



Anti-humans Are on the March — and They Want You GONE

After it was asserted that cow flatulence contributes to “global warming,” some greentopians concluded that all animal agriculture should be [ended](#); this, of course, means eliminating most of the cows on Earth. Given this, with [a new study claiming](#) that human breathing also contributes to global warming, should most of our planet’s people be gone, too?

Actually, this has already been suggested, with a World Economic Forum (WEF) advisor saying last year that we “don’t need the vast majority of the population” and that there was a growing class of “useless people.”

So first we heard the pejorative “useless eaters.”

Is it now “useless breathers”?

That WEF advisor, Israeli homosexual Yuval Harari, may or may not be driven by climate concerns when making such comments. It’s also true that some anti-human quotations — such as one [attributed to](#) globalist puppeteer Klaus Schwab — are made-up, [misrepresented](#), or are misattributions. (And we all should aim to be accurate.) Yet the reality is that an anti-human philosophy has taken hold in some pseudo-elite circles.

This onus put on human breathing is interesting, too, because it’s another case of life imitating art, as fiction issued a prophetic warning about such thinking long ago.

Writing at American Thinker, commentator Howard Hirsch mentions that while teaching a course on energy and environmental policy 40-plus years back at Metro State University in St. Paul, Minnesota, he’d recommend a 1973 book titled *The Bridge*, by author D. Keith Mano. The work is “the story of a world in which the enviros obtain complete hegemony,” Hirsch [writes](#). “Food as we know it is forbidden, and humans live off an inorganic ‘e-diet’ instead.”

What’s more, the powers that be finally conclude that human breathing itself is a problem (though for different reasons) and that everyone must commit suicide.

The irony is that we now not only have a warning about our breathing but also resolutions that [our diet must change](#), with meat replaced with insect protein. (Is your mouth watering yet?)

Anti-human philosophies are nothing new, either. In the late Middle Ages there was Catharism, which held that all spirit was good and all matter evil. Consequently, its teaching went, suicide could be positive because it eliminated the wicked flesh, and perversion could be good because it didn’t lead to life’s generation. (Sound familiar? Note that radical homosexuals today will sometimes pejoratively call normal people “breeders.”)



jokerpro/iStock/Getty Images Plus



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on January 3, 2024

But anti-human ideas appear more common than ever. An “antinatalism” movement exists, which holds that [“it is wrong for humans as a whole to procreate.”](#) (In 2019, [there was a story](#) about an Indian man who intended to sue his parents for giving birth to him without his consent.) Elon Musk [has related](#) that Google cofounder Larry Page accused him of “speciesism” for valuing man more than digital life forms (AI). And exiled commentator Anne Barnhardt has [reprinted quotations](#) from misanthropic figures who, as the original source puts it, consider most people as “akin to ‘Cave Men’, that must be made extinct.”

Then there’s the WEF’s Harari (a homosexual, [reportedly](#), who claims to be “married” to a man). He says that though governments at one time required citizens for “labor and production,” [writes](#) National File, artificial intelligence and bioengineering will render most people “useless” and allow them to be “replaced” — though he doesn’t specify with what.

But we can imagine. After all, Christendom, being Christendom, had long operated by the biblical injunction “Be fruitful and multiply, and fill the earth and subdue it” and had shared Jesus’s observation that we should feel “joy” when “a human being has been born into the world.” Yet many today, our pseudo-elites in particular, reckon man a mere organic robot — and a pox upon the planet. To them, human birth may be ecological terrorism, and actual robots preferable.

Yet these greentopians, as G.K. Chesterton said of moderns in general, make a fundamental philosophical error: They “shirk the problem of what is good.” Chesterton [explained his meaning](#) while critiquing friend and contemporary writer H.G. Wells, who not only appreciated human birth, but said he’d consider man only in his “chief function,” parenthood.

What, however, “is the good of begetting a man until we have settled what is the good of being a man?” Chesterton asked. “You are merely handing on to him a problem you dare not settle yourself. It is as if a man were asked, ‘What is the use of a hammer?’ and answered, ‘To make hammers’; and when asked, ‘And of those hammers, what is the use?’ answered, ‘To make hammers again’. Just as such a man would be perpetually putting off the question of the ultimate use of carpentry, so Mr. Wells and all the rest of us are ... successfully putting off the question of the ultimate value of the human life.”

Ask the same thing about “animal life” and you have the point the greentopians should ponder. Okay, so a 90-percent human population reduction would make more room for fauna and flora, but what’s the point? Why should it be, and who says, that things will be “better” if we have more animals and forest? Oh, with fewer people there’ll be more of an ecological balance? Alright, but why does any of this matter? What is the ultimate value of animal life and the natural world? And how does this measure against the ultimate value of the human life?

Just as Chesterton actually had profound respect for human life, the point here isn’t to discount nature’s importance. We *should* be good shepherds of the Earth. But we won’t be good shepherds of anything, including ourselves, if we wallow in the error that man is just an [“object that perceives”](#) and all that we see is a mere cosmic accident. We can claim to want to do “good,” but will surely do evil if we’re moral nihilists who ultimately have no idea what the good is.

Addendum: Apropos to this topic, Elon Musk just posted the following tweet.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe