

Wesley J. Smith debates Professor Francione on The Michael Medved Show

April 16, 2010

Michael Medved (MM): And another great day in this greatest nation on God's green Earth, a great day to confront some of the great fears about radicalism. In the Obama administration a lot of attention paid to radical intentions regarding the economy and a so called socialist agenda, lots of attention paid to disarmament imperatives and to a radical agenda on foreign policy. But what about a radical agenda on animal rights? Haven't heard much about that but there are people close to the President of the United States, and in fact an increasingly strong movement in the United States that Wesley Smith says is a danger to our core American values, and that's identified with the animal rights movement. Is the animal rights movement a credit to this country, something that is helping to enhance our humanity, or is it a danger to America? That's the subject of a debate that's occasioned by Wesley Smith's new book, it is called *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy: The Human Cost of the Animal Rights Movement*. And I'm very glad Wesley is going to be debating Gary Francione, he is a professor of law at Rutgers University, one of the universities at which my late mother pursued her education. Gentlemen, thank you very much for joining me, both of you.

Wesley Smith (WS): Thank you.

Gary Francione (GF): Thank you Michael.

MM: Thanks a lot. Okay Wesley, you first because you're the author of this very provocative new book, it is posted up on our website at michaelmedved.com. The obvious question that everyone wants to ask is, Wesley, most people understand that it's a good thing not to be cruel to animals, there's a very strong element in Judaeo-Christian tradition that compels respect to all living things, so what's with moving forward in society to deal with some of the genuine, undoubted horrors that are involved in some of our treatment of animals in places like factory farms and slaughterhouses, things like that, isn't it a good thing to move in that direction?

WS: Yes of course, we should move increasingly to improve our humane care of animals and improve our methods of animal husbandry. But animal rights is not about that and I think this is something that Gary and I will agree on. Animal rights and animal welfare are two different things. Animal welfare believes in human exceptionalism, that is, the idea that there

is a hierarchy of moral worth with humans at the pinnacle, that gives us unique rights as human beings but it also gives us very important duties. In fact we're the only species in the history of the known universe that can be said to have enforceable duties that can be imposed upon us. Animal rights says, no, to believe that human beings have greater moral worth than animals is something called speciesism that is the equivalent of racism, it's discrimination against animals. Animal welfare says as we mentioned before that it is important for us to, as we use animals, which acknowledges our right to use animals, that we do so humanly; animal rights says we should not use animals at all, we should not eat meat, we should not wear wool, clothing, we should not use animals in medical research. And I think that is a crucial distinction and it's one that Gary has made quite clearly. Gary opposes animal welfare actions and supports animal rights actions.

MM: Gary, is that accurate, you are –

GF: He said a lot of things Michael just now. I would say this: I do oppose animal welfare for moral reasons but I also oppose animal welfare for practical, economic reasons. Because animals are chattel property, animal welfare levels will always be and have historically been very, very low. The only time we will protect animal interests is when we derive an economic benefit from doing so. And much of my scholarship over the past twenty five years has been to document the history of animal welfare and to prove the point that animal welfare standards have historically been low and in the future will be low because of the property status of animals.

MM: Hold on, you began by saying you oppose animal welfare –

GF: Yes.

MM: And a lot of people are listening to that on the radio and saying, what, he opposes animal welfare, how can anyone be opposed to the welfare of animals? What you're saying is that you believe we need a higher standard and we need to talk about the rights of animals not just their wellbeing.

GF: I talk about the right not to be property. I don't want to be equated with PETA or a lot of these other organisations whose positions I reject. I have nothing to do with PETA and as Wesley well knows I have a very strong position on any sort of violence in the animal rights movement, I am violently opposed to violence. My position Michael is simply this, and I'd

like to use an example to get us into the discussion in a way that I hope will engage the listeners on a deeper level. Wesley in his book talks about Michael Vick and he talks about how horrible it was that Michael Vick was involved in fighting dogs and all of this cruelty that was involved and Wesley agrees that what Michael Vick did was wrong. He says that in two places in the book, he criticises Michael Vick. Now, my question is this: why is it that we were all upset with Michael Vick? We were upset with Michael Vick because he was deriving pleasure from actions that involved the suffering and death of animals, he was getting pleasure, amusement or convenience – he was enjoying the activity of dog fighting. And my position is very simply this: what is the difference between Michael Vick who likes sitting around a pit watching dogs fight and the rest of us who like to sit around roasting their corpses around the summer barbecue. The bottom line is we all agree with the notion that it's wrong to inflict unnecessary suffering and death on animals. Now, we could have an interesting philosophical discussion about what necessity means, but if it means anything, if that moral rule means *anything* – that it's wrong to inflict unnecessary suffering and death on animals – it means we can't justify suffering and death for reasons of pleasure, amusement or convenience. But we kill 56 billion animals a year for food, not including fish and other aquatic animals. We kill 56 billion animals a year for food. Nobody maintains that we need to eat those animals for optimal health, indeed an increasing number of mainstream health professionals –

MM: Okay, Wesley Smith, is he right, is the average American carnivore out there a worse actor in terms of animal cruelty than Michael Vick?

GF: I didn't say worse, I said *were the same*.

MM: Okay wait, give Wesley a chance now.

WS: Well I think Gary's answer shows that animal rights is not about animal welfare, it's an ideology. In fact it's a dogma. Gary believes that what gives value is sentience and if an individual has sentience that means it has rights not to be property. In fact he has stated having sentience is what should confer personhood status on that individual. So we see there is a tremendous moral equivalent created here between animals and humans.

MM: Okay that's what your book is about, I want to go back and focus Wesley for just a moment on the challenge that Gary put on the table. Given the fact that the average American

eats several animals a year – certainly when it comes to chickens eats many animals a year – is the average American responsible for more animal cruelty in a normal year than Michael Vick?

WS: No, because eating animals first off is a natural food for human beings, we are omnivores. Secondly, we are moving progressively towards improved methods of animal husbandry. There is a professor for example named Temple Grandin and she's got autism and she believes –

MM: Right, celebrated in a recent TV movie.

WS: Yes. And she believes that allows her to perceive particularly how cattle perceive. And she has been able to really excellent improvements not only in the husbandry of cattle but also in the slaughter of cattle.

MM: Okay, but even if we move forward to those improvements, the question would be: is it a valid standard as Gary suggests to actually talk about the suffering of animals. In other words if human beings and society should try to avoid animal suffering, should there be specific policies in place in society to discourage people from eating meat?

WS: No, I don't believe there should be but I do believe there should be policies that encourage and require methods of animal husbandry that reduce animal suffering or if possible eliminate it. I think it is not immoral to eat meat and Gary does and that's part of the difference.

MM: Gary?

GF: Wait, wait, wait. We can talk about whether or not animal welfare is economically practical and I believe that is fantasy Wesley, you simply cannot reduce animal suffering to any significant degree, particularly in a world in which we have something called free trade because as long as the demand is there for the lower welfare products, the supply is going to be provided. But that's an economic discussion, let's not bore people with that. What I –

MM: Okay, what we can't bore people with right now is running over the break, we're coming up to a break in the proceedings. The provocative new book that has occasioned this argument is called *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy*. If we should try to discourage suffering for animals, how far does that need go? We'll be right back.

MM: Twenty one minutes after the hour on the Michael Medved show, your daily dose of debate, a particularly heated debate right now between two worthy adversaries. Wesley Smith is the author of the new book *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy*. That of course is a slogan of the animal rights movement. The subtitle of his book is *The Human Cost of the Animal Rights Movement*. Wesley Smith is a senior fellow in human rights and bioethics at the Discovery Institute and he's the author previously of *The Culture of Death: The Assault on Medical Ethics in America*. We're also speaking with Gary Francione who is a Professor of Law at Rutgers University Law School in Newark and he has written extensively on this issue of animal rights. He in fact has authored *Introduction to Animal Rights: Your Child or the Dog?*. Okay, let's try to establish just quickly if we can before we get back into the back and forth to see where we have some common ground. Wesley Smith and Gary Francione, Wesley first, just a yes or no please. Wesley, it is a valid goal for society and governments that organise society to try to reduce as much as feasible suffering for animals.

WS: Yes.

MM: Gary Francione?

GF: Well of course it's better to impose less suffering than more suffering –

MM: Is it a valid goal for government to try to reduce suffering for animals?

GF: It's an impossible goal. It can't be done because animals are chattel property. What I would like to –

MM: We'll come back to that in just a moment. But you both acknowledge – Gary Francione is saying it can't be done. We certainly can't eliminate suffering for animals, nobody is talking about that –

GF: We can't even reduce it significantly. We've had animal welfare for two hundred years, we're using more animals than ever before in human history in more horrific ways. But what I'm trying to get to is – and just look, I'm the leftist in the lion's den here so I'm in minority, be good to the minority.

MM: We've been very good to you but get to your point.

GF: Alright, my point is this: Wesley thinks that we ought to reduce suffering because he thinks there is something morally wrong with imposing suffering that is not necessary. And my point is simply this: we can live without eating animal products, I have been a vegan for

almost thirty years, I'm a very healthy guy. And so the question is: why is it that we think that *any* level of suffering or death is acceptable if it's not necessary for us and it's not as an empirical matter necessary for us. And I get very concerned when I hear Wesley say something like: well, it's natural for us to eat meat. You know what –

MM: Hold on, let's come back to the eating of meat in a moment.

GF: Okay.

MM: What about animals for medical research? Will you grant that that is at sometime, as Wesley argues in his book very passionately, will you grant that the use of animals in medical research is sometimes indispensable?

GF: It may as an empirical matter be indispensable, I don't think it's morally justifiable.

MM: Wesley?

GF: But I also think –

MM: Wesley? Go ahead.

WS: Well we cannot have medical advances and scientific increasing in biological knowledge without animal research and maintain our morality and ethics. In fact that comes out of a Nuremberg code because of the terrible atrocities that occurred to human beings in the concentration camps. Gary is very honest about this. He will acknowledge that there is benefits to be derived for human beings from medical research but believes it is unethical to do so despite those benefits. Most of the animals –

GF: Yeah but Wesley, Wesley. But what I also say is you overlook – for example. You assume that the only way to assume certain health problems is using animals in experiments. I for example have argued that if you want to cut down on new HIV cases, the economically most effective way to do that is safe sex education, condom distribution and needle distribution, but that's not politically acceptable. If you did that –

WS: But things are happening right now for Heaven's sake. The point I was going to make is that most in the animal rights movement deny – and this is empirically unjustifiable and intellectually dishonest – that there is benefit to be obtained for human beings and for animals

–

GF: Wesley, with all respect that's false. There are very few people who deny that there may be – I think it's grossly overestimated. There may be some benefits for humans from using non-humans in biomedical experiments – that's not the point. The point is whether it's morally justifiable. But there's an additional issue as to whether or not there's empirical necessity –

MM: Gary those are separate issues –

GF: I agree they are separate issues but –

MM: Gary, can I ask you a question?

GF: Sure.

MM: Do you support the use of embryonic stem cells in medical research?

GF: Yes I do.

MM: Okay, do you support abortion rights?

GF: I support the right of a woman to terminate pregnancy, yes I do. And I am not happy about that –

MM: Up till what month?

GF: I believe that it is the right of a woman to – in a patriarchal society Michael I believe that a woman should be able to make a decision to terminate pregnancy at any point.

MM: Okay so hold on for a moment. On what basis would you say that a sentient being that is non-human would have some rights but a sentient being like a well developed fetus and utero has no rights?

GF: Because you a conflict situation that replicates itself nowhere in nature Michael. Assuming that the fetus is a right holder, you've got one right holder living in the body of another right holder. That sort of conflict situation doesn't replicate itself anywhere else in nature. And the only question is: who decides who resolves that conflict? The woman in whose body the subsidiary right holder exists or a white male legislator or judge who isn't going to get pregnant –

MM: Why do you bring up a white male?

GF: In a patriarchal society – because Michael –

MM: You think if it was a black male legislator he would have the right?

GF: Because Michael we live in a society of racism and sexism. It's a patriarchal, racist society.

MM: Okay, Gary?

GF: That's where you and I probably differ.

MM: Okay, Wesley?

GF: I think it's a racist and patriarchal society.

WS: You know I think the thing that we need to focus on is that for an animal rights believer – not animal welfare, but animal rights – that which is done to an animal should be viewed in the same way as if the same thing were done to a human. Thus People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals ran the Holocaust on Your Plate campaign, an odious comparison equating animal husbandry with the death camps. And listen to this quote from PETA: “Like the Jews murdered in concentration camps, animals are terrorised in their house in huge filthy warehouses and rounded up for shipment to slaughter. The leather [inaudible] are the moral equivalent of the lampshades made from the skins of people killed in the death camps”. Michael and Gary, I've been to Auschwitz, I've been to Birkenau, I've stood in the crematoria and the gas chambers, I've seen that horrible rail terminus where Jews were divided for immediate murder or torture in slave labour camps, and it strikes me that anybody who could equate the worst evil done to human beings with animal husbandry has no business preaching morality to anybody.

MM: Okay when we come back we'll get a response from Gary Francione. I also want to pursue this idea that a sentient being called a mouse deserves more respect and concern for its pain than the pain of a, say, eight month old baby in the womb. We'll be right back with Gary Francione and Wesley Smith.

MM: Thirty four minutes after the hour on the Michael Medved Show. The provocative new book that is the basis for this debate today is called *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy: The Human Cost of the Animal Rights Movement*. The author is Wesley J. Smith of Discovery Institute. The book is posted up on our website at michaelmedved.com. His adversary in this particular colloquy is Gary L. Francione, he is a professor of law at Rutgers University Law

School in Newark, New Jersey. Alright, Gary Francione, there's just been a strong challenge posed to you by Wesley Smith regarding the tendency of people in the animal rights movement to equate the killing of animals with the killing of human beings, a particular odious example. And I must tell you I agree with Wesley in this regard was the Holocaust on Your Plate campaign by PETA. We had spokespeople from the PETA organisation, People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals, on our radio show about that. Is it a valid statement to suggest that Kernel Sanders was a worse mass murderer than Adolf Hitler, which was said on my radio show because Kernel Sanders killed more chickens than Hitler killed Jews.

GF: Michael, with all respect, that's like saying: is it worse to kill Jews than it was to kill Romanians? Or was it worse than he killed Poles than he killed Jews? I mean –

MM: Hold on, you're saying that comparing human beings to chickens is like comparing Jews to gypsies?

WS: That's exactly what he's saying here Michael.

GF: I'm not interested in ranking evil. I think that is not –

MM: There's a direct challenge here. Is it a valid distinction, is it a more valid distinction to say that there is a big difference between a chicken and a human being? Is that a more valid distinction than the distinction between a Jew and a gypsy?

GF: I think that it's all wrong. I'm not going to get into the game of ranking evils. I think it's all wrong. There is no reason to kill or impose suffering on any sentient being without at least a valid reason, and pleasure, amusement, convenience or hatred are not sufficient reasons.

MM: Okay, stay with me for a moment and then we're going to give Wesley a chance to respond because you've just said something truly, truly extraordinary in my opinion. Would you agree with many of the great moral philosophers going back to the time of Moses, as a matter of fact, that if human beings see the needless torture, murder, suffering of other human beings, they are obligated, if necessary, to risk their own lives to stop that?

GF: There have been people who have said that, yes, I agree with that, sure.

MM: You agree with that. So again do you then say that human beings are obligated if necessary to risk their own lives to stop the torture and suffering of animals?

GF: Well I – are you asking me about principles of self defence?

MM: I'm asking you – again, the biblical example that's given is a famous biblical example is the story of Moses, the author of the entire Old Testament, five books of Moses, right? Moses leaves Egypt because he interposes himself and risks his life to stop an Egyptian overseer from beating to death a Hebrew slave.

GF: Yeah.

MM: And he is praised –

GF: A wonderfully noble thing to do and I think we should all –

MM: Is it also noble if somebody comes in and kills a butcher or someone who is working in a slaughterhouse?

GF: Michael, come on, that's not what Moses did.

MM: Yes he did, he came and he killed the overseer, he murdered him, he killed him.

GF: No, I do not believe in violence.

MM: So then Moses was wrong?

GF: On the story that you're telling me, yes.

MM: This is in the Book of Exodus, Moses sees an overseer who is beating to death an innocent slave.

GF: You said interpose himself and now you're saying he killed him.

MM: He interposed himself and ended up killing the overseer.

GF: I do not believe in violence. I am opposed to violence.

WS: Gary is a principled pacifist.

GF: I am a principled pacifist, that is correct. And I would like to make a comment about Wesley's book that –

MM: Okay well you said it was okay if Moses interposed himself. Would Moses have been justified in standing over the stricken slave and saying: okay overseer, kill me first?

GF: Would he have been justified? Yes. As a matter of fact I think –

MM: So would you be justified in going down to your local slaughterhouse and saying: cut my throat first before you get that next cow?

GF: It would be a futile gesture but –

MM: Yes.

GF: – I believe Michael that most of us subscribe to spiritual traditions which elevate the idea of sacrificing oneself for the other as a very, very good thing.

MM: Yeah but sacrificing yourself for other human beings, which is the whole basis of Christianity after all, is a little bit different than sacrificing yourself for chickens I think most people would say. We'll get a response from Gary Francione and Wesley Smith. The book: *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy*.

MM: Forty four minutes after the hour on the Michael Medved Show. Before we go through with this, Gary Francione doesn't know this, I think Wesley Smith does: I myself am not a meat eater. I am a 'fishatarian', I will eat fish and I do eat fish but I don't eat animals that have been slaughtered. Wesley Smith I want to give you the first shot at this. Gary Francione just said something extraordinary, which he said it would be an admirable though futile gesture for activists to interposed themselves and to offer their own lives in the place of a cow or a chicken that is about to be slaughtered. I take it you would disagree.

WS: Well yeah, I believe that human beings have greater moral value than animals. Animal rights activists, again distinguishing it from animal welfare, do not. Gary is a pacifist and has to his very great credit spoken against the violence that is increasing in animal rights advocacy. Many of his colleagues, I know he would not associate himself with them, like the Animal Liberation Front, Stop Huntington Animal Cruelty, not only engage in threats, have engaged in pipe bombings, incendiary bombings. In England, in order to stop a farm family from raising guinea pigs for use in medical research, animal rights activists robbed the grave of a farm family's grandmother and wouldn't give the body back until they got out of the business.

GF: But Wesley, Wesley, with all respect. First of all you know I detest that stuff and I have gotten threats from people –

WS: Didn't I just say that Gary?

GF: There are a lot of unbalanced people in the world Wesley and they gravitate to various positions and some of them gravitate to the animal position, and I can't really be responsible for them and I despise what they advocate and what they do. But I also think –

MM: Wesley, let me come back for just a moment. When you say it would be a futile gesture to interpose yourself with a slaughterer who is about to kill cows? If I could show you that by your interposing yourself you could save say a thousand cows from going to the slaughterhouse by sacrificing your life, wouldn't you be by your calculus morally obligated to sacrifice your own life to save those one thousand cows?

GF: I think it would be morally permissible, I don't know that I'd be morally obligated because I actually think I can save more by continuing the advocacy that I'm doing and the creative, non-violent vegan education –

MM: That's begging the question.

GF: No it's not begging the question.

MM: Hold on for a moment. I just want to see what moral basis we're all operating on here in terms of assumptions. I would suggest that if I could save a thousand human beings by sacrificing my own life, I would be obligated to do that. Wesley, would you agree?

WS: I wouldn't know if you would be obligated but it certainly would be morally permissible in –

GF: That's exactly what I said.

MM: Okay, so –

GF: I mean, Michael, you could say right now Michael, after we've finished the show, you could go and you could give up all of your organs, I'm sure you're a reasonably healthy fellow, and you could save at least twenty people by donating your organs. Are you morally obligated to do so?

MM: Again what we're talking about now is not simply sacrificing yourself but interposing yourself to stop cruelty and to stop wanton slaughter.

WS: But wait a second, there's more to the animal rights movement than that. Animal rights activists, and Gary's very candid about this, it isn't just about suffering, it's about not having the right to own an animal and animals not having the right to be owned. Gary doesn't

believe that we should even be able to have dogs no matter how well we treat them because, as he calls them, they are refugees in a world in which they do not belong. So it isn't just about suffering, it's a rights view in which the view of owning animals is seen as equivalent to slavery.

MM: Gary, I take it you're opposed to Seeing Eye dogs?

GF: I am opposed to any animal use whatsoever. Are Seeing Eye dogs high on my list Michael? No, absolutely not. Let me just make one thing clear. My position is quite simple: we all agree it's wrong to impose unnecessary suffering and unnecessary death on animals and that reasons of pleasure, amusement or convenience do not constitute necessity. But 99.999999% of our animal use can only be justified by reasons of pleasure, amusement or convenience. And that was the basis of my argument, that in many ways morally we are indistinguishable from Michael Vick. But I want to make one point that I think is extremely important to make. Wesley's book is problematic in a number of respects from my perspective obviously. But one thing that troubles me greatly is that, yes, there are people in the movement who advocate violence but they are a very small number of people. Most of the people that I have met in the movement despise and reject that stuff. He talks about people like Steve Best; most of the people I know in the movement don't even know who Steve Best is and those who do know who he is dismiss him as a clown. And I really think that this idea that animal rights people are pro-violent or people who want to kill vivisectionists or people who want to kill butchers, that's unfair and that's empirically wrong.

MM: Okay, Wesley Smith, challenge to you.

WS: If most people –

MM: Hold on. Wesley, if you separate out the violent elements of the animal rights movement –

WS: Right.

MM: – is it still a dangerous movement?

WS: Yes, because it's anti-human and explicit and implicit. It destroys the concept of human exceptionalism. It says that human being and animals have equivalent moral worth.

GF: No I didn't –

MM: Ah, let him finish.

WS: It would do tremendous harm to human benefit. I disagree with Gary completely with 99.9% of our use of animals us just for frivolous reasons or for pleasure. It would impede medical research, it would destroy –

GF: That’s a small number of animals Wesley. The animals that we eat, the animals that we use for sport hunting, the animals that we use for entertainment, those are the large number of animals. We could put vivisection aside as a completely separate issue.

MM: Okay Gary, let me just try to see the extent of this and the consistency of this. Recently Ted Turner was involved in this I believe, there was some culling of the buffalo herd based upon illness in the buffalo herd in Montana. Would human beings be justified in doing that, in mass killing –

GF: We shouldn’t be breeding those animals – those animals were purpose bred for meat as I understood.

MM: No, the problem was it was a free range buffalo herd in Yellowstone Park and it was infected with some type of cow disease and they had to kill some of the buffalo to prevent further infection. Are humans justified in doing that?

GF: If an animal is irretrievably ill, and this is something else that Wesley and I disagree in, if I were irretrievably ill, if I were terminally ill and I were in great pain, I should have the right to terminate my own life. I think Wesley disagrees with that.

MM: Okay we’ll be right back with this life, death, animals and humans with Wesley Smith and Gary Francione.

MM: Fifty five minutes after the hour. We only have a few moments left for a very heated and provocative and substantive debate. The debate centres around a new book, and explosive new book, it is called *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy: The Human Cost of the Animal Rights Movement*. It is by Wesley Smith who is a critic of that movement. He is debating Gary Francione who is a law Professor specialising in the rights of animals at Rutgers University Law School. Gentlemen, you’ll each have just about a minute and I’m going to have to hold you to that. Gary Francione I would love you to go first please. Tell us

how the world would be better for human beings if human beings stopped owning and, in your view, unjustifiably exploiting other forms of life.

GF: The central proposition in Wesley's book is that if we were to follow the passes that I propose we would be denigrating human beings, we would not be acknowledging what is special about us. And I think a fundamental disagreement that I have with Wesley: what is fundamentally special about us? What I believe is fundamentally special about humans is our ability to love, our ability for compassion, our ability to reach out and to help the vulnerable other whether the vulnerable other is human or non-human. And I think that's what great about being human is that I'm able to choose to do that. I believe strongly in non-violence.

MM: Gary Francione, thank you. Wesley Smith, where is he wrong, how would our world and our society be worse off if we disentangled ourselves from the ownership and exploitation of animals?

WS: Well it would be, in my view, first, to accept animal rights ideology would be a moral equivalency between human beings and animals which I reject. It seems to me that if we perceive ourselves as just another animal in the forest that's precisely how we will act. Secondly there would be a tremendous cost tolled to human beings. We have duties to animals, I agree with that, but we also have duties to human beings, we have duties to end disease, we have duties to provide good nutritious food for the multitudes, we I think have the right to derive pleasure from owning dogs and cats and have that wonderful, loving companionship. A world in which we could not have wool coats and which we could not horseback ride, which is not a form of cruelty –

GF: Yes it is.

WS: – a world in which we could not eat meat would be a world far diminished over the one that we have and it wouldn't only hurt human beings it would also tend to hurt animals.

MM: Alright, the book is called *A Rat is a Pig is a Dog is a Boy*, and we haven't even gotten into some of the most explosive elements of disagreement here. Gary Francione, we would look forward very much to having you back and I would like next time when you come back to specifically go to the issue of eating meat, is there a moral justification ever, anywhere, for people to eat meat. Gary Francione is a professor of law at Rutgers University Law School, Wesley Smith is a distinguished author, the author most recently of *A Rat is a Pig is a*

Dog is a Boy. More about his work and about Gary Francione's work posted at our website at michaelmedved.com. An argument that will not disappear or dissipate in this greatest nation on God's green Earth.