

'Animal rights' promotes starvation

Part III of a series shows how this movement, which apes Adolf Hitler's beliefs, also wields the means for mass murder. By Marcia Merry.

In the 5th century, when Saint Augustine did battle against the cults and barbarism threatening civilization at the time, he singled out the animal rights movement and explained how the meaning of God's commandment, Thou Shalt Not Kill, did not prohibit taking animal or plant life.

Again today, civilization is confronted with barbarism and cults. The animal rights movement has, in particular, targeted agriculture and the human diet at a time when millions in the world are going hungry and starving, and farmers are being thrown off the land.

The scope of the threat to food supplies and nutrition posed by the animal rights movement should be viewed on two levels. First, there is a wave of baseless restrictions being imposed on farmers through new laws and executive orders, in the name of "protecting" the rights of animals. Secondly, there is the question of why the general public, and farmers in particular, are so susceptible to tolerating this insanity.

The important thing to understand is that the animal rights movement is no "natural" outcropping of concern for what goes on in the barnyard, or for protection of the beasts in the wild. There are dozens of animal rights groups and campaigns that have sprung up in only the past few years that are funded directly or indirectly by major foundations, food cartel companies, and private financial groupings whose agenda is to impose austerity and depopulation on large parts of the world. These interests want to decide who eats and who starves; and what better way than to use animal rights "issues" against traditional, science-based farming and eating habits.

Farmers targeted

There are a network of groups demanding that various animal husbandry practices be banned or restricted, including animal confinement (instead of freedom to roam), de-horning, castrating, and tail docking. They charge that even the most careful animal husbandry is cruelty. Invariably, the photographs and arguments used by the animal advocates show sick or abused animals that are not typical of proper farming practices, any more than the case of an abused child is typical of normal parents. The animal rights campaign wants police state oversight and penalties on farmers.

In 1988, a group called CEASE put a referendum on the ballot in Massachusetts that would have put an end to about 89% of the livestock business in the state, and would have created a national precedent for making it impossible for

farmers to produce meat. The referendum called for the creation of a board of non-farmer, animal rights advocates to police farmsteads. Under the proposed rules, no farmer could make an alteration in his farm that would cost more than \$10,000 without approval of this board. Normal farming practices would have been prohibited, including such common practices as branding and the use of many veterinary medicines. This referendum was defeated, but there are similar initiatives in the works elsewhere.

There are also increasing restrictions on farmers' responsibilities to protect livestock and people from predators such as wolves, coyotes, and bears. A 1931 federal law allowed for controls and eradication of predators to protect agriculture. Now, the original intent of the law is ignored, and farmers are harassed and fined for protecting their livestock. Farmers must locate a federal official to deal with a "problem" varmint that may be preying on stock. This can take a long time. In a recent well-publicized case in New Mexico, a rancher lost 110 ewes and lambs in 10 days before the federal agent came and killed the 20-pound female coyote responsible. In Montana, a rancher recently lost an appeal in the 9th Circuit Court, which upheld that the rancher had to pay \$2500 for killing a grizzly bear in 1982, after the rancher lost 64 sheep to grizzlies.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture plans to hold public hearings this summer on its new "Animal Damage Control Guidelines." These sessions will offer a platform for the animal rights crowd to further restrict farmers. Jim Fish, of the Public Lands Action Network, says that there should be no predator control. "We feel like predators are part of the natural system and removing predators causes other problems which then require manipulation. . . . You never get out of the cycle."

The web of groups targeting farmers and attempting to sway public opinion against farmers, includes:

Farm Animal Reform Movement. Based in the Washington, D.C. area, the FARM roster of advisers and directors include a list of hoary, old "causeniks" that were against nuclear power and every other form of technology-based advancement for mankind: Cesar Chavez (United Farm Workers), George Wald (biologist, longtime anti-nuclear activist), Peter Singer (guru author of *Animal Liberation*, who advocates infanticide for "defective" humans), and others. FARM's letterhead states: "Unlike an all-out nuclear conflagration, which wreaks wholesale destruction in a blinding

flash, today's intensive animal agriculture does its deadly damage gradually, but just as inexorably and thoroughly."

