

**Chapter 1 : Eric Wenstrand (Illustrator of Shaw on Vivisection)**

*Shaw on Vivisection [George Bernard Shaw, Eric Wenstrand, Russell F. Knutson] on calendrierdelascience.com*  
*\*FREE\* shipping on qualifying offers. Book by Shaw, George Bernard.*

In Greek mythology, Circe was an enchantress who transformed humans who set foot on her island into animals. For many, Wells himself represents a very similar figure, an intellectual visionary whose writings both foretold the wondrous future of science and forewarned of grave consequences should society fail to adopt new ethics for the technological era. Wells, via Wikimedia Until very recently, I too envisioned H. Wells uncritically as a genius ahead of his time. On the surface I loved it simply as a gripping adventure tale, but on a deeper level I found it offered many profound insights on human nature, justice, and the evolution of societies. These included what I perceived as a strong implicit message regarding human exploitation of animals. The Eloi are strict vegetarians, while the Morlocks are carnivores, using industrial technology to farm and slaughter Eloi for food. Wells is often included in lists of famous historical vegetarians. The only citation usually given is a quote from his work *A Modern Utopia*, in which he lays out his vision of the perfect human society on an alternate version of Earth: There used to be. But now we cannot stand the thought of slaughter-houses. And, in a population that is all educated, and at about the same level of physical refinement, it is practically impossible to find anyone who will hew a dead ox or pig. We never settled the hygienic question of meat-eating at all. This other aspect decided us. I can still remember, as a boy, the rejoicings over the closing of the last slaughter-house. Cassowary, a close living relative of the extinct elephant bird photo credit: Kim Bartlett "Animal People, Inc. The giant rattite, 14 feet tall as an adult, eventually turns aggressive following a skirmish over limited food, and the sailor is forced to kill the bird to protect himself. His regret is profound, however, and the overall impression is one of tragedy, illustrating what happens when wild animals are forced to live in close proximity to humans. I sat by his corpse and sorrowed over him, and shivered as I looked round the desolate, silent reef. I thought of what a jolly little bird he had been when he was hatched, and of a thousand pleasant tricks he had played before he went wrong. I felt exactly as if he was human. There he encounters Dr. Moreau, an infamous vivisector driven out of London following public outcry over his cruel research on dogs. Now free of any restrictions on his work, Moreau has taken vivisection to a new extreme, seeking to transform animals into the image of humans by surgically restructuring their living bodies and brains. The creatures molded under his scalpel are capable of human-like motion, thought, and even speech, and while often coarse and violent, are ultimately acknowledged by Prendick as being no more bestial than most human beings. Wells thereby erases any intrinsic moral distinction between humans and animals, or their suffering, and details the horrific magnitude of the latter with devastating clarity as Prendick overhears a puma being vivisected by Moreau: Yet had I known such pain was in the next room, and had it been dumb, I believe "I have thought since "I could have stood it well enough. It is when suffering finds a voice and sets our nerves quivering that this pity comes troubling us. In fact, he delights in the pain he inflicts, describing it like some medieval religious zealot as a means of spiritual purification: Men have been a hundred thousand in the making. Reading the novel, it appears self-evident that H. Wells saw vivisection as monstrously wicked, and penned Doctor Moreau to illustrate the evils that result when science is pursued at the expense of ethics or compassion. Ivan Pavlov and assistants operating on a dog in from the Wellcome Library, London It was to my great shock, then, to learn that later in life H. Wells actually defended vivisection as a noble scientific venture! He even went so far as to visit physiologist Ivan Pavlov in Russia, whom he publicly praised in almost worshipful language. Pavlov was in many ways a real-life Dr. The reality of his experiments was a far cry from the cutesy popular image of puppies drooling at the sound of a kitchen bell; rather, they entailed cutting off the lower jaws of immobilized dogs and inserting tubes directly into their salivary glands. Few animals survived more than a few days of such treatment. He was an influential figure in a line of researchers who believed that subjective experiences, such as consciousness and suffering, could not be scientifically quantified and so were unworthy of any consideration by scientists. This was true not only for other species but for humans as well, whose behavior they also sought to explain in purely mechanical terms

and indeed, humans were sometimes vivisected too, as in U. Wells on Vivisection, with Shaw attacking and Wells defending the practice. It may be relevant to note that despite their extremely heated conflict over vivisection in the public sphere, H. Wells and George Bernard Shaw were actually close friends in real life. How, then, can we resolve the paradox of H. Wells start off morally opposed to vivisection because of the suffering it caused animals, as when he wrote *The Island of Doctor Moreau* at the age of 29, only to change his position later in life? Or did he conclude that vivisection was ethically justified, deciding that the potential benefits to medicine or science in general outweighed the harm caused to animals? In his book *Practical Ethics*, animal rights philosopher Peter Singer argues on utilitarian grounds that some experiments on animals may be justified if the results prove to benefit a much larger number of sentient beings; and Kim Rogers Bartlett of *Animal People* has proposed that activists might reach an accord with biomedical researchers if the latter agree to minimize animal use wherever possible, abide by high standards of animal welfare, and actively seek alternative models for their work. Did Wells in fact never intend *The Island of Doctor Moreau* to criticize vivisection at all, as a few commentators have argued? If so, I can regard him as none other than a psychopathic monster. Lady Justice cradles a small dog while weighing the brain against the heart on her scale. Could it be that he supported some experiments, for some purposes, while rejecting others, and wrote *Doctor Moreau* not as a blanket condemnation of all vivisection, but to establish some dividing line between acceptable and unacceptable practices? If so, he shared common concerns with many in the scientific community, including Charles Darwin, who defended vivisection but, having himself demonstrated the common descent and shared capacities of humans and other species including the ability to suffer, insisted that subjects be anesthetized, and rationalized that the results would ultimately benefit all species of animal. On a personal level, perhaps his demonic characterization of Dr. Moreau was a way of expurgating his own troubled conscience, quite separate from the positions he held on intellectual grounds? *The Time Traveler* eventually learns that the cannibalistic Morlocks were not always the aggressors against the Eloi. Long before the 8th century, the ancestral Eloi built a Utopia for themselves upon the backs of Morlock laborers, transforming the Earth into a fruitful garden free of predators, disease, or natural disasters. Having achieved their own vision of perfection, the Eloi ceased to evolve, slowly degenerating in strength and intelligence until eventually, the Morlocks were able to overthrow their former tyrants and exploit them for food. So we learn that no matter how lofty or noble its goals, a society based on the exploitation of others can only end in the degradation of all. How could Wells the visionary not see that by defending exploitation of animals as a means of progress, he was creating the very future he foretold? Since writing this article, I discovered a print copy of H. I have transcribed it for you to read online here.

