

ANIMAL WELFARE AND HUMAN BENEFIT: RATIONALE EXPANSION AS STRATEGY IN THE ANTI-VIVISECTION CAMPAIGN

Karl R. Kunkel, Southwest Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

Research in the construction of social problems examines claims-making activity as groups attempt to define conditions as problems. Previous research on domain expansion documents how established claims become the foundation for new sets of concerns. In the campaign for the rights of laboratory animals, groups attempting to construct these conditions as problems do not solely rely on cruelty rhetoric for moving the public and lawmakers to action. Realizing the culture does not provide inherent sympathy for these animals, groups attempt to link their concern to other rationales, threat to humans and waste of taxpayers' money, for supporting a desired outcome.

INTRODUCTION

Vivisection, the use of live animals in research, has been a major concern of the animal rights movement since the campaign began in the late 1970s (Finsen, Finsen 1994; Jasper, Nelkin 1992). Two early examples of public protest illustrate this saliency. During 1976, armed with the moral stance advocated by Singer's (1975) *Animal Liberation*, Henry Spira lead a group demonstrating against a long-running research program on cat sexuality at the American Museum of Natural History in Manhattan (Jasper, Poulsen 1993). This action was later followed by Spira's 1980 organized protest of animal testing in the production of Revlon cosmetics (Jasper, Nelkin 1992). The campaign against vivisection was, and continues to be, at the center of the animal rights movement. Estimates vary on the number of animals used in research each year in the United States. The National Anti-Vivisection Society (n.d.) claims the number is between 17 and 22 million ("The Campaign for Life"). Other sources (American Anti-Vivisection Society n.d.) report numbers as high as 100 million ("STOP: Why We Oppose Vivisection").

The use of animals in research takes many forms, all of which are objectionable in the eyes of animal rights sympathizers. Animals are used in product safety testing, including cosmetics and various household products. Animals are used in medical research including basic biological education, the study of drug and alcohol addiction, observing the etiology of disease, developing surgical techniques, vaccinations, and drugs. Furthermore, animals are subjects in a variety of research projects sponsored and performed by the U.S. military. Examples include radiation exposure and attempts to understand war injuries (e.g., head injuries) so that treatment can be developed (Maggitti 1994). Animals are also used

as subjects in psychological research (Ulrich 1991). Consistent with the philosophy advocated by many animal rights groups, animals have the right not to be used as instruments for human benefit and, because they suffer and/or die in this type of research, vivisection is a problem that needs elimination.

Numerous organizations are concerned with defining the use of animals in research as a social problem. Examples of these organizations include People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM), Psychologists for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PsychETA), Last Chance for Animals (LCA), the American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS), and the National Anti-Vivisection Society (NAVS). Their objective is to end cruel treatment of animals. These groups strive to change people's attitudes and habits so that members of the public will put pressure on both companies and governmental agencies that either conduct or fund research on animals, as well as policymakers who are asked to outlaw certain vivisection practices. PETA, in its journal *Animal Times*, provides lists of companies that test products on animals and asks members to boycott these companies. Animal rights groups concerned with vivisection also lobby for legal restrictions on animal experimentation. For example, various local jurisdictions have outlawed the Draize eye test, where substances are placed in the eyes of rabbits to test for toxicity, and the California general assembly has considered such a measure on the state level (Millsaps 1990). PETA asks members to write legislators urging them to support legislation restricting or outlawing vivisection.

This examination of claims-making rhetoric concentrates on attempts to construct the use of animals in biomedical research as a problem requiring change. This issue is of

particular interest because vivisection proponents believe research on animals is important for human health. It is widely claimed by pro-vivisectionists that improved human health and increased longevity is dependent on research involving animals. Some people have trouble feeling sympathy for research animals when the perceived alternative is loss of human life and quality of life. Furthermore, most animals used for medical research are rodents making sympathy and mass public action unlikely. Groups claiming biomedical vivisection is a social problem solely because the practice is cruel to laboratory animals probably will not convince many people to support their cause.

