

1. Record Nr.	UNINA9910231238003321
Autore	Bates A.W.H
Titolo	Anti-Vivisection and the Profession of Medicine in Britain [[electronic resource]] : A Social History / / by A.W.H. Bates
Pubbl/distr/stampa	London : , : Palgrave Macmillan UK : , : Imprint : Palgrave Macmillan, , 2017
ISBN	1-137-55697-8
Edizione	[1st ed. 2017.]
Descrizione fisica	1 online resource (XXI, 217 p.)
Collana	The Palgrave Macmillan Animal Ethics Series, , 2634-6672
Disciplina	170
Soggetti	Ethics Great Britain—History Animal welfare Medical ethics Sociology Moral Philosophy History of Britain and Ireland Animal Welfare/Animal Ethics Theory of Medicine/Bioethics Sociology, general Great Britain
Lingua di pubblicazione	Inglese
Formato	Materiale a stampa
Livello bibliografico	Monografia
Nota di contenuto	Introduction -- Chapter 1. Vivisection, virtue, and the law in the nineteenth century.- Chapter 2. Have animals souls?.- Chapter 3. A new age for a new century -- Chapter 4. The National Anti-Vivisection Hospital, 1902–1935.- Chapter 5. The Research Defence Society -- Chapter 6. State control, bureaucracy, and the national interest from the Second World War to the 1960s -- Conclusion.
Sommario/riassunto	This book is open access under a CC BY 4.0 license. This book explores the social history of the anti-vivisection movement in Britain from its nineteenth-century beginnings until the 1960s. It discusses the ethical principles that inspired the movement and the socio-political background that explains its rise and fall. Opposition to vivisection

began when medical practitioners complained it was contrary to the compassionate ethos of their profession. Christian anti-cruelty organizations took up the cause out of concern that callousness among the professional classes would have a demoralizing effect on the rest of society. As the nineteenth century drew to a close, the influence of transcendentalism, Eastern religions and the spiritual revival led new age social reformers to champion a more holistic approach to science, and dismiss reliance on vivisection as a materialistic oversimplification. In response, scientists claimed it was necessary to remain objective and unemotional in order to perform the experiments necessary for medical progress.