**Chapter 2 : Animal Rights A History George Bernard Shaw**

*Enter your mobile number or email address below and we'll send you a link to download the free Kindle App. Then you can start reading Kindle books on your smartphone, tablet, or computer - no Kindle device required.*

We never pause to wonder at our feasts, If animals, like men, can possibly have rights. We pray on Sundays that we may have light, To guide our footsteps on the path we tread. Like carrion crows, we live and feed on meat, Regardless of the suffering and pain We cause by doing so, if thus we treat Defenseless animals for sport or gain, How can we hope in this world to attain The PEACE we say we are so anxious for. Thus cruelty begets its offspring – WAR You do not settle whether an experiment is justified or not by merely showing that it is of some use. The distinction is not between useful and useless experiments, but between barbarous and civilized behaviour. Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character. When a man wants to murder a tiger he calls it sport; when the tiger wants to murder him he calls it ferocity. Think of the fierce energy concentrated in an acorn! You bury it in the ground, and it explodes into an oak! Bury a sheep, and nothing happens but decay. A mind of the calibre of mine cannot derive its nutriment from cows. A man of my spiritual intensity does not eat corpses. While we ourselves are the living graves of murdered beasts, how can we expect any ideal conditions on this earth? Cruelty must be whitewashed by a moral excuse, and pretence of reluctance. If a group of beings from another planet were to land on Earth -- beings who considered themselves as superior to you as you feel yourself to be to other animals -- would you concede them the rights over you that you assume over other animals? Archibald Henderson, author of a three-volume biography of Shaw, recorded a conversation with GBS in , when Shaw was already sixty-eight; it appears in Table-Talks, a collection of the playwright: So be a good fellow and tell me how you succeeded in remaining so youthful. I look my age; and I am my age. It is the other people who look older than they are. What can you expect from people who eat corpses and drink spirits? Atrocities are not less atrocities when they occur in laboratories and are called medical research. Animals are my friends On being asked why he was a vegetarian: That boot is on the other leg. Why should you call me to account for eating decently? If I battered on the scorched corpses of animals, you might well ask me why I did that. The Vegetarian, 15 January Human beings are the only animals of which I am thoroughly and cravenly afraid. It seems to me, looking at myself, that I am a remarkably superior person, when you compare me with other writers, journalists, and dramatists; and I am perfectly content to put this down to my abstinence from meat. That is the simple and modest ground on which we should base our non-meat diet. I am to be made the pretext for killing all those wretched animals and birds, and fish! Thank you for nothing. Blood sacrifices are not in my line. Letter 30 December I was told that my diet was so poor that I could not repair the bones that were broken and operated on. So I have just had an Xradiograph taken; and lo! Patrick Campbell The Anti-Vivisector does not deny that physiologists must make experiments and even take chances with new methods. He says that they must not seek knowledge by criminal methods, just as they must not make money by criminal methods. He does not object to Galileo dropping cannon balls from the top of the leaning tower of Pisa; but he would object to shoving off two dogs or American tourists. In the play a number of ethical dilemmas crop up for the protagonist, for example the temptation of young doctors to perform costly and unnecessary operations and other treatments solely for personal gain. The excerpts from various sections below contain antivivisection viewpoints. If the medical profession were to outdo the anti-vivisection societies in a general professional protest against the practice and principles of the vivisectors, every doctor in the kingdom would gain substantially by the immense relief and reconciliation which would follow such a reassurance of the humanity of the doctor. From Shakespear and Dr. If the medical profession were to outdo the Anti-Vivisection Societies in a general professional protest against the practice and principles of the vivisectors, every doctor in the kingdom would gain substantially by the immense relief and reconciliation which would follow such a reassurance of the humanity of the doctor. Not one doctor in a thousand is a vivisector, or has any interest in vivisection, either pecuniary or intellectual, or would treat his dog cruelly or allow anyone else to do it. It is true that the doctor complies with the professional fashion of

