**Case 2**

**“Street Art”:  Vandalism or Philanthropy?**

In the art world, people get their start in some surprising places. In 2008 Shepard Fairey produced a stylized image of Barack Obama underscored with the word ‘HOPE.’ This image became an iconic symbol of Obama’s presidential campaign. Though this image made Fairey a household name, his work had already been seen by many in graffiti and stickers affixed to buildings, street signs, park benches, etc. Despite his work’s notoriety, Fairey remained relatively underground (as part of the counter culture) until 2008 in part because his art—tagging, street art, or graffiti—exists in what he describes as a “legal grey area.”[[1]](#footnote-1) Fairey, like many street artists, has been arrested numerous times.

Opponents of graffiti argue that “Graffiti is ugly…Graffiti is an eyesore that decreases property values, is a drain on tax dollars and makes residents feel unsafe.”[[2]](#footnote-2) Some reports indicate that Graffiti clean-up costs each taxpayer between one and three dollars annually. In most places there is legislation that addresses graffiti with specific definitions and penalties. For instance, according to Florida statutes graffiti resulting in less than $1,000 in damage is a misdemeanor offense with subsequent infractions constituting a third degree felony.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Free speech advocates argue that graffiti is a legitimate form of artistic self-expression and that the costs associated with graffiti removal and decreased property values are the product of social prejudice. One such advocate describes graffiti artists as painting “murals in celebration of line, color, and the beauty of life on a dull gray train trestle for the viewing pleasure of people on their way to work, all without demanding a cent for the service.”[[4]](#footnote-4) Some emphasize that graffiti is supposed to be troubling and is disliked because of the political and social messages it conveys. Others highlight the fact that graffiti competes for expressive space with messages delivered in traditional commercial and political advertising and argue that graffiti gives a voice to someone other than marketers and politicians in public spaces.

One widely proposed resolution to the spread of graffiti is the production of public mural walls, or the designation of certain walls as “legal” walls or walls open to public art. Legal walls are popular in many cities, but graffiti artists sometimes reject legal walls in favor of walls with better placement in terms of viewership, artistic context, surface characteristics, permanence, etc. Also, critics of legal walls argue that legal graffiti walls encourage the development and spread of graffiti and are thus counterproductive “oozing” into adjacent areas.[[5]](#footnote-5)

Recently a painting by renowned British street-artist Banksy was discovered on the wall of an abandoned Packard plant in Detroit. Within days a local gallery had gathered the resources necessary to cut away the Bansky portion of the block wall, crate the wall and move it to their Gallery near I-75. The owner of the Packard plant filed suit, alleging that the gallery had stolen a work of art worth in the area of $100,000.[[6]](#footnote-6) Some in the art community maintain that the piece has no value once removed from its street context, but recent gallery shows reveal that the work of prominent street artists can be very valuable. This gathering commercial value may raise a new challenge to restrictions on graffiti and ironically may limit the artistic value of the work.

**Case 14**

**Caged rats**

In a time of global terrorism and economic recession, the humane treatment of lab rats may not be high on many people’s list of just causes, but that doesn’t mean they don’t have advocates.

Animal welfare advocates have long taken umbrage at the NIH (National Institute of Health)’s ambiguous position on animal welfare. Their argument is that the welfare of millions of laboratory animals is important and ought to be taken seriously, even if protecting that welfare constitutes an inconvenience or a financial burden.[[7]](#footnote-7) One of the typical ways of affording laboratory animals some relief is giving them more space. Animal welfare advocates maintain that larger housing pens would improve rodents’ wellbeing. According to ethologist J. P. Balcombe, studies have shown aggressive behavior among male mice when they were exclusively kept captive “in small, commercial cages.”[[8]](#footnote-8) In fact, the latest scientific research, which provides evidence of empathetic behavior among lab rats, suggests that the emotional capacities and needs of these rodents might be much more complex than previously thought.[[9]](#footnote-9)

Perhaps in response to such concerns, for the first time since 1996, the NIH has updated its guidelines for the housing of laboratory animals. Research institutions wishing to secure funding from the NIH will supposedly have to comply with the new housing guide, which is designed to reduce the overcrowding of millions of rodents used for research every year in the U.S. The recommendations don’t exactly specify deluxe accommodations, though. A mouse and her litter will be entitled to a minimum of 51 square inches, while a rat and her litter should get at least 124 square inches.[[10]](#footnote-10)

Nevertheless, research institutions have objected to the new guidelines: giving each animal more room will require them to purchase more cages (and hire more staff to clean those cages), which means diverting money away from research on product safety, pharmaceuticals, and other causes that could improve the well-bring of humanity. Furthermore, scientists argue, there is little research to substantiate the claim that rodents’ quality of life would improve with larger cages. As Joseph Thulin of the Medical College of Wisconsin puts it, it is unclear whether more spacious enclosures “will have any measurable positive impact on the animals.” If laboratory animals aren’t going to experience any relief and fewer funds end up going to research, the new guidelines seem to be the equivalent of running in a wheel that ultimately doesn’t go anywhere.

The importance of the new guidelines seems further weakened by the NIH’s assurance to researchers that the housing guidelines are just a recommendation for minimum standards. In fact, overcrowding will be allowed as long as it is justified by the research and “the animals' health or behavior won't suffer.” The ambiguity in the NIH’s response has left scientists wondering to what extent these guidelines will be enforced and whether non-compliance will affect funding.
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