An examination of rhetorical claims-making by various anti-vivisection groups reveals their strategy does not rely solely on the cruelty issue. Much of the rhetoric does stress the suffering of animals in research labs; however, rationale expansion can be seen in their strategy. Current rhetoric can be divided into two broad categories of claims: 1) the continued issue of cruelty supplemented by recent development of alternatives to vivisection, and 2) alleged lack of benefit from animal experimentation and the tremendous taxpayer cost of such research.

STUDYING RHETORICAL STRATEGY AMONG ANTI-VIVISECTION GROUPS

Data for this study were derived using a qualitative content analysis of claims-making activity and rhetorical devices used by individuals and groups in the anti-vivisection movement. Data sources include newsletters, other mailings, and organizations' home pages on the World Wide Web, as well as observations and interviews conducted at two animal rights conferences in June 1990 and November 1991. These data provide insight to the rhetoric and strategies used by activists when advancing the rights of animals. Data were collected from June 1990 through February 1996.

During the course of analyzing rhetorical content of claims-making activities by anti-vivisection groups, it became apparent that these groups universally advocate, quote, and endorse particular books critical of vivisection and written by people said to be experts. These monographs are claimed by anti-vivisection groups to be articulations of their position and arguments. Recommended books include: Michael W. Fox (1990), *Inhumane Society: The American Way of Exploiting*

Animals; Robert Sharpe (1988), *The Cruel Deception: The Use of Animals in Medical Research*; and Peter Singer (1975), *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for our Treatment of Animals*. Qualitative content analysis of the anti-vivisection rhetoric contained in these books provided additional data for this case study of anti-vivisection claims-making strategy.

Cruelty Rhetoric

The victim, a winsome little squirrel monkey, is shown swinging happily in his cage. Then, step by horrifying step, he becomes less and less a sensate creature and more a specimen. First, he is immobilized in a plexiglass yoke for anesthetizing. Then, still alive, cut open along the abdomen. Then beheaded. The skull is cracked away from the brain. The brain, eyes still attached, is frozen, bisected, and sliced like a ham. The slices are mounted. A scientist peers at one slice under the microscope. The monkey is now only an abstract composition, a cluster of dots in a dull sea of protoplasm. "Beautiful," says the scientist, with rare emotion in his voice, "Just beautiful". (AAVS n.d. STOP: Why We Oppose Vivisection)

The initial and primary concern involves the suffering and death of animals in research laboratories. Pamphlets distributed by these organizations reflect the notion of cruelty. For example, monkeys are pictured locked in small cages peering through the bars or immobilized in laboratory equipment. Dogs and cats are displayed in similar situations. It is common to see leaflets, pamphlets, and other written material containing pictures of living monkeys, dogs, and cats with pieces of scientific equipment embedded in their heads, many of which have wires connecting the animals to machines recording biological functions.

Animal experiments are graphically described in leaflets, such as one distributed by LCA entitled, "Facts About Vivisection." The rhetorical device contains the following section:

Vivisection is inhumane. There are no laws guaranteeing protection from pain in research laboratories. Anesthetics are not regularly used; dogs are debarked to eliminate their cries of agony. 100 million animals a year are shot, electrocuted, irrigated, force-fed toxic substances, burned, drowned, suffocated,

crushed, tortured, forced to cannibalize, starved, frozen, deprived of the company of other animals, sleep, and water. They are kept in restraining devices for months at a time, unable to move, while their brains or their sexual organs are shocked or removed—and as many more atrocities as the human mind can imagine. (LCA n.d. Facts About Vivisection)

Anti-vivisection groups encourage members to engage in acts of civil disobedience and other public demonstrations. Each year, In Defense of Animals (IDA) sponsors "World Laboratory Animal Liberation Week." Numerous regionally coordinated conferences and demonstrations are held worldwide. This annual event is now in its twelfth year. Demonstrations and acts of civil disobedience typically are held outside places where alleged vivisection is practiced or in front of government offices where funding for vivisection is distributed. These demonstrations involve people carrying signs with pictures of animals being tortured in laboratory settings.

These organizations publish newsletters and journals sent several times a year to dues-paying members. Publications discuss specific campaigns against particular projects. LCA prints elaborate descriptions of work conducted by individual researchers. These descriptions show pictures of alleged vivisectors followed by such descriptors as "kitten crippler," "brain destroyer," "cat tormentor," and "skull driller." Telephone numbers are also provided so that interested persons can call these individuals to express feelings of outrage.