defending vivisection, and assuring you that people like Shakespear and Dr. Johnson and Ruskin and Mark Twain are ignorant sentimentalists, just as he complies with any other silly fashion: Making all possible allowance for the effect of the brazen lying of the few men who bring a rush of despairing patients to their doors by professing in letters to the newspapers to have learnt from vivisection how to cure certain diseases, and the assurances of the sayers of smooth things that the practice is quite painless under the law, it is still difficult to find any civilized motive for an attitude by which the medical profession has everything to lose and nothing to gain. Limitations of the Right of Knowledge But neither does any government exempt the pursuit of knowledge, any more than the pursuit of life, liberty, and happiness as the American Constitution puts it, from all social conditions. No man is allowed to put his mother into the stove because he desires to know how long an adult woman will survive at a temperature of degrees Fahrenheit, no matter how important or interesting that particular addition to the store of human knowledge may be. A man who did so would have short work made not only of his right to knowledge, but of his right to live and all his other rights at the same time. The right to knowledge is not the only right; and its exercise must be limited by respect for other rights, and for its own exercise by others. When a man says to Society, "May I torture my mother in pursuit of knowledge? Not even if I have a chance of finding out how to cure cancer by doing it? Johnson and their like may say No. Vivisectors can hardly pretend to be better than the classes from which they are drawn, or those above them; and if these classes are capable of sacrificing animals in various cruel ways under cover of sport, fashion education, discipline, and even, when the cruel sacrifices are human sacrifices, of political economy, it is idle for the vivisector to pretend that he is incapable of practising cruelty for pleasure or profit or both under the cloak of science. We are all tarred with the same brush A False Alternative It will now, I hope, be clear why the attack on vivisection is not an attack on the right to knowledge: No knowledge is finally impossible of human attainment; for even though it may be beyond our present capacity, the needed capacity is not unattainable. Consequently no method of investigation is the only method; and no law forbidding any particular method can cut us off from the knowledge we hope to gain by it. The only knowledge we lose by forbidding cruelty is knowledge at first hand of cruelty itself, which is precisely the knowledge humane people wish to be spared. Routine Vivisection is now a routine, like butchering or hanging or flogging; and many of the men who practise it do so only because it has been established as part of the profession they have adopted. Far from enjoying it, they have simply overcome their natural repugnance and become indifferent to it, as men inevitably become indifferent to anything they do often enough. It is this dangerous power of custom that makes it so difficult to convince the commonsense of mankind that any established commercial or professional practice has its root in passion. Let a routine once spring from passion, and you will presently find thousands of routineers following it passionlessly for a livelihood. In the same way many people do cruel and vile things without being in the least cruel or vile, because the routine to which they have been brought up is superstitiously cruel and vile. It is this dangerous power of custom that makes it so difficult to convince the common sense of mankind that any established commercial or professional practice has its root in passion. Thus it always seems strained to speak of the religious convictions of a clergyman, because nine out of ten clergymen have no religious convictions: To say that every man who beats his children and every schoolmaster who flogs a pupil is a conscious debauchee is absurd: The ill-tempered vulgarity that instinctively strikes at and hurts a thing that annoys it and all children are annoying, and the simple stupidity that requires from a child perfection beyond the reach of the wisest and best adults perfect truthfulness coupled with perfect obedience is quite a common condition of leaving a child unwhipped, produce a good deal of flagellation among people who not only do not lust after it, but who hit the harder because they are angry at having to perform an uncomfortable duty. Let cruelty or kindness or anything else once become customary and it will be practised by people to whom it is not at all natural, but whose rule of life is simply to do only what everybody else does, and who would lose their employment and starve if they indulged in any peculiarity. A respectable man will lie daily, in speech and in print, about the qualities of the article he lives by selling, because it is customary to do so. He will flog his boy for telling a lie, because it is customary to do so. He will also flog him for not telling a lie if the boy tells inconvenient or disrespectful truths, because it is customary to do so. He will give the same boy a present on his birthday, and buy him a spade and bucket at

the seaside, because it is customary to do so, being all the time neither particularly mendacious, nor particularly cruel, nor particularly generous, but simply incapable of ethical judgment or independent action. Just so do we find a crowd of petty vivisectionists daily committing atrocities and stupidities, because it is the custom to do so. Vivisection is customary as part of the routine of preparing lectures in medical schools Vivisectioning the Human Subject Once grant the ethics of the vivisectionists and you not only sanction the experiment on the human subject, but make it the first duty of the vivisector. If a guinea pig may be sacrificed for the sake of the very little that can be learnt from it, shall not a man be sacrificed for the sake of the great deal that can be learnt from him? The Lie is a European Power Public support of vivisection is founded almost wholly on the assurances of the vivisectors that great public benefits may be expected from the practice. Not for a moment do I suggest that such a defence would be valid even if proved. But when the witnesses begin by alleging that in the cause of science all the customary ethical obligations which include the obligation to tell the truth are suspended, what weight can any reasonable person give to their testimony? I would rather swear fifty lies than take an animal which had licked my hand in good fellowship and torture it. If I did torture the dog, I should certainly not have the face to turn round and ask how any person dare suspect an honourable man like myself of telling lies. Most sensible and humane people would, I hope, flatly reply that honourable men do not behave dishonourably even to dogs. For the complete Preface:

**Chapter 3 : Vivisection by Claire Shaw on Prezi**

*Shaw on Vivisection by George Bernard Shaw, Eric Wenstrand (Illustrator), Russell F Knutson (Foreword by) starting at \$ Shaw on Vivisection has 2 available editions to buy at Alibris.*

