

Animal rights: the new Nazism

The 'animal liberationists' are so crazy they might sound like harmless kooks—but look again. They're deadly serious. By Kathleen Klenetsky.

On June 10, a 13-month-old baby was nearly killed in Bristol, England, when a car bomb intended for a scientist exploded next to the infant's carriage. Just days earlier, British researcher Margaret Baskerville, a veterinarian at the Chemical Defence Establishment at Porton Down, barely escaped death when an explosive planted beneath her car detonated.

Authorities believed that both acts of terrorism were the work of so-called animal liberationists. In the Baskerville case, a man who identified himself as a representative of an animal rights group called BBC TV to claim credit for the attack, saying it was "unfortunate" that Baskerville had survived, and warning that "anyone who works at Porton Down is now a target."

These incidents are only the latest in a long string of acts of violence and intimidation carried out in recent years by the proponents of "animal liberation" or "animal rights." Their targets include scientists, researchers, farmers, pet owners, furriers, and fur-wearers—anyone, in fact, who uses animals in any way. Since 1981, ninety-one incidents in the United States alone, including bomb threats, break-ins, and arson, were linked to animal rights groups, according to the office of Rep. Charles Stenholm (D-Tex.). Scotland Yard has put the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) on its list of terrorist organizations.

'A rat is a pig, is a boy, is a dog'

The animal rights movement, which has been growing by leaps and bounds over the past several years and has received the de facto imprimatur of such oligarchs as Britain's pro-pagan Prince Philip, represents a potent danger to humanity. Behind all the rhetoric about protecting animals against cruel treatment, the animal liberationists' real agenda is to destroy the physical and philosophical bases for the survival of mankind.

With lethal intent, the movement has made biomedical research one of its priority targets. Through tactics ranging from actual and threatened violence through letter-writing and propaganda campaigns, it has succeeded in spreading fear and demoralization through the scientific community. Animal liberationists have wrought tremendous physical damage on labs and research centers, forced experiments vital to medical progress to be delayed or terminated, and frightened current and prospective scientists into other fields. "The potential toll

in human lives is incalculable," says one scientist.

In other areas, animal activists have promoted legislation aimed at shutting down all meat production, by imposing regulations on livestock farmers so stringent that they would either drive them out of business or drive meat prices into the stratosphere.

The animal rightists are quite open about their goals: They want to end the use of animals by man, period, and they are explicit about why this should be done. To view animals as having been created for man's use is gross "specieism"—according to Peter Singer, the movement's leading philosopher and author of its bible, *Animal Liberation*, first published in 1975. The fact that human beings are endowed uniquely with creative reason does not give them any greater importance, or greater rights, than animals, he says.

"I don't believe human beings have the 'right to life,'" asserted Ingrid Newkirk of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) in a 1986 interview. "That's a supremacist perversion. A rat is a pig is a dog is a boy." Newkirk also believes that ending animal experimentation is as urgent as the obligation to crush the Nazi oppression of the Jews. And PETA founder Alex Pacheco predicts, "The time will come when we will look upon the murder of animals as we now look on the murder of men."

These depraved views are gaining currency among larger and larger numbers of people. Six years ago, PETA, the best-known U.S.-based animal liberation outfit, had 8,000 members, an annual budget of \$242,000, and a staff of eight. Now it has more than 300,000 members, a \$7 million per year budget, and it employs nearly 100 people. According to the American Medical Association, the U.S. is currently home to over 400 animal-protection societies, which spend \$200 million each year.

Against the sanctity of human life

The utter contempt for human life expressed by Newkirk and Singer is far more dangerous than any specific act committed by the animal rightists, and places the movement on the cutting edge of the campaign to wipe out Judeo-Christian civilization, and bring back paganism.

By insisting that a man is no better than an animal, and that no animal should be "sacrificed" to human use (in scientific research, or as food or clothing),

are consciously attempting to destroy the fundamental premise of Christianity, that God made man—and man alone of all Creation—in His image.

That campaign can be traced directly to the highest reaches of the international oligarchy, which is committed to recreating a global empire modeled on that of pagan imperial Rome. Prince Philip gave voice to this intention, when he gave a ringing endorsement of paganism, telling the National Press Club in Washington that pagan religions had been more effective than the “revealed religions” in cultivating a proper respect for Mother Nature.

