

# Prince Philip apes Adolf Hitler's creed

by Mark Burdman

In a commentary appearing in the *Sunday Telegraph* of London June 17, Prof. John Casey of Caius College, Cambridge University launched a sharp attack on the fascist "animal rights" movement. Casey identified Adolf Hitler as the most famous animal rights advocate of this century. Also, Casey singled out for attack an individual whose endorsement of paganism is familiar to readers of this publication: Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh, prince consort of Queen Elizabeth II.

Casey is a professor of philosophy and expert on questions of morality and ethics. He has just written a book entitled *Pagan Virtues*, which defends Christianity against its pagan critics. Earlier this year, Casey wrote an opinion column for the *Sunday Telegraph*, in which he warned that Britain would irreversibly be crossing the boundary from Christianity into paganism if its leading influentials continued to call into question the principle of the sacredness of human life.

His attack on the "animal rights" movement followed by days, an offensive launched by the left-Fabian *Guardian* newspaper in support of the "animal rights" philosophy. *Guardian* feature articles of June 11 and June 14 asserted that there was no moral or philosophical basis to distinguish human beings from the animal species, and singled out the most precious notions of the Judeo-Christian tradition, such as natural law and the primacy of human creative reason, as impediments to the realization of "animal rights." In the days leading up to the *Guardian* offensive, Prince Philip had openly lent his support to the pagan animal rights movement. Also, Britain and other countries have been hit by an increasing wave of "animal liberation front" terrorist actions, targeting scientific researchers in particular.

## Do ants have rights, too?

Casey's June 17 piece is entitled, "How animals make an ass of man." He began the article with a quatrain:

"He prayeth best who loveth best  
All things both great and small;  
The streptococcus is the test;  
I love him best of all."

After this colorful beginning, Casey, in the early segments of the article, called into question an historical-philosophical trend in English thinking which openly prefers animals to human beings, especially when those human beings are non-whites. He noted that the English have traditionally been guilty of what he calls the "heresy" of "animal worship." He warned that "conservationists and animal rightists" are proposing to replace the Judeo-Christian tradition with "a mixture of sentimentality and species fascism."

The Cambridge professor pointed to Prince Philip, international president of the World Wide Fund for Nature (formerly World Wildlife Fund), as representative of this kind of thinking: "The husband of the Supreme Governor of the Church of England [Queen Elizabeth II] recently tried to persuade the Pope to abandon Judeo-Christian teaching, in which man has dominion over all the beasts of the field, in favor of the conservationist view that human beings are now simply a teeming proletariat, who are making the world unsafe for gorillas, elephants, and badgers. This must have been the most improbable attempt at conversion since St. Francis of Assisi preached Christian pacifism to a startled Sultan of Egypt in 1219."

Further on, he honed in on the philosophy of the animal rights movement: "Until very recently, all philosophers and theologians taught that only persons can have rights. Indeed, the idea of a person is the idea of a being with rights. . . . The idea of the rights of animals is made up of several elements: a revulsion at inflicting pain upon them; a delight in them; and a denial of their otherness and strangeness. To claim that animals have rights is to reduce the very notion of rights to mere sentimentality, a matter of taste. To grant rights to gorillas and the higher mammals, but to deny them to sparrows and ants, is to make rights arbitrary, and to remove all force from the idea. And to extend

tures would be to make the notion of a right unintelligible. "If that is all we mean by 'rights' then we are in grave danger," he went on. "For it encourages us to think that having rights is not an essential, inalienable part of being rational. Human beings have rights, not because they are clever, or rare, or nice—but because they are human beings."

## 'His name was Adolf Hitler'

In the last two paragraphs, Casey went in for the kill.

"The idea that human beings are to be valued, not essentially, but only if they are members of higher, rarer groups, is not unknown in the modern times. And a love of animals need not lead to a reverence for human beings.

"The most famous animal lover of the 20th century happened also to be a fervent vegetarian. It is said that his dog was the only being which inspired human affection in him. If he saw anyone eating meat-soup, he berated them for consuming what he called 'corpse tea.' He thought that the world would be a better place with a smaller human population of the finest stock. His name was Adolf Hitler."