We live by the death of others. We are burial places! You only hunger after sweet and gentle creatures who harm no one, which follow you, serve you, and are devoured by you as the reward of their service. Vegans are a living demonstration of the fact that we do not need to exploit animals for food. Are there social pressures that encourage you to continue to eat, wear, and use animal products? Of course there are. But in a patriarchal, racist, homophobic, and ableist society, there are social pressures to participate and engage in sexism, racism, homophobia, and ableism. At some point, you have to decide who you are and what matters morally to you. And once you decide that you regard victimizing vulnerable nonhumans is not morally acceptable, it is easy to go and stay vegan. And to act so is immoral. If a man aspires towards a righteous life, his first act of abstinence is from injury to animals. It is not enough. You turn against the dead flesh, it revolts you, it must be transformed by fire, boiled and roasted, seasoned and disguised with drugs; you must have butchers, cooks, turnspits, men who will rid the murder of its horrors, who will dress the dead bodies so that the taste deceived by these disguises will not reject what is strange to it, and will feast on corpses, the very sight of which would sicken you. The more vegetarian food we eat, the more peace is taken into us. All the scientific discoveries stained with innocent blood I count as of no consequence. They are given to us to use. You have duties towards them. They were not made for humans any more than black people were made for white, or women created for men. They are only animals. According to this logic, we should not try to prevent people from murdering other people, since this has also been done since the earliest of times. We can judge the heart of a man by his treatment of animals. All fear death, all love life. See yourself in others. Then whom can you hurt? What harm can you do? And therein we err, and greatly err. For the animal shall not be measured by man. In a world older and more complete than ours they move finished and complete, gifted with extensions of the senses we have lost or never attained, living by voices we shall never hear. They are not brethren, they are not underlings; they are other nations caught with ourselves in the net of life and time, fellow prisoners of the splendor and travail of the earth. If a being suffers there can be no moral justification for refusing to take that suffering into consideration. It appears to me, besides, that [such people] can never have observed with attention the character of animals, not to have distinguished among them the different voices of need, of suffering, of joy, of pain, of love, of anger, and of all their affections. It would be very strange that they should express so well what they could not feel. He experiences himself, his thoughts and feelings as something separated from the rest- a kind of optical delusion of his consciousness. This delusion is a kind of prison for us, restricting us to our personal desires and to affection for a few persons nearest to us. Our task must be to free ourselves from this prison by widening our circle of compassion to embrace all living creatures and the whole of nature in its beauty. First, it is ridiculed. Second, it is violently opposed. Third, it is accepted as being self-evident. If the beasts were gone, men would die of a great loneliness of spirit. For whatever happens to the beasts, soon happens to man. All things are connected. Man did not weave the web of life; he is merely a strand in it. Whatever he does to the web, he does to himself. Now it is necessary to civilize man in relation to nature and the animals. That is the way of a whole human being. For as long as men massacre animals, they will kill each other. Indeed, he who sows the seed of murder and pain cannot reap joy and love. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has. We have to strive to achieve it, and the striving should be conscious, deliberate and hard. Expediency asks the question: Vanity asks the question: But conscience asks the question: And there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor political, nor popular – but one must take it simply because it is right. Moral courage is a rarer commodity than bravery in battle or great intelligence. Yet it is the one essential, vital quality for those who seek to change a world that yields most painfully to change. And let me remind you also that moderation in the pursuit of justice is no virtue. Neutrality helps the oppressor, never the victim. Silence encourages the tormentor, never the tormented. It involves some degree of action, of movement, of potential for change. Activism can be lobbying legislators.

Activism can be sabotaging hunts. Activism can be rescuing animals, undercover investigations, lecturing about animal rights. Food, however, is not activism. Vegan dinner parties is not activism. Those who profess to favor freedom and yet deprecate agitation are men who want crops without plowing up the ground; they want rain without thunder and lightning. They want the ocean without the awful roar of its many waters. This struggle may be a moral one, or it may be a physical one, and it may be both moral and physical, but it must be a struggle. Power concedes nothing without a demand. It never did and it never will.

**Chapter 4 : Quotes About Veganism, Activism and Animal Rights –“ Vegan Rabbit**

*Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character. Vivisection is now a routine, like butchering or hanging or flogging; and many of the men who practise it do so only because it has been established as part of the profession they have adopted.*

The Society began with the goal of regulating the use of animals in science and society. After a few years, the intention switched from regulation to the complete abolition of vivisection in scientific testing. The first American animal testing facilities were opened in the 1850s and 1860s, much to the dismay of animal rights pioneers. After two years the group was trying to have legislation passed, proposing the Bill to Restrict Vivisection, which was defeated. After gaining a bit of exposure, many in the medical field began siding with the AAVS. Since then, the group has consistently worked on educating the public on issues regarding animal cruelty as well as worked with the U. S. Federal government in passing legislations for animal rights. Relevant discussion may be found on the talk page. Please do not remove this message until conditions to do so are met.

