well-planned-vegan-diets-can-support-healthy-living-in-people-of-all-ages.html>
- Brown, C. (2004). Emerging zoonoses and pathogens of public health significance – an overview. *Revue scientifique et technique-office international des epizooties*, 23(2), 435–442. doi: 10.20506/rst.23.2.1495
- Buechler, S. M. (2013). New social movements and New Social Movement theory. In D. A. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans & D. McAdam (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Carson, E. A. (2020). Prisoners in 2018. U.S. Department of Justice. Retrieved from <https://bjs.ojp.gov/content/pub/pdf/p18.pdf>
- Chai, B. C., van der Voort, J. R., Grofelnik, K., Eliasdottir, H. G., Klöss, I., & Perez-Cueto, F. J. (2019). Which diet has the least environmental impact on our planet? A systematic review of vegan, vegetarian and omnivorous diets. *Sustainability*, 11(15), 4110. doi: 10.3390/su11154110

- Chemnitz, C., & Becheva, S. (Eds.). (2021). *Meat Atlas: Facts and Figures about the Animals We Eat*. Berlin: Heinrich Böll Foundation.
- Chu, S. (2019). Nonviolence through veganism: An antiracist postcolonial strategy for healing, agency and respect. In L. Wright (Ed.), *Through a Vegan Studies Lens: Textual Ethics and Lived Activism* (pp. 180–201). Reno, NV: University of Nevada Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1997). Why is classical theory classical? *American Journal of Sociology*, 102(6), 1511–1557. doi: 10.1086/231125
- Counihan, C. M., & Kaplan, S. L. (2003). *Food and Gender: Identity and Power*. Oxon & New York: Routledge.
- Currey, A. D. (2011). The evolution of industrial food production: Mcdonaldization and population health. *Scientia et Humanitas*, 1, 121–135.
- De Backer, C., Erreygers, S., De Cort, C., Vandermoere, F., Dhoest, A., Vrinten, J., & Van Bauwel, S. (2020). Meat and masculinities: Can differences in masculinity predict meat consumption, intentions to reduce meat and attitudes towards vegetarians? *Appetite*, 147, 104559. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2019.104559
- Deckha, M. (2012). Toward a postcolonial, posthumanist feminist theory: Centralizing race and culture in feminist work on nonhuman animals. *Hypatia*, 27(3), 527–545.
- Donovan, J. (1990). Animal rights and feminist theory. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*, 15(2), 350–375.
- Donovan, J., & Adams, C. (Eds.). (2007). *The Feminist Care Tradition in Animal Ethics*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Eisnitz, G. A. (2006). *Slaughterhouse: The Shocking Story of Greed, Neglect, and Inhumane Treatment Inside the US Meat Industry*. Amherst, NY: Prometheus Books.
- Elliott, K. (2016). Caring masculinities: Theorizing an emerging concept. *Men and Masculinities*, 19(3), 240–259. doi: 10.1177/1097184X15576203
- Francione, G. (2009). Sexism and Misogyny in the Movement. Retrieved from [www.abolitionistapproach.com/sexism-and-misogyny-in-the-movement/](http://www.abolitionistapproach.com/sexism-and-misogyny-in-the-movement/)
- Francione, G. (2021). Woke Animal Rights Means no Animal Rights. Retrieved from <https://garyfrancione.medium.com/woke-animal-rights-means-no-animal-rights-bf1e420e0404>
- Frisk, K. (2019). What makes a hero? Theorising the social structuring of heroism. *Sociology*, 53(1), 87–103. doi: 10.1177/0038038518764568
- Gaard, G. (2002). Vegetarian ecofeminism. *Frontiers: A Journal of Women Studies*, 23(3), 117–146.
- Gardner, E. (2011). *Women and the Animal Rights Movement*. Rutgers University Press.
- Gazzola, L. (2015). Bad things happened: Metaphorical fingerprints, constellations of evidence, and “Guilt For Association”. *Vermont Law Review*, 40, 813–920.
