

so special that God even took the form of a human; it would be unthinkable that he would have taken the form of a chimpanzee, gorilla or orangutan. Even unbelievers live with the legacy of these traditions. The specialness of humans in nature is part of the background of our belief and action. Yet . . . this picture in which human uniqueness plays such an important role is being undermined by the emerging world view of science and philosophy. A secular picture which takes evolutionary theory seriously provides no support for human privilege. On this view, humans are seen as one species among many, rather than one species over many; in the long run, humans are destined to go the way of other extinct species, and there is nothing that directly supports the idea that this would be a loss.

All of this gets various authors on bizarre tracks, of a "practical" nature. Prof. Gary Francione of Rutgers University argues: "Even the most conservative understanding of the concept of equal protection requires that all great apes be regarded as 'persons' under the law." Francione's precedent? "Slaves in the United States and elsewhere were clearly human, but did not enjoy legal personhood; they were regarded as property in much the same way that nonhuman animals are regarded today."

Jamieson takes these "practical" matters one step further. First, like Singer and Francione, he cannot refrain from making degrading comparisons between the great apes and African-Americans: "Would we be required to establish affirmative action programs, to compensate for millennia of injustices? . . . A world without slavery was unfathomable to many white southerners prior to the American Civil War. . . . [I]t is interesting to note that perception of difference often shifts once moral equality is recognized. Before emancipation (and still among some confirmed racists), American blacks were often perceived as more like apes or monkeys than like Caucasian humans. Once moral equality was admitted, perceptions of identity and difference began to change. Increasingly blacks came to be viewed as part of the 'human family,' all of whose members are regarded as qualitatively different from 'mere animals.' Perhaps some day, we will reach a stage in which the similarities among the great apes will be salient for us, and the differences among them will be dismissed as trivial and unimportant, or perhaps even enriching."

He then comments: "One source of our resistance may be this: we are unsure what recognizing our equality with the other great apes would mean for our individual behavior and our social institutions. Would they be allowed to run for political office?"

Observers of the recent monkey-shines among Newt Gingrich's pals on Capitol Hill would surely conclude that that question is no longer hypothetical. The "Prince Philip lobby" seems to believe it has the unlimited right to turn us all into a bunch of monkeys. We require a reinvigorated "Human Race Project" to protect us from this breed.

---

## Book Reviews

---

# Conceptual origins of the Great Ape Project

by Mark Burdman

---

### **Huxley: The Devil's Disciple**

by Adrian Desmond

Michael Joseph, London, 1994

475 pages, hardbound, £20

---

My working men stick by me wonderfully. By next Friday morning, they will all be convinced that they are monkeys.—Thomas Henry Huxley, letter to his wife, March 22, 1861

This new biography of biologist Thomas Henry Huxley, grandfather to the 20th century's Julian and Aldous, provides useful insights into what raised that family to the upper ranks of British imperial servants and policy-propagators for the Crown. Patriarch Thomas, known as "Darwin's bulldog" for his leadership in smashing the opposition to Darwinism in the 1860s and '70s, was a cynical, manipulative, philosophical bankrupt, who hated Judeo-Christian civilization with a passion, particularly the conception that the individual human mind was capable of true creativity and hence a living image of God the Creator. Progress, for T.H. Huxley, was the suppression of any economic development that might challenge English supremacy, and obliteration of any peoples that might take up that challenge. By bending nominally "scientific" issues to these unabashed political and social objectives, he laid the foundations for all the pseudoscientific justifications of such policies from the 1860s to the present.

One finds T.H. Huxley's spoor in the modern-day movements of "ecologism," fabian social-engineering, and eugenicist "bio-genetic" Darwinism, as well as among such Great Apes as Oxford University's Prof. Richard Dawkins.

Adrian Desmond, who has also written a biography of Darwin, and devotes much fawning prose to this duo, nonetheless provides the useful characterization of Huxley in the book's title: "the devil's disciple." Huxley's war against the Judeo-Christian outlook, in the name of a radical-positivist fanaticism that he labelled "science," fully earns him this

sobriquet. Indeed, he has to rank as one of the more noxious figures of the past century and a half, who militantly agitated to bring British philosophical radicalism to a new low of bestialism. From Huxley, to Prince Philip's World Wildlife Fund, and to the Great Apes' propagation of the idea that there is no fundamental difference between man and ape, is a relatively small step.