Anti-vivisection groups clearly oppose the use of animals in research because it is a violation of fundamental animal rights. Their basic philosophy is one of anti-anthropocentrism arguing humans cannot use animals for human benefit because animals are sentient creatures, capable of feeling pain. Obviously those believing research on animals brings cures for human ailments and saves human lives challenge this notion. Since anti-vivisection groups are battling a culture that places human life above that of animals, these groups expanded their rhetoric to other concerns. One expansion involves rhetoric claiming there are bona fide alternatives to the use of animals in research.

EXPANSION OF CRUELTY RHETORIC: ALTERNATIVES TO ANIMALS TESTING

Vivisection is unnecessary. Many superior alternatives to animal research have been developed. They are cheaper, the results can be safely applied to humans, and do not require animal suffering and death to perform. The Ames test is a good example. It uses a strain of salmonella bacteria to test for the potential of chemicals to cause mutation in the structure of the genes. It costs about \$300.00 to perform and gives results in 3 days. The same test in a dog costs about \$150,000.00 and takes 3 years to give less reliable results. Researchers are reluctant to develop alternatives, however, because the funding is not as lucrative when these procedures are used. (LCA n.d. Facts About Vivisection)

Anti-vivisection groups claim scientists have developed superior alternatives to using animals in research. Pamphlets, brochures, articles, and columns in newsletters and journals, all discuss alternatives to the use of animals in research. For example, NAVS publishes a brochure (n.d.), "A Compendium of Alternatives," which includes detailed discussion of the feasibility of using alternatives to animal research. Cell, tissue, organ, and bacteria cultures, computer and mechanical models, placentas, and human subjects are discussed. This rhetoric often contains quotations from doctors claiming the data generated from these alternatives are superior and much more applicable to humans than data generated from animals in medical research. The implication of this rhetoric centers on the assertion that vivisection not only involves pain, suffering, and death for animals, but it is even more cruel because it is not necessary. Anti-vivisection groups claim these alternatives yield results more applicable for bettering human quality of life.

Anti-vivisection rhetoric goes beyond the emotional issue of cruelty and the rational plea for using alternatives to animal research by questioning what is really learned from research on animals. These interest groups expand rationale for opposing vivisection by questioning the very applicability of this research.

Rationale Expansion: Danger to Human Health

Another problem with a great deal of animal research is that it cannot be reliably applied

to humans. The tragic birth defects caused by thalidomide occurred because of reliance on animal testing. But thalidomide is just one of many drugs (including DEX, Oraflex and Zomax), which were tested in many species of animals and judged safe, but had the potential to cause disastrous effects if taken by humans... Conversely, aspirin can kill a cat and penicillin is highly toxic to guinea pigs. It should be remembered that all disease is the result of the malfunction of cells, and, consequently, the primary study of disease should be at the cellular level. Studying whole animals ignores this basic fact... (AAVS n.d. STOP: Why We Oppose Vivisection)

Anti-vivisection rhetoric contains numerous claims that the biological systems of animals and that of humans are not the same. Therefore, research findings on one species cannot necessarily be assumed valid for another. Many claims also argue this situation can be dangerous for humans. For example, LCA distributes a booklet, "Vivisection: Science or Sham," written by Roy Kupsine, M.D. (n.d.). In this booklet he provides details on the physiological differences between human and non-human animals, such as rhesus monkeys, dogs, mice, rats, rabbits, and cats. The argument centers on the notion these biological systems are not representative of one another and findings from research on one species are not transferable to another. The doctor also presents a list of 28 drugs found "safe" on animals that killed or injured humans. The list of afflictions to humans includes, but is not limited to, cataracts, birth defects, various cancers, and heart problems. Furthermore, NAVS (n.d.) distributes a leaflet, "What Physicians Say About Vivisection," containing 132 quoted statements from medical doctors claiming information obtained from research on animals is not relevant to treating humans.