July Anti-vivisection[ edit ] The biggest concern of the American Anti-Vivisection Society is the implementation of vivisection in medical testing. Vivisection is any experiment conducted on a subject that is still living at the time of the procedure and, omitting technicalities and procedure failures, still alive afterwards. However, with any experimentation there comes trial and error. Also, the benefit of an experiment is unknown. Since, by and large, the anti-vivisection movement is a moral struggle it is hard to define in concrete terms. Scientists argue that their testing could possibly better all of mankind and often claim that it is more important to risk the lives of animals if it means the betterment of the human race[ citation needed ]. Anti-vivisectionists argue that most vivisections are unnecessary and true work should be done with cell and tissue samples, seeing as vivisection is an outdated form of experimentation to begin with. As the anti-vivisection movement stemmed from compassion towards animals as it still does today , there is another aspect. It is what Dr. This section does not cite any sources. Please help improve this section by adding citations to reliable sources. Unsourced material may be challenged and removed. July Learn how and when to remove this template message Various racketeers engage in something widely unheard called pound seizure. This is when someone takes cats and animals from the pound, sometimes even the pounds themselves, and sell the animals to various testing facilities. Animals are even required to be released to dealers after an allotted time at a pound. This is seen as a substitute for euthanasia in many places and was, for a time, considered an ethical replacement. However, as the animals in a pound that are healthy and non-aggressive are the ones most valued by laboratories for testing, they are also the ones most likely to be adopted by families. The AAVS argues that since these animals could go to good homes instead of testing facilities, there should be bans and restrictions placed on pounds for supplying dealers with these animals. Many states are beginning to enforce legislation to restrict and ban pound seizure. Animal patents [ edit ] Considering that animals which undergo testing are not human, many of them have to be genetically altered in order to simulate human ailments. When these animals are altered, the group who created them are able to obtain a government patent for that animal. So far, [ citation needed ] animal patents have been granted to various testing facilities for the creation of new animals that are bred to have specific human ailments. The AAVS has created Stop Animal Patents campaign and have already overturned two animal patents –“ rabbits bred with bad eyesight to simulate dry eye and beagles bred with lung infections. List of animals that have been cloned A more recent concern of the organization is that of animal cloning. Animal cloning has a 1 to 4 percent success rate, meaning that 96 to 99 percent of animals attempting to be cloned die or are never fully created[ citation needed ]. In January the U. Teaching humane treatment of animals not only helps interspecies relationships, but also creates a betterment of ideology towards all creatures. The group intends to illustrate how science and biology can be taught in schools without actually using animals, like with dissection in the classroom. Animalearn conducts free workshops with educators nationwide to show how to teach science without the use of animals, as well as trying to incorporate animal-rights, in concept and practice, into the curriculum and educational environment of the school setting.

**Chapter 5 : Shaw on vivisection (Book, ) [calendrierdelascience.com]**

*Note: Citations are based on reference standards. However, formatting rules can vary widely between applications and fields of interest or study. The specific requirements or preferences of your reviewing publisher, classroom teacher, institution or organization should be applied.*

That boot is on the other leg. Why should you call me to account for eating decently? If I batted on the scorched corpses of animals, you might well ask me why I did that. You bury it in the ground and it explodes into a giant oak! Bury a sheep and nothing happens but decay. I am to be made the pretext for killing all those wretched animals and birds, and fish! Thank you for nothing. Blood sacrifices are not in my line. You know, to me this is a funny sort of lunch. You begin with the dessert. We begin with the entrees. We shall not offer you any. Then how do you keep up your strength? It keeps itself up. It seems to me, looking at myself, that I am a remarkably superior person, when you compare me with other writers, journalists, and dramatists; and I am perfectly content to put this down to my abstinence from meat. That is the simple and modest ground on which we should base our non-meat diet. So I have just had an Xradiograph taken; and lo! Patrick Campbell Archibald Henderson, author of a three-volume biography of Shaw, recorded an appropriate conversation with him in , when Shaw was already sixty-eight; it appears in Table-Talks, a collection illustrating the outspoken and witty side of the prolific playwright: So be a good fellow and tell me how you succeeded in remaining so youthful. I look my age; and I am my age. It is the other people who look older than they are. What can you expect from people who eat corpses and drink spirits? Our time is running short. You will have to be off to speak on behalf of the Labor Party, or Vegetarianism, or Communism, or Fabianism, or what not. You are such an incorrigible publicist that I have not yet got round to literature, or to drama which is popularly supposed to be one of your chief interests. A poem - attributed to Shaw, but disputed by some see notes below: Living Graves We are the living graves of murdered beasts, Slaughtered to satisfy our appetites. We never pause to wonder at our feasts, If animals, like men, can possibly have rights. We pray on Sundays that we may have light, To guide our footsteps on the path we tread. Like carrion crows we live and feed on meat, Regardless of the suffering and the pain we cause by doing so, if thus we treat defenceless animals for sport or gain, how can we hope in this world to attain, the PEACE we say we are so anxious for. Once grant the ethics of the vivisectionists and you not only sanction the experiment on the human subject, but make it the first duty of the vivisector. If a guinea pig may be sacrificed for the sake of the very little that can be learnt from it, shall not a man be sacrificed for the sake of the great deal that can be learnt from him? We are, as a matter of fact, a cruel nation; and our habit of disguising our vices by giving polite names to the offences we are detested to commit, does not, unfortunately for my own comfort, impose on me. Vivisectors can hardly pretend to be better than the classes from which they are drawn, or those above them; and if these classes are capable of sacrificing animals in various cruel ways under cover of sport, fashion education, discipline, and even, when the cruel sacrifices are human sacrifices, of political economy, it is idle for the vivisector to pretend that he is incapable of practising cruelty for pleasure or profit or both under the cloak of science. We are all tarred with the same brush Public support of vivisection is founded almost wholly on the assurances of the vivisectors that great public benefits may be expected from the practice. Not for a moment do I suggest that such a defence would be valid even if proved. But when the witnesses begin by alleging that in the cause of science all the customary ethical obligations which include the obligation to tell the truth are suspended, what weight can any reasonable person give to their testimony? I would rather swear fifty lies than take an animal which had licked my hand in good fellowship and torture it. If I did torture the dog, I should certainly not have the face to turn round and ask how any person dare suspect an honourable man like myself of telling lies. Most sensible and humane people would, I hope, flatly reply that honourable men do not behave dishonourably even to dogs. If you cannot attain to knowledge without torturing a dog, you must do without knowledge. The only knowledge we lose by forbidding cruelty is knowledge at first hand of cruelty itself, which is precisely the knowledge humane people wish to be spared. You do not settle whether an experiment is justified or not by merely showing that it is of some use. The distinction is not between useful and useless experiments, but between

barbarous and civilized behaviour. Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character. Vivisection is now a routine, like butchering or hanging or flogging; and many of the men who practise it do so only because it has been established as part of the profession they have adopted. Far from enjoying it, they have simply overcome their natural repugnance and become indifferent to it, as men inevitably become indifferent to anything they do often enough. It is this dangerous power of custom that makes it so difficult to convince the commonsense of mankind that any established commercial or professional practice has its root in passion. Let a routine once spring from passion, and you will presently find thousands of routineers following it passionlessly for a livelihood. In the same way many people do cruel and vile things without being in the least cruel or vile, because the routine to which they have been brought up is superstitiously cruel and vile. If the medical profession were to outdo the anti-vivisection societies in a general professional protest against the practice and principles of the vivisectionists, every doctor in the kingdom would gain substantially by the immense relief and reconciliation which would follow such a reassurance of the humanity of the doctor. I have to admit, if we look facts in the face, that the English nation is not in the habit of allowing considerations of humanity to interfere either with its interests or with its pleasures. Let us, then, taking the question on the utilitarian ground, admit that vivisections either have added or at some future time may add to our knowledge of disease and to our knowledge of the secrets of nature. But the next step in the argument is that experiments upon dogs and guinea-pigs and creatures equally unlike men and women can never be as conclusive as experiments on men and women. If you once begin to balance the thing in that way, you will soon prove that you are justified not only in vivisectioning dogs and guinea-pigs, but in dissecting every human being you can get into your power. I myself have been vivisectioned. He had me as much as any doctor ever had a guinea-pig in his power. But if he had begun to argue in my presence in the way I have been describing, I could not have helped asking, "Why should not this man sacrifice me if he thinks he can confer a benefit on humanity or advance science by doing so? He will see that even if he takes the most sordid view of it; if he puts aside all questions of sympathy or compassion; if he shares the view - not altogether so rare in England as I could desire - that there is something manly and characteristically British in not being too sentimental about those things, yet he must draw the line somewhere; and if he draws it in such a way as to include quadrupeds only, the doctor may draw it a little higher up. He may say, quite logically, "Here is a person who will never be missed. If I perform an experiment on him in the interest of science, and anything comes of it, that man by his death under my scalpel will have done more for the world than he would if I merely cured him. The cruel ones can teach us only what we ought not to know. Wells in *The Sunday Express*, August We have it at last from Mr Wells. The vivisectionist experiments because he wants to know. On the question whether it is right to hurt any living creature for the sake of knowledge, his answer is that knowledge is so supremely important that for its sake there is nothing that it is not right to do. Thus we learn from Mr Wells that the vivisectionist is distinguished from the ordinary run of limited scoundrels by being an infinite scoundrel. The common scoundrel who does not care what pain he or she inflicts as long as he can get money by it can be satiated. With public opinion and a stiff criminal code against him he can be brought to a point at which he does not consider another five-pound note worth the risk of garrotting or sand-bagging or swindling anybody to get it. But the vivisectionist-scoundrel has no limit at all except that of his own physical capacity for committing atrocities and his own mental capacity for devising them. No matter how much he knows there is always, as Newton confessed, an infinitude of things still unknown, many of them still discoverable by experiment. When he has discovered what boiled baby tastes like, and what effect it has on the digestion, he has still to ascertain the gustatory and metabolic peculiarities of roast baby and fried baby, with, in each case, the exact age at which the baby should, to produce such and such results, be boiled, roast, fried, or fricasseed. You remonstrate with him, especially if you are the mother of one or two of the babies. You say, "What good is all this? You do not eat babies. My; object is to learn something I do not know at present. Like Cleopatra I have immortal longings in me. When I know all these things about babies I shall know more than Einstein, more than Solomon. I shall have eaten one more apple from the tree of knowledge of good and evil. The proper place in organized human society for a scoundrel who seeks knowledge or anything else without conscience is the lethal chamber. The Anti-Vivisectionist does not deny that physiologists must make experiments

and even take chances with new methods. He says that they must not seek knowledge by criminal methods, just as they must not make money by criminal methods. He does not object to Galileo dropping cannon balls from the top of the leaning tower of Pisa; but he would object to shoving off two dogs or American tourists. Darwin popularized Evolution generally, as well as making his own special contribution to it. Now the general conception of Evolution provides the humanitarian with a scientific basis, because it establishes the fundamental equality of all living things. It makes the killing of an animal murder in exactly the same sense as the killing of a man is murder. St Anthony was ripe for the Evolution theory when he preached to the fishes, and St Francis when he called the birds his little brothers. Our vanity, and our snobbish conception of Godhead as being, like earthly king- ship, a supreme class distinction instead of the rock on which Equality is built, has led us to insist on God offering us special terms by placing us apart from and above all the rest of his creatures. Evolution took that conceit out of us; and now, though we may kill a flea without the smallest remorse, we at all events know that we are killing our cousin. No doubt it shocks the flea when the creature that an almighty Celestial Flea created expressly for the food of fleas, destroys the jumping lord of creation with his sharp and enormous thumbnail; but no flea will ever be so foolish as to preach that in slaying fleas Man is applying a method of Natural Selection which will finally evolve a flea so swift that no man can catch him, and so hardy of onstitution that Insect Powder will have no more effect on him than strychnine on an elephant.