Ironically, Huxley had bitterly denounced theories of evolution, not much more than a decade before Darwin came on the scene. The idea of species transformations was not original with Darwin; what was original, was the amalgamation of that idea, with the Malthusian version of Thomas Hobbes's war of each against all. Prior to Darwin, the word "evolution" explicitly meant development, progress, unfolding of higher-orders of existence—and was castigated by the British establishment for that reason. "Evolution"—widely bruited in European continental circles—was understood to be the *opposite* of Malthusianism. Huxley understood immediately what a coup Darwin had pulled off. Henceforth, species transformation—as was becoming obvious to biologists must occur, in some form—would no longer imply progress in the biosphere, but would be redefined as an English nobleman's form of "descent": Your nature is not to be found in what you are becoming, or might become, but rather in what you *were*. The stage was set for the diversionary battle between the "radical" Huxley, and the nominally "Christian" Church of England establishment.

Huxley's philosophy was the equivalent of a virus that has mutated to a more virulent stage. Whereas the main current of British philosophy since the 17th century's Hobbes, which itself derived from Venice's Paolo Sarpi, is defined by the notion that there is no fundamental difference between man and beast, now, with Darwin and Huxley, the next step could be taken: the mobilization of supposedly "scientific" proof, that man is not only descended from apes, but *is* himself an ape, maybe of a somewhat higher variety.

### Marx and the 'monkey book'

The Huxley-Darwin offensive, beginning in the late 1850s, was one particular expression of a broader radical-positivist, empiricist insurgency of the mid-19th century. It was linked to British Foreign Secretary Lord Palmerston's promotion, via his agent Giuseppe Mazzini, of radical political movements throughout Europe (see *EIR*, April 15, 1994, "Lord Palmerston's Multicultural Human Zoo"). Among Huxley's intimates and/or patrons, one finds senior British East India Company intelligence operative John Stuart Mill, British intelligence agent Sir John Bowring, romanticist historian Thomas Carlyle, "evolutionist" Herbert Spencer, and other important figures in the British imperialist policymaking and/or secret service structure. They were the Empire's "radicals," who portrayed themselves as "Dissenters," "rationalists," and "secularists," and promoted such "reform" movements as Chartism. They promoted free trade, as a "lib-

eral" alternative to the more ham-handed methods of the British Empire, but, in reality, as a more devious way of reinforcing imperial rule. Their mouthpiece was the *Westminster Review*, launched in the earlier 19th century by British secret service coordinator Jeremy Bentham, the bestialist philosopher of the "pleasure-pain principle," and by Mill.

This gets us back to the introductory quote above. Not only does it affirm Huxley's devotion to what we would today identify as the Prince Philip variety of man-ape, but it betrays the special operation he and his "radical" circle were involved in: to build a "workingman's" movement, premised inclusively on the idea that man is descended from the ape. This was put forward, with fiery passion, by Huxley, as a "liberating" and "revolutionary" idea, because it was demagogically counterposed to an encrusted, class-centered Church of England which supported a supposedly "divine order" in which man's place was fixed, and, thereby, the position of Britain's lower classes eternally preserved. Before the Great Ape Project, there was the Huxley-Darwin "Man-Ape Liberation Front"!

For a complex of reasons in the mid-19th century, the British had to make some adjustments in imperial strategy. They were facing a number of threats, including the development of the Abraham Lincoln-centered political movement in the United States and the agro-industrial development of the United States brought about by Lincoln's allies and co-thinkers; the progression in Russia toward the liberation of the serfs by Czar Alexander I in the 1860s; and the industrial development of Germany under the influence of the "national economy" policies of the German-American Friedrich List. The post-1815 repressive order of the Congress of Vienna and Holy Alliance had outlived its usefulness, and had to give way, by the 1840s-1850s, to something more "flexible." There had to be some degree of industrial development promoted in Britain, which meant the emergence of some kind of industrial working class. But that working class had to be engineered into an instrument of the Empire, as well as an insurgent force against Judeo-Christian Western civilization, under the banner of an ostensibly "rationalist" "scientific materialism." The "working-class radicalism" promoted by the imperialist circle to which Huxley belonged, was molded as a counterforce to the Christian social doctrine that began to develop in the 19th century, and which was to reach its culmination with the publication of the papal encyclical *Rerum Novarum* later in the century.

It is not surprising, from this standpoint, that Palmerston would sponsor the radical movements of Giuseppe Mazzini and the International Workingman's Association. In fact, the circles around Mazzini, and those of Huxley, as he became more prominent in the 1850s and 1860s, broadly overlap, in the personages of Mill, Bowring, and others. Also not surprising, is that, in 1863, when Huxley published a tract entitled *Evidence as to Man's Place in Nature*, Friedrich Engels wrote a letter to Karl Marx, recommending the book as "very good"; indeed, Marx himself was only following in the footsteps of

British mentors and patrons, in his own promotion of “scientific materialism.”

Desmond writes that the purpose of the 1863 *Evidence* tract was to “move man from the center of creation.” On receiving it, Darwin exulted, “Hurrah the monkey book has come!”