Various anti-vivisection groups claim there is little progress from animal-based research. For example, NAVS argues in a brochure, "The Campaign for Life," only 6 percent of all animal experimentation has any direct influence on medicine. This rhetoric also cites a comprehensive study demonstrating vaccines and drugs account for only 3.5 percent of the 69.2 percent decline in overall mortality between 1900 and 1973. Anti-vivisection groups urge members and other concerned people to read Sharpe's (1988), *The Cruel Deception: The*

Use of Animals in Medical Research. This book argues reduced mortality since 1900 (life expectancy in 1900 was 47, today it is 72) is not due to advances from animal experimentation, as various pro-vivisection groups argue, but is due to increased public health, particularly improved sanitation, immunization, and the use of antibiotics. Additionally, an NAVS brochure, "The Campaign for Life," further argues recent studies have determined cure rates for the most common forms of cancer and heart disease are not improved and contemporary gain in the fight against them is primarily due to improved lifestyles and prevention, not techniques and drugs developed through vivisection.

Rhetoric provided by anti-vivisection groups claims the findings from most animal research are not significant, many studies simply reflect the confirmation of common sense. Neil Barnard, president of PCRM discussed an example of such research in an interview conducted for a documentary film on the "March for the Animals" held in Washington, D.C. during the summer of 1990. He claimed a head injury study was conducted by researchers at Louisiana State University, during which 700 cats were shot in the head and, allegedly, the only valid conclusion reached by the project was that cats stop breathing when shot in the head. The AAVS pamphlet, "STOP: Why We Oppose Vivisection" presents the following:

One does not have to be an expert to determine whether experiments such as the following are moral or useful:

- *Burn studies to determine the amount of liquid necessary during the recuperative period.
- *Aggression, induced by electric shock and other painful manipulations.
- *Department of Defense research on the effects of radiation, chemicals, and explosives.
- *Addiction to various drugs and withdrawal.
- *Prolonged exposure to temperature extremes.
- *Stress-induced heart studies.
- *Sleep deprivation.
- *Pain studies including battering, striking and crushing.
- *Learned helplessness, induced by electric shock.

(American Anti-Vivisection Society n.d.)

It can be implied from examining this rhetoric that anti-vivisection groups argue animal experimentation yields little value to bettering the human condition and improving quality of life because the findings are misguided and trivial as illustrated by this quotation from the Council for Progress in Science and Medicine (CPSM) on its World Wide Web page:

A Lie That is Killing Us

Animal experimentation, also known as vivisection, is directly responsible for the rampant growth of cancer, heart disease, diabetes, birth defects, arthritis, muscular dystrophy, leukemia, all kinds of mental diseases, and an endless list of many other old afflictions as well as scores of new ones, such as Alzheimer's disease, and AIDS. These diseases are causing the most massive, systematic and widespread destruction of human health ever known. The reason is fundamental: **Today's research is based almost entirely on animal experimentation, which is medical and scientific fraud.** It is impossible to re-create a naturally occurring disease in a healthy animal simply because once it is "re-created" it is no longer the original, natural disease. The predictable result of looking at **artificially diseased animals** is that the data [are] **not applicable to man** and this is tragically misleading. This is the reason why no disease has been cured in the 20th century except for the control of infectious diseases, which was accomplished thanks to nutrition, hygiene, and public sanitation. Consequently, all the **old** diseases along with the **new** ones are killing and damaging more and more people every day, including you and your family and friends. (CPSM n.d.) [bold in original]

The claim is one of waste — wasting animals, wasting research, wasting time, and wasting quality of human life. This claim-making also includes the waste of taxpayers' money on research involving animals.

Secondary Rationale Expansion: Fiscal Waste

Congress continues to waste millions of dollars annually on this "basic," "no-goal" animal experimentation, even as the Administration has cut spending for maternal and child health programs by 18%, reduced funds for nutrition programs such as WIC (Women-Infants-Children), and plans further cuts in federal

programs such as Medicaid, leaving poor people without access to adequate prenatal and postnatal care... This [research] of course conjures up in the public's mind a picture of researchers working night and day over hot Bunsen burners in a "basic laboratory" mixing up immediate cures. We fail to see how this applies to experiments showing that monkeys are afraid of snakes or that chicks whose wings have been bound by adhesive tape since hatching cannot learn to fly. Yet both experiments were paid for by the NICHD [National Institute of Child Health and Human Development]. (UAA n.d. *Your Child or Your Dog?*)

An additional theme in anti-vivisection rhetoric involves the cost of this research. Claim-makers state money spent on this type of research, in light of the "payoff," is wasted. Rhetoric stresses taxpayers pay the bills for these "scams."