**Chapter 6 : George Bernard Shaw quote: Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human**

*Shaw on Vivisection by George Bernard Shaw, , available at Book Depository with free delivery worldwide.*

Yes, he was Irish in that he was born in Ireland. Ireland was still part of the UK when he was born there so his passport if he had one would probably say that he was British -- SteveCrook talk If he had a British passport then he would be a British citizen not of British natinality. But what about in the Info box where it has "Nationality: Irish" and that also links "Irish" to Irish people? The problem with that, and with what you say about his being a British citizen but not of British nationality is the question of what does Nationality mean? Does "Nationality" in the Info box mean where someone was born or the state they pay allegiance to and pay their taxes to. Because the Nobel Prize Committee says he is British. The idea of people being Irish or people being described as Irish or being from Ireland does exist before Irish Nationalism. Was Julius Caesar Roman or Italian? No sense at all to it to be polite. Bernard Shaw has even referred to himself as Irish so I think that settles that dispute. As for the Nobel Prize Committee saying he was British, it is clear that they gave him a more "respectable" title at the time. Clearly Irish but was labelled British by newspapers when he has accomplished something great! Yet described as Irish when he did something bad. Jamie Kelly talk On the other hand at the time all Irish people were citizens of the United Kingdom, and legally entitled to the privilages and subject to the duties involved. So all Irish people were also "British" - or at least "British subjects". The Nobel prize committee, rather pedantically perhaps but not incorrectly, classed him from their standpoint and in this context as "British". Nowadays, Ireland no longer being part of the United Kingdom, the situation is obviously otherwise. My extraction is the extrac- tion of most Englishmen: I am English enough to be an inveterate Republican and Home Ruler. When I look round me on the hybrid cosmopolitans, slum poisoned or square pampered, who call themselves Englishmen today, and see them bullied by the Irish Protestant garrison as no Bengalee now lets himself be bullied by an Englishman; when I see the Irishman everywhere standing clearheaded, sane, hardily callous to the boyish sentimentalities, susceptibilities, and credulities that make the Englishman the dupe of every charlatan and the idolater of every numskull, I perceive that Ireland is the only spot on earth which still produces the ideal English- man of history. Sign your posts in discussion pages Mr. What does "desperate to be idiosyncratic" mean - Shaw is simply making a point about nationalism and, worse, racism and contrasting it with legitimate national pride. Not especially idiosyncratic at all - more like a breath of sanity. How does this impinge on our article - what changes would you like to make based on your perception of Shaw as being idiosyncratic just for the sake it nonsense - but let that pass for the moment? Dicussion pages are not intended as forums or intended for general discussions of the subject concerned. This discussion, to put it another way, is about this article, which in turn happens to be about Shaw. I think that one should simply leave his nationality as Irish with maybe the addition of that quotation to demonstrate where he placed himself in terms of Irishness. But there is no need for this quote much less an out-of-context quotation from it here - this is a brief encyclopedia article, not a book length autobiography. As you say, his nationality was Irish - no need whatever to elaborate - that WOULD be "literary" or at least encyclopedic flatulence. The very point of the quote incidentally it is more a chuckle than a "rant", based on a VERY tongue-in-cheek jibe that the Irish are better "Englishmen" in the best sense of the word than the English themselves makes the whole question of his nationality LESS notable than it might have been otherwise, not more. A general observation, if I may be permitted: A bit like being tone deaf or colour blind. We all have our limitations, when all is said and done. Pleased to realise you had no such intent - but you might forgive me for supposing you had. Not sure I would class Shaw or at least his writings as "Irish" in quite the same sense as of those of say Synge. At the moment, Shaw is presented as a staunch champion of the working classes and in that aspect - within the lead - is shown in a favourable light undisturbed by any question that he might have been gullible and at the very least fallible in his judgement of what causes he championed. Can someone explain to me and other editors why this information should be kept out of the lead? Specific mention of controversial matters, in particular, is really better left to the body of an article, where they can receive coverage that is not simplistic or superficial. The problem would be wording a

