

## **Oxfam and RSPCA comparisons**

Nowadays charities face major problems, for example charities need money, but they need the money from people. So they try to make advertisements, so that people have sympathy for them and donate money. The Oxfam and RSPCA are trying to achieve to stop cruelty towards animals, kids and help the third world. To achieve this goal they need the finance support from the people more fortunate. Some charities are not government supported so they need help, so that's why they turn to the next best thing the public.

Let me start of with the Oxfam advertisement, this is effective cause there is a girl with a broken leg, bandaged eye, and something wrong with the arm. Which is also effective is the heading 'look me in the eye and tell me the arms control are tough enough'. I felt very sympathetic towards that, mainly because you see a little battered girl telling you to look her in the eye when she's only got 1. The RSPCA is on the same motorway but going different direction, cause the layout is different for example there's three different stories which make the reader sympathetic but not as much as the Oxfam. The RSPCA says if you pay £3 a month it will benefit the animals. So both advertisements are made for good causes, but for different species.

The Oxfam advertisement is about arms control. They believe 90% of casualties are caused by arms controls. Oxfam want to stop the new code of conduct on arms sales. The EU leaders say its tough. But Oxfam disagrees. So Oxfam wants to persuade people to back them up by stopping arms control. The RSPCA advertisement is mainly based on animal cruelty. They want £3 so it can save more animals lives. The RSPCA showed three sad stories about Billy, Nutcracker and Tom. These stories are about how these three creatures were viciously sabotaged by their owners. RSPCA objective was to stop animal cruelty.

The Oxfam girl picture is so disaster able that it will catch the public's eye. Because she has so many body damages that it almost makes you sick. I think Oxfam deliberately showed this picture to the public, because they knew the public would be pulled in like a magnet to this horrendous picture. I personally think that the public must be horrified to wonder how a girl of this age can be in this kind of state. The RSPCA picture about the dog lying on the floor will not attract as much people as the little girl, but still makes the message it wants to get out. I believe the Oxfam advertisement is more of a concern to me than the RSPCA, and I think will grab more attention.

The similarity between the two advertisements is that both humans and animal can get physically and emotionally hurt. The difference between them is that the Oxfam picture is a human and that the RSPCA pictures are creatures. Plus I have to include that the RSPCA were asking for money, but the Oxfam were asking you for your support against arms control.

I reckon overall I think the Oxfam advertisement is more sufficient, this is since the girls picture is much more devastating to me and I think others than the RSPCA's. The Oxfam advertisement has a much more stronger message going across especially the slogan, which says 'look me in the eye and tell me that arms control are tough enough'. However we should consider that the Oxfam advertisement is focusing on children and war, which is more valuable than animals. I personally think the Oxfam advert is much more better and effective. Mainly because it goes into the deep concepts of war and the children who suffer from it. I find it way more interesting than abused animals. So my opinion is that the Oxfam advertisement is much more effective than the RSPCA's advertisement. Thank you.

**By Joseph Zere**