United Action for Animals (UAA) publishes three pamphlets that include descriptions of various experiments involving animals. "Your Child or Your Dog?," "Animal Agony in Addiction Research," and "Science Gone Insane," describe specific research projects on childhood issues, mental illness, and drug addiction. The description of each project includes the amount of money the research cost taxpayers. For example, the following are listed in a UAA pamphlet (bold print in the original):

*Electric shocks to the brains of morphine-addicted monkeys causes withdrawal symptoms (Yale, 1987. **COST \$55,000**).

*Squirrel monkeys dosed with lithium, a potent drug used in the treatment of psychotics, lose their appetites. (National Institute of Mental Health, 1986. **COST: \$407,200**).

*Dogs with narcolepsy (a disease causing uncontrollable sleeping) spend more time drowsy and asleep than normal dogs. (Stanford University School of Medicine, 1986. **COST: \$847,000**).

*Young pig tail monkeys housed in groups have disorganized sleep patterns because they spend much of their time playing. (University of Colorado, 1982. **COST: \$173,500**).

(UAA "Science Gone Insane" n.d.)

LCA provides another example of this rhetorical form. They published a brochure (n.d.),

"Inside the UCLA Brain Research Institute: A Taxpayer's Report." The claims in this "report" describe a project funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) over a 20-year period. They claim almost \$24 million in taxpayers' money was spent to study induced dysfunction in cats' brains with the hope this research may provide answers to human brain dysfunction. Another information sheet distributed by LCA discusses cat research at UCLA. This sheet describes a project in which the spinal cords of kittens and cats were severed to ostensibly learn something helpful for humans with spinal cord injury. The report discusses the research procedures and claims the research was sponsored by two grants from NIH amounting to \$2.8 million and \$360,000.

Recent rhetoric provided by NAVS on their World Wide Web page makes further claims of wasting taxpayers' money on vivisection:

Wasted Lives and Wasted Funds

More than \$5 billion of tax revenues are spent annually on animal research. Although studies by public health experts show that lifestyle accounts for 50 percent of the causes of death in this country, virtually no money in the National Institute of Health's budget [\$11 billion in 1994] is allocated to educating the public in the prevention of illness. (NAVS n.d.)

DOMAIN EXPANSION IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SOCIAL PROBLEMS

Domain expansion is a process whereby established social problems form the basis for making related claims to construct new problems. Best (1990) noted once physical child abuse gained acceptance as a social problem, claimants began to reconstruct the problem, making new claims about related forms of abuse. Typically, claims-makers attempted to extend the boundary or domain of child abuse to cover additional situations. Thus, neglect, sexual abuse, and emotional abuse became recognized as forms of child abuse; later claims included child-snatching by estranged parents, illicit drug use, inadequate social services, explicit rock lyrics, and even traditional sex-role socialization as additional forms of child abuse. "These new claims can be linked to the established problem: claims-makers present new, peripheral issues as 'another form of,' 'essentially the same as,' 'the moral equivalent of,' or 'equally damaging as' the original, core problem" (Best

1990).

Jeness (1995) discusses gay and lesbian activists' domain expansion of the category of hate crimes to include attacks on homosexuals. Claims-makers argued that violent crimes against gays were like attacks on members of religious and ethnic minorities in that hate or bias motivated the violence. Once violent attacks against gays became established as a form of hate crime, activists sought to expand the domain further. Because they too involved a predator-prey relationship, verbal harassment of gays, domestic violence in gay intimate relationships, and the multiple discrimination suffered by African-American or Jewish gays were also framed as forms of sexual terrorism. Each expanded claim inspired new policies (i.e. hot lines and educational strategies) to deal with these problems.