- Goodland, R., & Anhang, J. (2009, November/December). Livestock and Climate Change: What If the Key Actors in Climate Change are Cows, Pigs, and Chicken? World Watch. <https://awellfedworld.org/wp-content/uploads/Livestock-Climate-Change-Anhang-Goodland.pdf>
- Greenebaum J., & Dexter, B. (2017). Vegan men and hybrid masculinity. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 27(6), 637–648. doi: 10.1080/09589236.2017.1287064
- Gruen, L. (1993). Dismantling oppression: An analysis of the connection between women and animals. In G. Gaard (Ed.), *Ecofeminism: Women, Animals, Nature* (pp. 60–90). Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Gruen, L. (2015). *Entangled Empathy*. New York: Lantern Books.
- Gruen, L., & Probyn-Rapsey, F. (2018). Distillations. In L. Gruen & F. Probyn-Rapsey (Eds.), *Animaladies: Gender, Animals, and Madness* (pp. 1–8). New York: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Hancock, A.-M. (2011). *Solidarity Politics for Millennials: A Guide to Ending the Oppression Olympics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Harper, A. B. (2010). Race as a “feeble matter” in veganism: Interrogating whiteness, geopolitical privilege, and consumption philosophy of ‘cruelty-free’ products. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 8(3), 5–27.
- Harper, A. B. (2011). Vegans of color, racialized embodiment, and problematics of the ‘Exotic.’ In A. Alkon & J. Agyeman (Eds.), *Cultivating Food Justice: Race, Class, and Sustainability* (pp. 221–238). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Harper, A. B. (2012). Going beyond the normative white ‘post-racial’ vegan epistemology. In P. Williams-Forsen & C. Counihan (Eds.), *Taking Food Public* (pp. 155–174). New York: Routledge.

- Hearn, J., & Collinson, D. (2018). Men, masculinities and gendered organizations. In R. Aldag & S. Nkomo (Eds.), *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Business and Management*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Herro, A., & Obeng-Odoom F. (forthcoming). Philanthropy and the feminist ethics of care: Prospects and problems. In R. Mirabella, A. Eikenberry & T. Coule (Eds.), *The Handbook of Critical Perspectives on Nonprofit Organizing and Voluntary Action: Concepts, Applications and Future Directions*. Edward Elgar: Cheltenham.
- Hultman, M., & Pulé, P. M. (2018). *Ecological Masculinities: Theoretical Foundations and Practical Guidance*. London: Routledge.
- Inness, S. A. (Ed.). (2001). *Cooking Lessons: The Politics of Gender and Food*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- IPCC (2021). *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Masson-Delmotte, V., P. Zhai, A. Pirani, S. L. Connors, C. Péan, S. Berger, N. Caud, Y. Chen, L. Goldfarb, M. I. Gomis, M. Huang, K. Leitzell, E. Lonnoy, J. B. R. Matthews, T. K. Maycock, T. Waterfield, O. Yelekçi, R. Yu & B. Zhou (eds.)]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jenkins, R. (2018). The other ghosts in our machine: Meat processing and slaughterhouse workers in the United States of America. In A. Linzey & C. Linzey (Eds.), *Ethical Vegetarianism and Veganism* (pp. 232–244). London: Routledge.
- Joki, M. M. (forthcoming). Negotiating disability in celebrity cat Lil BUB's eating videos. In K. Aavik, K. Irni & M. M. Joki (Eds.), *Feminist Animal and Multispecies Studies: Critical Perspectives on Food and Eating* (pp. xx–xx). Leiden: Brill Critical Animal Studies Series.
- Kemmerer, L. (2018). Evidence of sexism and male privilege in the animal liberation/rights movement. *Between the Species*, 21(1), 12.
- Kemmerer, L. (2023). *Oppressive Liberation: Sexism in Animal Activism*. Cham: Springer Nature.
- Ko, A., & Ko, S. (2017). *Aphro-ism. Essays on Pop Culture, Feminism, and Black Veganism from Two Sisters*. New York: Lantern Books.
- Landers, T., Landers, T. F., Wittum, T. E., & Larson, E. L. (2012). A review of antibiotic use in food animals: Perspective, policy, and potential. *Public Health Reports*, 127(1), 4–22. doi: 10.1177/003335491212700103
- Lazare, J. (2020). Ag-gag Laws, animal rights activism, and the constitution: What is protected speech? *Alberta Law Review*, 58, 83–106.
- Leth-Espensen, M. (forthcoming). Care in a time of anthropogenic problems: Experiences from sanctuary-making in rural Denmark. In K. Aavik, K. Irni & M. M. Joki (Eds.), *Feminist Animal and Multispecies Studies: Critical Perspectives on Food and Eating* (pp. xx–xx). Leiden: Brill Critical Animal Studies Series.
- MacAskill, W. (2017). Effective altruism: Introduction. *Essays in Philosophy*, 18(1), eP1580; 1–5. doi: 10.7710/1526-0569.1580
- Mansbridge, J. (2013). Everyday activism. In D. Snow, D. della Porta, B. Klandermans & D. McAdam (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Social and Political Movements* (pp. 1–2). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Melina, V., Winston, C., & Levin, S. (2016). Position of the academy of nutrition and dietetics: Vegetarian diets. *Journal of Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics*, 116(12), 1970–1980. doi: 10.1016/j.jand.2016.09.025
- Micha, R., Micha, R., Peñalvo, J. L., Cudhea, F., Imamura, F., Rehm, C. D., & Mozaffarian, D. (2017). Association between dietary factors and mortality from heart disease, stroke, and type 2 diabetes in the United States. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 317(9), 912–924. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.0947
- Mirabelli, M., Wing, S., Marshall, S., & Wilcosky, T. (2006). Race, poverty, and potential exposure of middle-school students to air emissions from confined swine feeding operations. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 114(4), 591–596. 10.1289/ehp.8586
- Modlinska, K., Adamczyk, D., Maison, D., & Pisula, W. (2020). Gender differences in attitudes to vegans/vegetarians and their food preferences, and their implications for promoting sustainable dietary patterns: A systematic review. *Sustainability*, 12(16), 6292. doi: 10.3390/su12166292
- Moore, J. W. (2017). The Capitalocene, Part I: On the nature and origins of our ecological crisis. *The Journal of Peasant Studies*, 44(3), 594–630.

- Mycek, M., K. (2018). Meatless meals and masculinity: How veg\* men explain their plant-based diets, *Food and Foodways*, 26(3), 223–245. doi: 10.1080/07409710.2017.1420355
- Nakagawa, S., & Hart, C. (2019). Where's the beef? How masculinity exacerbates gender disparities in health behaviors. *Socius*, 5. doi: 10.1177/2378023119831801.
- Nocella II, A., Sorenson, J., Socha, K., Matsuoka, A. (2013). Introduction: The emergence of Critical Animal Studies: The rise of intersectional animal liberation. In A. Nocella, A. II, J. Sorenson & K. Socha (Eds.), *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersectional Social Justice Approach for Liberation* (pp. xix–xxxvi). New York: Peter Lang.
- Noske, B. (1989). *Humans and Other Animals*. London: Pluto Press.
- Parks, B. C., & Roberts, J. T. (2006). Globalization, vulnerability to climate change, and perceived injustice. *Society & Natural Resources*, 19(4), 337–355. doi: 10.1080/08941920500519255
- Pellow, D. N., & Brehm, H. N. (2015). From the new ecological paradigm to total liberation: The emergence of a social movement frame. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 56(1), 185–212.
- Polish, J. (2016). Decolonizing veganism: On resisting vegan whiteness and racism. In J. Castriano & R. R. Simonsen (Eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Veganism* (pp. 373–391). Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Potter, W. (2011). *Green is the New Red: An Insider's Account of a Social Movement under Siege*. San Francisco, CA: City Lights.