Note that the Huxley statement cited at the beginning of this article was made in 1861. This has obvious relevance to attempts by the British to counter the threat that Abraham Lincoln’s war against the British-backed southern Confederacy represented. That Huxley proclaimed himself to be “anti-slavery” at the time, only underscores how devious he and his lot were. This is just like today’s Great Ape Project proponent’s disgusting insistence on likening the “liberation of apes,” to the emancipation of African-American slaves.

### **Huxley looks into the mirror**

Huxley’s overriding passion, beyond making monkeys out of workers, was to break down the “species barrier” between man and animal.

In an 1858 lecture entitled “The Distinctive Characters of Man,” Huxley had proclaimed: “Now I am quite sure that if we had these three creatures [humans, gorillas, and baboons] fossilized and preserved in spirits for comparison, and were quite unprejudiced judges, we should at once admit that there is very little greater interval as animals between the gorilla and the man, than exists between the gorilla and the baboon.”

Desmond interjects this comment: “Skeleton or cerebrum, it made no difference. The devil dared him, and he proclaimed in public what Darwin thought in practice.” Desmond continues the quote from Huxley: “Nay more. I believe that the animal and moral faculties are essentially and fundamentally the same in kind in animals and ourselves. I can draw no line of demarcation between an instinctive and a reasonable action. . . . To the very root and foundation of his nature, man is one with the rest of the organic world.”

In 1860, he wrote *On the Zoological Relations of Man with the Lower Animals*, where he scorned “theologians and moralists” who are “impressed by a sense of the infinite responsibilities of mankind, awed by a just prevision of the great destinies in store for the only earthy being of practically unlimited powers,” and who “have always tended to conceive of their kind as something apart, separated by a great and impassable barrier.” By contrast, anatomists “discovering as complete a system of law and order in the microcosm as in the macrocosm . . . have no less steadily gravitated towards the opposite opinion, and, as knowledge has advanced, have more and more distinctly admitted the closeness of the bond which unites man with his humbler fellows.”

According to Desmond, Huxley seems to have had something of an identity crisis about all this. The biographer writes: “He peered into the chimpanzees’ cage and came ‘face to face with these blurred’ mirror images. The apes forced a sudden ‘mistrust of time-honored theories’ about our own vaunted place. ‘It is as if nature herself had foreseen the arrogance

of man.’ ”

Meanwhile, “radical” publications linked to Huxley and friends were “shattering the ‘man and beast’ dichotomy.”

### **Agnosticism and the war against science**

What Huxley became most famous, or infamous, for, was his attack on religion and theology. It is he who coined the term “agnostic,” to define his views. But he was certainly not anti-*religious* in his fervor; he was part of an organized movement, with significant allies on the European continent around Frenchman August Comte’s positivists, to create a new religion, or cult, based on a perverted concept of “science.” Science, for the Huxleys and their ilk, was no longer a process of fundamental discovery about the laws of the universe and how man might change these, but a radical empiricism that, in practice, amounted to gangsterism against anybody who might object to a radical Aristotelian approach to man’s relationship to the universe. It was the mentality of inquisitorial orthodoxy, which one sees today, against anybody who objects to the “ozone hole” and “global warming” hoaxes, or of Huxley-Darwinian epigone and Great Ape Dawkins, in insisting that belief in God is a “virus” passed down through the generations. The connection between then and now is also institutional: In 1870, Huxley became president of the British Association for the Advancement of Science, a command-center for today’s inquisition.

Although Desmond doesn’t mention this point, Huxley’s activity was extremely intense, at precisely the time when Bernhard Riemann and his collaborators in Germany were promoting a scientific method based rigorously on the Socratic method of Plato, and fully in accordance with the Golden Renaissance tradition of Nicholas of Cusa, Leonardo da Vinci, Johannes Kepler, Gottfried Leibniz, and so forth. It can be no accident, for anybody familiar with the British Empire’s methods of epistemological warfare, that Huxley came into prominence in the early- to mid 1850s, leading up to the 1859 publication of Darwin’s *On the Origin of Species*, just as Riemann was publishing his habilitation thesis, *On the Hypotheses Which Underlie Geometry*. Huxley had contacts in Germany; he cultivated exactly the opposite “scientific” trends to those of Riemann et al. One of his most intimate collaborators and supporters internationally, for many years, was Ernst Haeckel, the German “bio-geneticist” and “organist” who is the conceptual father of the modern-day “ecologist” movement.

Huxley brought the attack against the Judeo-Christian tradition, and against belief in God, to a point beyond that dared even by such earlier British bestialists as Hobbes, John Locke, and David Hume. As Desmond writes of Huxley’s views: “Reason could not reveal God, because it could not tear aside the veil of phenomena. Huxley realized that the human mind was trapped by the limitations of thought and language, and hemmed in by physical evidence. . . . He refused to treat the Divine *outside the reach of the senses* as anything but an ungraspable dream” (emphasis added).