Best (1990) presents a natural history for domain expansion. The first stage involves initial claims-making, attempts to attract public attention and then persuade the public and policymakers to define some condition as a problem needing a solution. Often, these claims are dramatic in order to catch the desired attention (Orcutt, Turner 1993). Individuals or groups of claims-makers strive to have their concern viewed as significant by both the public and policy-makers, so they may find it helpful to place their claim within a standard frame (Gamson, Croteau, Hoynes, Sasson 1992; Snow, Benford 1988, 1992) already used in the classification of social problems. Standard frames involve abstract conditions already accepted by the public and policy-makers as problem situations (i.e. abuse, destruction, waste, etc.).

The second stage is validation of the problem by others, especially those viewed as experts in a given area. Nelson (1984) referred to "valence issues" as those accepted, validated, and established on the policymaking agenda. The third and final stage in this natural history of social problems involves domain expansion, where established valence issues become the foundation for additional claims, both by those already involved with the issue and by new "outside" claims-makers. Insiders seek to expand the problem in order to gain additional resources and recognition, while outsiders strive to place what they see as salient issues on the public agenda. "Piggy-backing new claims upon established social problems increases the chances that the new claims will receive validation" (Best 1990).

Domain expansion has not received much attention from scholars examining rhetoric in social problems construction. The theoretical propositions put forth by Best (1990) and Jenness (1995) concerning domain expansion need to be examined in light of claims made by other groups about other issues.

The form of domain expansion found in the rhetoric of these animal rights groups differs from those discussed in Best's (1990) analysis of the construction of child abuse or Jenness' (1995) examination of hate crimes against gays. In the research conducted by Best and Jenness, claims-makers sought to add new phenomena to the domain of established problems. In contrast, claims by anti-vivisection groups remains focused on a perceived social problem and policy outcome. Anti-vivisection rhetoric expands the list of reasons — the rationales — for ending vivisection. Initial rhetoric focused on cruelty to laboratory animals; however, this rhetoric did not attract enough sympathy from the public or policymakers to generate change. As a result, these groups expanded their rationale. Anti-vivisection groups claim vivisection does not produce knowledge capable of raising the quality of human life and wastes taxpayer's money. This paper illustrates rationale expansion as another form of domain expansion in the construction of social problems.

The political nature and controversy surrounding the animal rights movement is ripe for constructionist analyses of rhetoric. Various interest groups, both in favor of and opposed to the use of animals for human concerns, attempt to convince the public and policymakers that their ideology should form the basis of public policy. Constructionist analysis of animal rights issues is recently emerging in academic literature. These articles include Arluke and Hafferty (1996) on the construction of experience among medical students working in a dog lab, Kunkel (1995) on expanding rhetoric used by the Farm Animal Reform Movement, Jasper and Poulsen (1993) on social movement success and failure, Arluke (1994) on the construction of laboratory animals in advertisements, Phillips' (1994) analysis of the construction of biography among workers in an animal research laboratory, and Maurer's (1995) content analysis of vegetarian rhetoric. Constructionists are beginning to see animal rights issues as a significant source of data.

DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Analysis of claims-making by anti-vivisection groups demonstrates expanding rhetoric concentrating on a desired outcome. The outcome is ending practices that exploit animals for human concerns, the use of animals in biomedical research. These groups do not simply rationalize outcomes through claiming these practices are cruel to animals but rather concentrate on the result and expand rationales for supporting policy. In this manner, they hope to increase support for the desired outcome regardless of whether or not others have the same concerns as animal rights groups. Potential supporters may or may not be convinced by cruelty claims; however, other types of claims may convince them to advocate policy outcomes desired by animal rights groups. Essentially, animal rights groups are attempting to achieve backdoor support for their issue.

Rationale Expansion in Social Problems Development

Initial studies of domain expansion focused on how claims about new problems built upon established social problems. Rhetoric from the animal rights groups examined in this research reveals a different sort of expansion — rationale expansion — in which claims-makers expand their list of reasons for addressing a particular problem. Rather than argue an issue is the moral equivalent of an already established problem, these groups remain focused on a particular goal. When initial claims about animal cruelty were not likely to achieve the desired results these groups offered new rationales for eliminating the use of animals for this human benefit.