- Potts, A., & Parry, J. (2010). Vegan sexuality: Challenging heteronormative masculinity through meat-free sex, *Feminism & Psychology*, 20(1), 53–72. doi: 10.1177/0959353509351181
- Prättälä, R., Paalanen, L., Grinberga, D., Helasoja, V., Kasmel, A., & Petkeviciene, J. (2007). Gender differences in the consumption of meat, fruit and vegetables are similar in Finland and the Baltic countries. *European Journal of Public Health*, 17(5), 520–525. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/ckl265
- Psihoyos, L. (2018). The Game Changers [Documentary Film].
- Räty, R., & Carlsson-Kanyama, A. (2010). Energy consumption by gender in some European countries. *Energy Policy*, 38(1), 646–649. doi: 10.1016/j.enpol.2009.08.010
- Regan, T. (1983). *The Case for Animal Rights*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Rippin, H. L., Cade, J. E., Berrang-Ford, L., Benton, T. G., Hancock, N., & Greenwood, D. C. (2021). Variations in greenhouse gas emissions of individual diets: Associations between the greenhouse gas emissions and nutrient intake in the United Kingdom. *PLoS One*, 16(11), e0259418.
- Ripple, W., Wolf, C., Newsome, T. Barnard, B., Moomaw, W., et al. (2020). *World Scientists' Warning of a Climate Emergency*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ritzer, G. (1993). *The McDonaldization of Society*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Robinson, M. (2013). Veganism and Mi'kmaq legends. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies*, 33(1), 189–196.
- Rothgerber, H. (2013). Real Men Don't Eat (Vegetable) Quiche: Masculinity and the justification of meat consumption. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 14(4), 363–375. doi: 10.1037/a0030379
- Roy, S. S. (2018). *Linking Gender to Climate Change Impacts in the Global South*. New York: Springer.
- Ruby, M. B., & Heine, S. J. (2011). Meat, morals, and masculinity. *Appetite*, 56, 447–450. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2011.01.018
- Sebastian, M. (2018). Deadly efficiency: The impact of capitalist production on the “meat” industry, slaughterhouse workers, and nonhuman animals. In D. Nibert (Ed.), *Animal Oppression and Capitalism. Volume 1: The Oppression of Nonhuman Animals as Sources of Food* (pp. 167–183). Santa Barbara, CA: Praeger.
- Shea, M. (2014). Punishing animal rights activists for animal abuse: Rapid reporting and the new wave of ag-gag laws. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*, 48, 337.
- Singer, P. (1975). *Animal Liberation*. New York: Avon Books.
- Singer, P. (1980). Utilitarianism and vegetarianism. *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, 325–337.
- Steffen, W., Richardson, K., Rockström, J., et al. (2015). Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science*, 347(6223), 1259855. doi: 10.1126/science.1259855
- Steinfeld, H., Gerber, P., Wassenaar, T. D., Castel, V., Rosales, M., Rosales, M., & de Haan, C. (2006). *Livestock's Long Shadow: Environmental Issues and Options* [Report]. Rome: Food and Agriculture Organisation.
- Sumpter, K. (2015). Masculinity and meat consumption: An analysis through the theoretical lens of hegemonic masculinity and alternative masculinity theories. *Sociology Compass*, 9(2), 104–114. doi: 10.1111/soc4.12241

- Szabo, M. (2019). Masculinities, food and cooking. In L. Gottzen, U. Mellström & T. Shefer (Eds.), *Routledge International Handbook of Masculinity Studies* (pp. 404–413). London: Routledge.
- Taylor, N., & Twine, R. (Eds.). (2014). *The Rise of Critical Animal Studies: From the Margins to the Centre*. London: Routledge.
- Taylor, S. (2017). *Beasts of Burden: Animal and Disability Liberation*. New York: The New Press.
- The Humane League (2021). How are Factory Farms Cruel to Animals? Retrieved from <https://the-humaneleague.org/article/factory-farming-animal-cruelty>
- The National Provisioner (2021). The 2018 top 100 Meat & Poultry Processors. Retrieved from [www.provisioneronline.com/2018-top-100-meat-and-poultry-processors](http://www.provisioneronline.com/2018-top-100-meat-and-poultry-processors)
- The Vegan Society (n.d.). Definition of Veganism. Retrieved from [www.vegansociety.com/go-vegan/definition-veganism](http://www.vegansociety.com/go-vegan/definition-veganism).
- Thomas, M. A. (2016). Are vegans the same as vegetarians? The effect of diet on perceptions of masculinity. *Appetite*, 97, 79–86. doi: 10.1016/j.appet.2015.11.021
- Twine, R. (2012). Revealing the ‘animal-industrial’ complex – A concept and method for Critical Animal Studies. *Journal for Critical Animal Studies*, 10(1), 12–39.
- Twine, R. (2014). Ecofeminism and veganism: Revisiting the question of universalism. In C. Adams & L. Gruen (Eds.), *Ecofeminism: Feminist Intersections with Other Animals and the Earth* (pp. 191–207). London: Bloomsbury Press.
- United Nations (2021). “Climate Commitments not on Track to Meet Paris Agreement Goals” as NDC Synthesis Report is Published. Retrieved from <https://unfccc.int/news/climate-commitments-not-on-track-to-meet-paris-agreement-goals-as-ndc-synthesis-report-is-published>.
- Whitmee, S., Haines, A., Beyrer, C., Boltz, F., Capon, A. G., de Souza, F., Dias, B., Ezeh, A., Frumkin, H., Gong, P., Head, P., Horton, R., Mace, G. M., Marten, R., Myers, S. S., Nishtar, S., Osofsky, S. A., Pattanayak, S. K., Pongsiri, M. J., & Romanelli, C. (2015). Safeguarding human health in the Anthropocene epoch: Report of The Rockefeller Foundation-Lancet Commission on planetary health. *The Lancet*, 386(10007), 1973–2028. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)60901-1
- Willett, W., Rockström, J., Loken, B., Springmann, M., Lang, T., Vermeulen, S., et al. (2019). Food in the Anthropocene: The EAT–Lancet Commission on healthy diets from sustainable food systems. *The Lancet*, 393(10170), 447–492. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31788-4
- Wiseman, M. (2008). The second World Cancer Research Fund/American Institute for Cancer Research expert report. Food, nutrition, physical activity, and the prevention of cancer: A global perspective. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 67(3), 253–256. doi: 10.1017/S002966510800712X
- Wilkie, R. (2017). Animals as sentient commodities. In *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Studies* (pp. 279–301). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Winter, M. F., & Robert, E. R. (1980). Male dominance, late capitalism, and the growth of instrumental reason. *Berkeley Journal of Sociology*, 24/25, 249–280.
- World Health Organisation (2017). Antimicrobial Resistance in the Food Chain. Retrieved from [www.who.int/foodsafety/areas\\_work/antimicrobial-resistance/amrfoodchain/en/](http://www.who.int/foodsafety/areas_work/antimicrobial-resistance/amrfoodchain/en/)
- Wrenn, C. (2013). The role of professionalization regarding female exploitation in the Nonhuman Animal rights movement. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 24(2), 131.
- Wrenn, C. L. (2016a). Social movement prostitution: A case study in nonhuman animal rights activism and vegan pimping. *Griffith Journal of Law & Human Dignity*, 4(2), 87–99.
- Wrenn, C. L. (2016b). *A Rational Approach to Animal Rights: Extensions in Abolitionist Theory*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Wrenn, C. L. (2016c). An analysis of diversity in nonhuman animal rights media. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 29(2), 143–165.
- Wrenn, C. L. (2019). *Piecemeal Protest: Animal Rights in the Age of Nonprofits*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Wrock, R. K. (2016). Ignorance is bliss: Self-regulation and Ag-gag laws in the American meat industry. *Contemporary Justice Review*, 19(2), 267–279. doi: 10.1080/10282580.2016.1168256