sufficiently succinct summary in a totally NPOV manner - and then getting a "reliable source" citation for what we said that would satisfy the "cite everything" brigade. Furthermore, I would question your claim that his support of Hitler was as incontrovertible as his support for Stalin: How about, following "We do not, of course, need to give citations in the lead so long as its statements are supported with proper citations to RS in the main article. Tried a few trial sentences myself but rejected all of them as being too POV. Yours is better than any of mine, but I think it still needs some tweaking. I would phrase the "eugenics" one differently - Shaw had a lot more to say about the "improving the breed" aspect of eugenics than "population control". Among other eccentricities, he was in favour of encouraging young women to choose the fathers of their children regardless of race or class, marrying, or at least procreating, outside what he called "narrow cliques". His ideas on "politics" as such quite eccentric enough are also separate from his at times quite friendly attitude towards thirties dictators. He had no great love of democracy as such, especially after the disillusion he felt after the First World War, and praised or excused the dictators more to have a dig at so called "freedom". Like Gore Vidal in our own time he was very conscious of the many flaws of British style "democracy". He was under the illusion that Stalin was a socialist he was nothing of the kind, of course - but so were a lot of people at the time. Shaw was noted for taking extreme views, whether on vegetarianism branding his own pre-vegetarian self a "cannibal", the development of the human race his own brand of eugenics, driven by miscegenation and marrying across class lines, or in politics in spite of his own liberal views he is recorded as supporting, or at least condoning, the dictators of the nineteen thirties. The parentheses may perhaps be overly long for such a short paragraph, but we can sort that out later; for what it is worth, I wholeheartedly support that the paragraph is made part of the text. Therefore I suggest rephrasing the article to point out that Shaw is not the first but indeed the only winner of both awards. If nobody objects I am going to change it. Do you think this deserves a place in this article? Can someone vouch for this story? Both fathers were living in Dublin. Deadly by all means, but humane not cruel He despised freedom, writing, "Mussolini Hitler and the rest can all depend on me to judge them by their ability to deliver the goods and not by If our friend at I think this is noteworthy. I cannot find and change them all, but I should like to point them out to any who may happen upon an example. Some of the entries are too subjective and sound more like an apology than a best as possible objective encyclopedic reading. Since Shaw was far from a doctrinaire "lefty" there is actually a tiny grain of truth in some of this, and because he was heavily into irony, it is easy enough manufacture or exaggerate real or supposed Shavian right wing views. For all that, most of the sources you mention are very far from "solid" - in fact they are shamelessly politically motivated: It is a shame, frankly, to have to mention them at all. Unambiguous truth is not "balanced" with slimy falsehood. I just googled it, out of interest, and it turns out to be a forgery. On at least one occasion, in her "German Requiem" article, she cites a source stating that the Franco-Prussian War ended in ! So either her source or her citation is incorrect there; it would be wise since she does not appear to meet WP: RS any more than if she had put up her undergraduate essays on a geocities page, for such references to be checked rather than simply changing our references to match her citations without double-checking them. I see that this contribution contains index marks to footnotes numbered in the mid two-hundreds e. Does this mean that the edit has been lifted from somewhere else and, if so, can anyone identify where? UNDUE prominence in this general article. Waiting now to see if the OP has a view before making a spinoff article. Beck is just quoting Snore the NYT. Pretending that this a Glenn Beck dispute and trying to push a false interpretation of is simply false. He was expressing his disagreement with some of the more vulgar eugenicists of his time. Because he was so very "left wing" people of the opposite persuasion sometimes have a field day pulling sarcastic things he said out of context. Read the article on satire. My concern is that, while we sit around here agreeing on things that are true, the article remains false. How is it that such atrocious misinformation can be kept on a Wikipedia article for so long? And how did a clip from Glenn Beck ever pass as a valid source? Shaw from memory was doing his usual and turning the argument on its head by suggesting that upper class drones should have to justify their existence. I also agree with needing additional sources which properly discuss his use of irony. This gives the wrong impression at the outset. This is to give contributors a chance to defend it before deletion. As far as I can see they both fail WP: The primary source, Dan Stone [3], makes a highly controversial and poorly-argued [4] attempt to link

## DOWNLOAD PDF SHAW ON VIVISECTION

Shaw and eugenics, which has been picked up by Glen Beck, the World Future Fund and Conservipedia: All of these sources use incomplete and out of context quotations. Note that the entire speech is not available. Because Dan Stone is employing selective quotation, it is not possible to say whose desires Shaw is discussing. A hypothetical world Shaw is describing to prove a point? No context is given, so ALL of these readings are equally defensible. Agreeing, though, that this needs context to make the best sense of it.

**Chapter 7 : George Bernard Shaw - From Animal Rights Online Quotations**

*Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character.*

Anti-vivisection Quotes "We cannot solve the problems we have created with the same thinking that created them. His General Theory of Relativity laid the foundation for cosmology and our understanding of physical reality. In his book, "Introduction to the Study of Experimental Medicine," Bernard argues that progress in medicine is not possible without animal-based physiological research. He taught that the researcher must not be hampered by the blood and cries of his animal subjects. His break with Freud is an important event in the history of psychoanalytic thought. I feel that this is not the means of acquiring true knowledge. Thoreau described himself as "a transcendentalist and natural philosopher. Rudolph Hammer, LLD "Atrocities are not less atrocities when they occur in laboratories and are called medical research. Best known for his plays and essays, he was a theater critic, political activist, socialist, and an opponent of war. I know of no achievement through vivisection, no scientific discovery that could not have been obtained without such barbarism and cruelty. Mayo, MD , son of the co-founder of the Mayo Clinic. The Mayo Clinic is consistently ranked among the top three U. Magel "Giving cancer to laboratory animals has not and will not help us to understand the disease or to treat those persons suffering from it. Abigail Van Buren is a well-known syndicated advice columnist and author. I learned nothing physiological. I learned that life is cheap, and that misery can be ignored. He has authored numerous books, articles, chapters and letters on animal experimentation, including "Of Pigs, Primates, and Plagues," a scientific critique of xenotransplantation. By the time [the students] arrive in the labs they have been programmed to accept the suffering around them. Jane Goodall is a world-famous primatologist whose decades of field research in Africa have contributed significantly to our understanding of chimpanzees and humans. She is author of several books and an internationally recognized lecturer. For many of the remaining procedures the use of anaesthesia would have increased the animal welfare cost of the procedure.

**Chapter 8 : H.G. Wells and Animals, A Troubling Legacy - ANIMAL PEOPLE FORUM**

*Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character.*

*Vivisection is a social evil because if it advances human knowledge, it does so at the expense of human character.*

**Chapter 9 : The Quintessential G.B.S. : Social Views**

*The American Anti-Vivisection Society (AAVS) is an organization created with the goal of eliminating a number of different procedures done by medical and cosmetic groups in relation to animal cruelty in the United States.*