Thus, even if people are not concerned with emotional claims about living and dying conditions for laboratory animals, anti-vivisection groups believe they will respond to other rational claims. In the case of anti-vivisection rhetoric, the expanded claims included "better" alternatives to the use of animals in research, the lack of significant knowledge generated by this research, and alleged waste of taxpayers' money. No matter which rationale elicits movement resulting in response and behavioral change, the group's objective, the abolition of vivisection, is achieved. The strategy is one of linking people concerned with different issues. In this case, those concerned with animal rights are linked with those concerned with preserving human health or saving tax

dollars. The goal is mounting a collective effort to achieve a single outcome.

Maurer (1995) categorized vegetarian claims using Ibarra and Kitsuse's (1993) notion of entitlement and endangerment. In vegetarian rhetoric, some claims involve entitlement where non-human animals are presumed to have the right of consideration and treatment equal to human animals. Kunkel (1995) found rhetoric used by the Farm Animal Reform Movement (FARM) also focused on entitlement: farm animals do not deserve the cruel treatment experienced under modern farming conditions. But Maurer convincingly argues, in United States culture, claims of entitlement do not offer solid reasons to change dietary behavior. She suggests claims of endangerment — arguments that meat is a threat to health — offer a more concrete basis for change and action. Kunkel (1995) found animal rights groups merely arguing that modern farming techniques are cruel and deprive pigs, chickens, and cows of inherent rights does not generate enough support to launch full-scale boycotts of animal-food products or enough pressure for legislators to regulate conditions on farms. Even when people are sympathetic to issues of animal welfare and rights, it is not easy to generate sympathy for cows, pigs, and chickens. Because these animals typically are thought of as food, reflecting deep-seeded cultural and personal dietary habits.

Along the same line, entitlement claims probably will fail to generate enough sympathy toward the plight of laboratory animals to end vivisection. People may be somewhat sympathetic; however, popular rhetoric from pro-vivisection forces claims this research is essential for human quality of life. Furthermore, animals used in this type of research, typically rats, mice, and monkeys, may not be close enough to people's lives to generate much sympathy based on cruelty rhetoric alone. As a result, a majority of individuals may see the situation as unfortunate yet necessary. Claims that animals have a right to be free from this mistreatment will not work. As was the case for vegetarian rhetoric, as well as claims-making by FARM, expansion to claims of human endangerment is necessary in order to increase the possibility of movement success. Thus, anti-vivisection claims also pre-sent endangerment rhetoric as an additional rationale for ending vivisection. Adding these types of claims to anti-vivisection rhetorical strategy

further increases the chance of success.

The case study of anti-vivisection rhetoric suggests conditions in which rationale expansion may occur. When certain putative conditions are deeply embedded cultural practices, claims-makers are unlikely to generate widespread agreement that the condition constitutes a problem. Therefore, groups perceiving these practices as problems need to concentrate on anticipated solutions while deriving other, more culturally compatible reasons for supporting the policy outcome. Entitlement rhetoric centered upon a culturally unpopular theme may never be persuasive or successful in problem construction. Rationale expansion provides an indirect attempt to solve the original problem. People who accept one of these added rationales, and take action for the cause, become advocates for the policy that solves the original problem. Even though they may not view the original condition as a problem, their activities do indirectly contribute to the solution.

CONCLUSION

From data gathered for this research it is not possible to evaluate rationale expansion as either a successful or unsuccessful strategy. Future research will be needed to determine whether this strategy launches a successful social movement. Additional case studies also will demonstrate how various groups cope with difficulty in expanding rationales for desired policy outcomes. For example, there are animal rights groups concerned with humans wearing fur. It may not be possible for these groups to expand claims beyond entitlement of animals used for fur. Can this issue be framed as an endangerment claim? Future case studies may evaluate the effectiveness of rationale expansion as a claims-making strategy as well as conditions under which rationale expansion is or is not effective in claims-making campaigns.