The Book of *Genesis* he dismissed contemptuously as “theology”—a curse-word in the Huxley lexicon almost as often used as “Platonism.” After the release of Darwin’s *Origin of Species*, Huxley wrote a review for the *Westminster Review* in April 1860, in which he defended Darwin against his detractors, whom he denounced as “bigots.” Huxley lamented that “nine-tenths of the civilized world” still held the “cosmogony of the semi-barbarous Hebrew” and the “coeval imaginations current among the rude inhabitants of Palestine” as “the authoritative standard of fact.”

Similarly, he blasted those paleontologists and geologists who believed in an idea of “progressive development” from lower forms of life to higher. Huxley’s “deconsecrated paleontology,” writes Desmond, “was deeply nihilistic and defiantly anti-Creative: no progress, no meaning to fossil life, no Christian comfort. For Huxley, almost uniquely, man was no ‘modulus and standard of the creation,’ no end point, merely an ‘aberrant modification.’ ”

As indicated, this was all promoted with a fervor suited to a religious fundamentalist cult. Huxley’s fanatical approach was variously described, by his contemporaries, as “Scientific Calvinism,” “Puritan evangelicalism,” or “romantic pantheism.”

But Huxley himself would be most proud of characterizing himself by his invented word “agnostic.” Desmond writes ironically, that Huxley was the “Infallible Head of the Church Agnostic,” to the extent that the magazine *Spectator* dubbed him “Pope Huxley.” And how did he come to the word “agnostic”? According to Desmond, he was trying to distance himself from some of the rhetorical and organizational excesses of the positivists associated with Auguste Comte; Huxley labelled their *modus operandi* as “Catholicism without Christianity.” One evening in 1869, he attended a dinner, at which “a cacophony of voices proclaimed that they ‘had attained a certain ‘gnosis,’ like the second-century gnostics who professed sparks of divine knowledge. That night, he came up with ‘Agnostic.’ ”

That Huxley was an imperialist and genocidalist, even his enthusiastic biographer acknowledges. As a 25-year-old, he expressed his views on Australia’s aborigines, in part to attack Christian missionaries and other “philanthropic evangelicals” who were trying to help them. He denounced the aborigines as “hopelessly irreclaimable savages,” and wrote: “Their ‘elimination’ . . . from the earth’s surface can be viewed only with satisfaction, as the removal of a great blot from the escutcheon of our common humanity, by all those who know them as they are, and are not to be misled by the maudlin philanthropy of ‘aborigines friends.’ ”

Desmond writes: “Australia’s nomads were blind to the Victorian ideals of private property, free-trade and Piccadilly fashion.” Describing Huxley’s “final solution” as “smugly horrifying,” Desmond comments: “Genocide and progress were ugly bedfellows.”

His great loyalty, of course, was to the Empire. In 1858, he wrote, “I firmly believe in the advent of an English epoch

in science and art.”

But he was sympathetic to imperialism more generally. In 1854, Huxley was assigned to write about the Caucasus wars for the *Westminster Review*, which pit the forces of the Russian czar against the Islamic guerrilla war leader Sultan Schamyl (a figure whose fanaticism Huxley greatly admired). Writes Desmond, interspersing quotes from the piece in the *Review*: “Huxley was not against Russian imperialism. Indeed, ‘the aggression of a nation of higher social organization upon those of lower grade’ was one of the ‘conditions of human progress.’ That was a bloody ethic of the age, soon to be sanctified in Darwin’s work. The point was to redirect the Russian bear’s gaze towards the Asian ‘wastes where his claws may find exercise advantageous to humanity.’ ”

This was fully in line with the views of Herbert Spencer, the man who, according to Desmond, drew Huxley “into a web of radical friendships” in the early 1850s. In 1866, Spencer wrote: “The continuance of the old predatory instinct . . . has subserved civilization, by clearing the earth of inferior races of men. The forces which are working out the great scheme of perfect happiness, taking no account of incidental suffering, exterminate such sections of mankind as stand in their way, with the same sternness that they exterminate beasts of prey and herds of useless ruminants.”

Prince Philip could not have stated the oligarchy’s intentions better!

# The Science of Christian Economy

And other prison writings by  
Lyndon H. LaRouche, Jr.

Includes  
*In Defense of Common Sense*,  
*Project A*, and *The Science of Christian Economy*,

three ground-breaking essays written by LaRouche after he became a political prisoner of the Bush administration on Jan. 27, 1989.

\$15

Order from:

**Ben Franklin Booksellers, Inc.**

Toll free (800) 453-4108 (703) 777-3661 fax (703) 777-8287

Shipping and handling: Add \$4 for the first book and \$.50 for each additional book in the order. Virginia residents add 4.5% sales tax. We accept MasterCard, Visa, American Express, and Discover.

