

Sophia Harron

Professor Rademaekers

Effective Writing 120

20 September 2025

Rhetorical Framing Analysis

Like many young girls growing up, I've always loved doing makeup. I would beg for eyeshadow palettes from claires and steal my moms lipstick. So starting from a young age I had already become a consumer to the cosmetic industry. Now that I am a freshman in college, I still am. Like many I like doing my makeup and have specific brands or products that I like to use. But not only do I buy makeup, as many do, I buy skin care and hair care products.

Everybody uses cosmetics. Although, most assume cosmetic products are only makeup and beauty products, it's not. Products to keep up hygiene like body wash, deodorant, shampoo, etc. Those products all fall in the category of cosmetics. So, wearing or using cosmetics has folded into the routine of everyday life. Because of the importance of hygiene as well as the growing popularity of makeup, the cosmetic industry has become huge. Today, the cosmetic industry is one of the biggest industries ever. And because of the long history of the brand, old methods/practices stay with the industry for years.

The beauty industry is a huge industry and is getting bigger each day. There has been a lot of change throughout the decades in beauty products. But one thing that has stayed consistent is the testing of beauty products. Behind the scenes of very popular makeup brands, animal testing is heavily depended on. Many people in society aren't aware these practices are still being

used. Many popular cosmetic makeup companies are involved with animal cruelty when testing products. Many people in society aren't aware of the testing done for beauty products they buy or are manipulated by the broad term, cruelty-free.

Looking back at the unawareness throughout society, it is clear that many consumers don't acknowledge the testing done for beauty products. Instead, most of society turns their cheek when hearing that animal testing is prevalent in cosmetics. In the article by National Humane Society, they fully state that society has been aware of animal testing but chooses to do nothing, "In a world where progress and compassion are often celebrated, there remains a dark undercurrent that many choose to overlook: animal cruelty. Despite the numerous advancements in animal rights, countless animals continue to suffer in silence, victims of abuse, neglect, and exploitation"(Animal Cruelty). In the article's perspective, animal cruelty is still prevalent in the cosmetic industry. Although for decades, there has been change in how animals should be treated, when it comes to testing, it doesn't change. The article firstly puts the blame on cosmetic brands for using animals as test subjects and then turns the blame toward consumers, "Many people are simply unaware of the extent of animal cruelty. The suffering of animals often happens behind closed doors, out of public view...In some cultures and industries, certain forms of animal cruelty are normalized and accepted as part of tradition or business practices"(Animal Cruelty). The article's view of society is that consumers of cosmetics purposely choose to do nothing. People refrain from attempting to stop animal testing. The article implies that it's not only the companies fault for partaking in animal testing, but it is also society's fault for not sparking more change.

One major reason why society doesn't take action or isn't aware of this practice is because companies take advantage of the loose term, "animal cruelty." Animal cruelty doesn't necessarily mean animal testing. It actually means abuse or neglect of animals. So companies take advantage of this. In the article by Ecowiser, they talk about cosmetic brands' abuse of the term, "The beauty industry has a well-known love for ambiguous definitions that leave consumers quite puzzled (or, deceived.). It's 2023, but surprisingly, there are makeup brands that still test on animals, yet use the 'cruelty-free' label flippantly, without facts to back their claims." (Beloved Makeup). As the article states, makeup brands are taking advantage of loose terms to keep the same practices and lying to customers. Society falls victim to cosmetic industries' lies and believes their claims without requesting evidence or proof. The article makes society come across as manipulated by these cosmetic brands. Ecowiser also states how the term, "Cruelty-free" which "is one of the most misleading labels, yet popular" in the makeup industry, "Several beauty industry insiders and activists confess that this practice is the undoing of the beauty industry. Cosmetics chemist and formulator Anthonia Ademuyiwa says, "There is no established definition of 'cruelty-free,' and also there is no regulating agency that oversees the usage of the term." Yikes!" (Beloved Makeup). Many beauty/cosmetic brands are taking advantage of the loose term, "cruelty-free" because many people assume that it means zero animal testing when really, it just means, animals weren't harmed. This use of the broad term has manipulated many of those who buy cosmetics. The article makes cosmetic brands look manipulative to their consumers because they lie about being cruelty free.

The articles blame not only the cosmetic brands that test on animals, but also society for not demanding change. Although the articles provide solutions to these problems and have intent to inform readers, there can be many problems that come out of these articles. The risk of providing information and readers not obtaining the information is common. A lot of the time readers will read the article, temporarily feel bad, and then proceed to do nothing. Another consequence is that the two articles put side by side can contradict each other. Ecowiser is stating that society knows of these practices and does nothing. While the National Humane Society states the companies are manipulating consumers by lying. Audiences of both articles might point out that it should be one or the other. Questions like, Who's fault is it? And, is society to blame for ignoring the problem or is society the victim of these brands' false information? Could pop up into readers minds. Although these complications can get in the readers minds, the articles do serve good points and hopefully get to most readers.