The article makes no pretense of defending Fox's aristotelian view of intrinsic, natural needs. Instead it offers illustration upon illustration (including some striking photographs) of unnecessary brutalities towards animals.

I would recommend it highly as a discussion starter for a class or series of classes on animal rights. It will hold the reader's attention and is written at the level the undergraduate can deal with.

Clyde Ebenreck
Prince George's Community
College

Articles

"SCIENTIST HELPS STIR NEW MOVEMENT FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS" BY DAVID NEVIN, SMITHSONIAN, APRIL, 1980 (VOL. II, # 1), PAGES 50-58.

Nevin discusses and illustrates the work of Michael W. Fox, Director of the Institute for the Study of Animal Problems, Washington, DC. Fox is convinced that needless pain and suffering is inflicted on animals for human purposes. This suffering ranges from the confinement of veal cattle to the searing of rabbit eyes with cosmetics.

The main ethical point is made on page 55: "... rights imply a grasp of the animal's intrinsic nature and its needs. It is inhumane to deprive an animal of its natural needs... Just as it is inhumane to inflict unnecessary pain."

These natural needs include the need for social grooming and freedom of movement. They do not automatically include a right not to be killed. In fact Fox believes that the use of animal products for human needs can be ecologically sound.