Humane Farming Association. Based in San Francisco, California, this group incites people's fears that their meat came from animals who suffered, and is contaminated by veterinary medicines and hormones.

People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. Based in Washington, D.C., PETA claims to be the fastest growing action group in the country, and pushes vegetarianism, veganism (no use of animal products of anykind, including dairy, hides, and wool). PETA has a host of slick sayings attacking "factory farming" (confining animals), and all "animal-based agriculture," and instead tells you to "Choose a Living Earth. Go Vegetarian. When you sit down to eat, are you aware of the effect your food choices have on the earth? The cruelty, suffering and destruction involved in the system of raising animals for food stand in glaring contradiction to our hopes for a better way of life."

Animal rights terrorism

This network of groups are lobbying Congress, state, and local governments to impose control measures on farmers. Simultaneously, there has been a wave of animal rights terrorism against farming and ranching.

In 1987-88, there were repeated acts of vandalism and terrorism against meatpacking plants near San Jose, California. The graffiti included the sign, "Cattlemen Pollute." In the East, there were break-ins, spray-painting, and other incidents at egg farms. The graffiti on the henhouse walls read, "Animal Auschwitz," and "Liberate Animals."

Two groups, Earth First! and Animal Liberation Front (ALF), claim increased "action" against remote farms and ranches in the West. Earth First! spokesman Dale Turner in Tucson, Arizona said they oppose livestock grazing on public lands. ALF spokeswoman Margo Tannenbaum of San Bernardino, California said that ALF's goal is the "elimination of the livestock industry."

Actions have included shooting holes in livestock water tanks and in the oil reservoirs or the gear boxes of farmers' windmills, so the engines burn out. The terrorists have drained the oil out of tractors so the engines seize up and repairs costs thousands of dollars.

In 1988, arson destroyed the \$2.5 million animal research center under construction at the University of California, Davis Campus, which is a premier animal husbandry center of the West. In January 1989, a huge fire did \$250,000 in damage to a livestock pen in Dixon, Solano County, California.

Why are farmers and the public so accepting of these onslaughts against agriculture, and meat and wool production and use?

One factor that makes the general public so gullible is that under the current conditions of economic depression—unemployment, lack of health care, drugs, con-artists, count-

erculture, and New Age kookery—people tend to fall for all kinds of magical and cultish ideas about food, animals, and whatever. And people are encouraged by the "me generation" to fixate on themselves and ignore the world.

There is every variety of propaganda in the animal rights movement to play on fears and ignorance. For example, a PETA flyer called "The Realities of Animal-Based Agriculture," taken from the book *Diet for a New America*, by John Robbins, argues that animals pollute, and should not be raised for food. There is no logic to the argument.

PETA states: "Production of excrement by total U.S. human population: 12,000 pounds per second. Production of excrement by U.S. livestock: 250,000 pounds per second. Sewage system in U.S. cities: Common. Sewage system in U.S. feedlots: None." Conclusion? Animals pollute.

There is constant propaganda that eating meat is bad for you. For the last five years, the FARM group has been pushing the "The Great American Meat-Out," when you are supposed to abstain from eating meat. FARM likes to advertise that celebrities are vegetarians, so you should be too. Doris Day is FARM's figurehead for the Meat Out.

Aging Beatle Paul McCartney is now on a concert tour in the U.S. featuring the PETA group giving out tofu and hotdogs and pushing vegetarianism. At McCartney's Iowa event, a booth pushing legalizing dope adjoined the PETA veggie stand.

EIR AUDIO REPORT

gives you an hour cassette each week of the news, analysis, interviews, and commentary that Establishment media don't want you to hear.

EIR AUDIO REPORT

comes to you from the staff of *Executive Intelligence Review*, the magazine founded by Lyndon LaRouche, with bureaus around the world.

With EIR AUDIO REPORT,

you get in an hour what "All-News Radio" won't give you in a lifetime.

*First with the War on Drugs.
First with the Food for Peace.
First to drive a stake in the heart of Satanism.
Listen to EIR AUDIO REPORT each week.*

\$500 per annual subscription.

Make check or money order payable to: EIR News Service, P.O. Box 17390, Washington, D.C. 20041-0390. MasterCard and Visa accepted. Or call to place your order, (703) 777-9451.