REFERENCES

- American Anti-Vivisection Society n.d. STOP: Why We Oppose Vivisection. Promotional Brochure
- Arluke A 1994 We build a better beagle: fantastic creatures in lab animal Ads *Qualitative Sociology* 17 143-158
- Arluke A, F Hafferty 1996 From apprehension to fascination with 'dog lab': the use of absolutions by medical students *J Contemporary Ethnography* 25 201-225
- Best J 1990 *Threatened Children: Rhetoric and Concern about Child-Victims* Chicago: U Chicago Press

- Council for Progress in Science and Medicine n.d. <http://www.cpsm.org/~cpsm>. Accessed February 5, 1996.
- Finsen L, S Finsen 1994 *The Animal Rights Movement in America: From Compassion to Respect* NY: Twayne
- Fox MW 1990 *Inhumane Society: The American Way of Exploiting Animals* NY: St Martin's Press
- Gamson WA, D Croteau, W Hoynes, T Sasson 1992 Media images and the social construction of reality *Annual Rev Sociology* 18 373-393
- Ibarra PR, JI Kitsuse 1993 Vernacular constituents of moral discourse: an interactionist proposal for the study of social problems. 21-54 in G Miller, JA Holstein eds *Constructionist Controversies: Issues in Social Problems Theory* Hawthorne NY: Aldine de Gruyter
- Jasper JM, D Nelkin 1992 *The Animal Rights Crusade: The Growth of a Moral Protest* NY: Free Press
- Jasper JM, J Poulsen 1993 Fighting back: vulnerabilities, blunders, and countermobilization by the targets of three animal rights campaigns *Sociological Forum* 8 639-657
- Jenness V 1995 Social movement growth, domain expansion, and framing processes: the gay/lesbian movement and violence against gays and lesbians as a social problem *Social Problems* 42 145-170
- Kunkel KR 1995 Down on the farm: rationale expansion in the construction of factory farming as a social problem. 239-256 in J Best ed *Images of Issues: Typifying Contemporary Social Problems* 2nd ed Hawthorne NY: Aldine de Gruyter
- Kupsine R nd Vivisection: Science or Sham?. distributed by Last Chance for Animals
- Last Chance for Animals n.d. Facts about Vivisection. promotional leaflet
- _____ n.d. Inside the UCLA Brain Research Institute: A Taxpayer's Report. promotional brochure
- Maggitti P 1994 Prisoners of war: the abuse of animals in military research *Animals' Agenda* 14 20-23 25-26
- Maurer D 1995 Meat as a social problem: rhetorical strategies in the contemporary vegetarian literature. 143-163 in D Maurer, J Sobal eds *Eating Agendas: Food and Nutrition as Social Issues* Hawthorne NY: Aldine de Gruyter
- Millsaps JR 1990 Governor vetoes Draize Bill *Bulletin of the National Anti-Vivisection Society* number 2 10-11 16
- National Anti-Vivisection Society n.d. The Campaign for Life. promotional brochure
- _____ n.d. A Compendium of Alternatives. promotional brochure
- _____ n.d. What Physicians Say about Vivisection. promotional leaflet
- _____ n.d. <http://www.cygnet.co.uk/NAVS>. Accessed on February 5, 1996.
- Nelson BJ 1984 *Making an Issue of Child Abuse* Chicago: U Chicago Press
- Orcutt J, JB Turner 1993 Shocking numbers and graphic accounts: quantified images of drug problems in the print media *Social Problems* 40 190-206
- Phillips MT 1994 Proper names and the social construction of biography: the negative case of laboratory animals *Qualitative Sociology* 17 119-142
- Sharpe R 1988 *The Cruel Deception: The Use of Animals in Medical Research* Wellingborough England: Thorsons Publishers
- Singer P 1975 *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals* NY: Avon Books
- Snow DA, RD Benford 1988 Ideology, frame resonance, and participant mobilization *International Social Movements Res* 1 197-217
- _____ 1992 Master frames and cycles of protest. 133-155 in AD Morris, CM Mueller eds *Frontiers in Social Movement Theory* New Haven: Yale U Press
- Ulrich RE 1991 Animal research: a psychological ritual *Animals' Agenda* 11 40-44
- United Action for Animals Inc n.d. Animal Agony in Addiction Research. promotional brochure
- _____ n.d. Science Gone Insane. promotional brochure
- _____ n.d. Your Child or Your Dog?. promotional brochure