Philip was in Washington for the North American Conference on Religion and Ecology May 16-19, which featured among its speakers leading animal-rights activist Michael Fox, of the Humane Society of the United States (see *EIR*, June 8, 1990, “Prince Philip and the EPA revive paganism as ‘ecology’”). In his presentation, Fox charged that man’s “doministic” attitude toward the animal kingdom had resulted in a “holocaust.” To establish the right relationship with nature, said Fox, humanity must abandon the “male, monotheistic religion of reason” and return to the “religious traditions of earlier times, which linked humanity to the animal kingdom through the Earth Mother, the matrix-creatrix . . . Gaia, Pan, Diana.”

Three weeks after the NACRE conference, Prince Philip told the London *Observer* that, in a recent meeting with Pope John Paul II, he had argued in favor of curbing human population growth, on the grounds that it was “reducing the space available” for wild animals. The prince also excoriated the Bible for allegedly promoting cruelty to animals. With exquisite timing, the prince’s statements came just days before 24,000 animal-rights activists demonstrated in Washington in favor of the pagan belief that man is on a par with the rest of nature.

Kill people, not animals

The animal liberation movement’s determination to obliterate the concept of the sanctity of human life is perfectly explicit. Peter Singer, a philosopher at Australia’s Monash University whose 1975 *Animal Liberation* is credited with initiating the animal rights movement, places himself in the tradition of British utilitarian Jeremy Bentham, who took love of animals to truly bizarre depths. Invoking Bentham’s ludicrous thesis that the most important characteristic of a being is its capacity to feel pleasure and pain, Singer argued that animals, because they have this capacity, should be treated essentially as humans—and vice versa.

This leads straight down the path to the wholesale destruction of human rights, including the fundamental right, the right to life. Singer has also written extensively on the need for instituting infanticide and euthanasia—against humans, not animals.

The Oxford-educated Singer has stated publicly that it is more moral to kill a “defective” human newborn, than it is

to kill a healthy chimpanzee. To say otherwise, he charges, is an example of “specieism.”

In 1985, in reaction to the U.S. “Baby Doe” decision, he wrote a book called *Should the Baby Live? The Problem of Handicapped Infants*, in which he insisted that the “doctrine of the sanctity of life, as understood in the Western tradition since Christianity prevailed, is not in any sense a fundamental tenet of a civilized society.” Singer cited examples of other “civilized” societies, such as ancient Greece, which practiced infanticide, and says that Western society’s “unusual” rejection of infanticide reflects “some seventeen centuries of Christian domination of Western thought and cannot rationally be defended.”

In an article published in 1983 in *Pediatrics*, Singer wrote: “Once the mumbo-jumbo surrounding the term ‘human’ has been stripped away, we may continue to see normal members of our species as possessing greater capacities of rationality, self-consciousness, communication and so-on, than members of any other species; but we will not regard as sacrosanct the life of each and every member of our species, no matter how limited its capacity for intelligent or even conscious life may be. If we compare a severely defective human infant with a nonhuman animal, a dog or a pig, for example, we will often find the nonhuman to have superior capacities, both actual and potential, for rationality, self-consciousness, communication, and anything else that can plausibly be considered morally significant.”

In a 1979 offering, *Practical Ethics*, Singer wrote that Bentham “was right to describe infanticide as ‘of a nature not to give the slightest inquietude to the most timid imagination.’” From there, he proceeded to argue for legislation that would “deny a full legal right to life to babies” for at least a month after birth. “Killing a defective infant is not morally equivalent to killing a person. Very often it is not wrong at all.”

In the same volume, he marshaled a host of arguments in favor of euthanasia—including “nonvoluntary euthanasia” and active euthanasia—against the elderly, the handicapped, and the terminally ill.

Hitler loved animals, too

As Singer’s pronouncements demonstrate, the animal rights mentality bears a frightening resemblance to the Nazis. Hitler, whose euthanasia program against “defective” German citizens led inexorably to the Holocaust, loved animals, and was a fanatical vegetarian, as were several members of his inner circle.

The similarity is not lost on the animal rights theorists. Singer wrote that, while the Nazis “committed horrendous crimes,” this “does not mean that *everything* the Nazis did was horrendous. We cannot condemn euthanasia just because the Nazis did it.”

Next: How the animal rights movement is sabotaging medical progress and agricultural production.