Passerelle
Vol. 13 No. 1

PP. 336-350
ISSN : 1112-6337 EISSN : 2716-8328

On Reconceptualising Human-Animal Relationships: A Posthuman Reading of H.G. Wells' *The Island of Doctor Moreau (2005)*

MEGUETTEF Selma[1]
Laboratoire de Traduction des Documents Historiques
University of Algiers 2 Abou EL Kacem Saâdallah / Algeria
selma.meguettef@univ-alger2.dz
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-7431-9340

AIT AMMOUR Houria[2]
University of Algiers 2 Abou EL Kacem Saâdallah / Algeria
houria.aksas@univ-alger2.dz
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-5097-7194

Received: 21/05/2024, **Accepted:** 11/10/2024, **Published:** 10/11/2024

Abstract: This paper investigates the reconceptualization of human-animal relations in light of scientific and technological progress. H.G.Wells' *The Island of Doctor Moreau*(2005) illustrates how animals are incorporated into human scientific research, raising ethical considerations about the extent to which humans are permitted to meddle with the nature of non-human beings. This interference often affects animals, capitalizing on their inability to protest. Through Posthuman lens, this study explores new possibilities for human-animal coexistence within a moral framework, free from the ontological boundaries of Anthropocentrism and Humanism.

Keywords: Reconceptualization, Humans, Animals, Relations, Posthuman

Résumé: Cet article examine la reconceptualisation des relations homme-animal à la lumière du progrès scientifique et technologique. L'Île *du docteur Moreau de H.G.Wells*(2005) illustre comment les animaux sont intégrés dans la recherche scientifique humaine, soulevant des considérations éthiques sur la mesure dans laquelle les humains sont autorisés à interférer avec la nature des êtres non humains. Cette interférence affecte souvent les animaux, exploitant leur incapacité à protester. À travers une perspective post-humaniste, cette étude explore de nouvelles possibilités de coexistence homme-animal dans un cadre moral, libéré des frontières ontologiques de l'Anthropocentrisme et de l'Humanisme.

Mots-clés: Reconceptualisation, Humains, Animaux, Relations, Post-humaniste

Introduction

Human-animal relations have always been contentious and arbitrary, serving as a subject of philosophical and literary inquiry that touches upon fundamental questions of interconnectedness, identity, ethics, and the nature of existence. Throughout history, humans have maintained complex and multifaceted relationships with animals, ranging from exploitation and subjugation to viewing them as companions or even deities[1]. However, nowadays the exponential growth of scientific and technological advancements is leading humanity and other life forms into an even more complex and uncertain trajectory, significantly reshaping humans' perceptions of themselves and the world around them. Human-animal relationships are undergoing profound transformations, giving rise to new ethical and philosophical considerations. This theme is central to science fiction literature, which provides a narrative framework that enables philosophers, writers, scientists, and technologists to project an end or a future where both humans and animals are eventually transformed. This transformation occurs through techniques such as biotechnology, artificial intelligence, genetic engineering, and others, prompting questions about how animals will weather and be affected by this human-oriented evolutionary process, and whether the entanglement of animals in this artificial evolution will be beneficial or detrimental to both humans and animals.

This article explores the intersection and reconceptualization of human-animal relations in Wells' *The Island of Doctor Moreau* (2005). The aim pursued is to examine how the human-animal bond is reshaped and influenced by emerging technologies, particularly in science fiction literature, and the way animals are enmeshed within the human agenda of scientific and technological revolutions. By considering human moral obligations toward other forms of being, this paper questions the ethical implications of manipulating animals for scientific research. It also investigates how traditional Anthropocentric and Humanistic boundaries between humans, animals, and nature are challenged in the modern age. Drawing on Posthuman theory, this study critically analyzes the complex dynamics of human-animal relations, considering their embodiment and embeddedness in an increasingly techno-scientific world. Additionally, it addresses how both humans and non-humans can move towards a more symbiotic coexistence, free from Anthropocentric and Humanistic influences.

[1] In ancient times and in some religions like Hinduism, animals are deified and worshipped like gods, making them superior to and feared by certain human beings.

1. Debunking Humanism and Anthropocentrism: A Posthuman Reform

The theory of Posthumanism stands at the forefront of contemporary philosophy and literary criticism, challenging the entrenched tenets of both Humanism and Anthropocentrism. These two philosophies have long shaped and dominated Western culture, misleading humanity and inflicting enduring ordeals on nature and non-human animals.

Humanism is a philosophical and cultural movement that emerged during the Renaissance in Europe and flourished during the Age of Enlightenment. It played a major role in shaping the intellectual, social, and cultural mindset of the Western world for centuries, significantly impacting philosophy, science, politics, and education. Humanists believe that humans are rational, autonomous, and moral beings endowed with dignity and agency, enabling them to thrive and find meaning in the world without relying on superstitions or divinity. This occurs through knowledge and scientific exploration, encouraging critical thinking, empirical observations, and rational decisions. Humanism underscores human rationality, subjectivity, and autonomy, advocating for the improvement of individual potential, virtue, and the pursuit of knowledge. According to Rusen (2021 : 23, 32), civilization is the culmination of humanity's major and universal capacities to improve their conditions for the better. This is achieved through reason and knowledge, which are transmitted to future generations through education. Thus, Humanism and western humanities view civilization as the outcome and work of human agency and cognition. These mental and spiritual potentials have enabled individuals to improve their lives and conditions by creating technologies, systems, and moral rules that make the control of nature and society achievable.

While Humanism has played a major role in human progress and enlightenment, it prioritized human interests and values at the expense of other beings and the environment, making humans the center of the universe and alienating them from nature. This fostered a sense of hubris and megalomania. By the 19th to 20th centuries, Humanism began to be criticized as its drawbacks became apparent. It was questioned for its cultural values, which caused significant harm to nature and inflicted a serious damage to the ecosystem. By accentuating human dignity, Humanism has undermined human-nature relationships, drawing on Descartes' notion that humans are the masters and owners of nature. This claim even stripped certain humans of their intrinsic value as a vital part of the natural world. Furthermore, Humanism emphasized the cultural quality of humans, alienating them not only from nature but also from other species. In a Humanistic context,

humans are seen as those who create a new order of life and civilization through rational and moral laws, distinguishing them from other beings that exist in a pre-given environment and cannot develop themselves(Rusen, 2021 : 8, 92).

Similar to Humanism, Anthropocentrism is a philosophy and a belief system that exalts human exceptionalism and supremacy. It "*denotes humanity's superiority over the non-human world, on the basis that humans occupy a higher position on the Great Chain of Being*"(De Jonge, 2011 : 308). Anthropocentrism emphasizes the uniqueness and centrality of humankind by prioritizing their interests and justifying their ends, while relegating non-human entities to the periphery and marginalizing their needs. This separation of humans from nature has given rise to numerous oppressive ontological boundaries, such as human-animal, subject-object, and culture-nature. These dualisms elevate humans above nature, ultimately severing the ties between them. Consequently, rather than subjugating nature directly, humans tend to adjust it to meet their own demands, a process achieved through reason(Krebber, 2011: 329). In this process of adjustment, animals are also included.

Anthropocentric and Humanistic philosophies have constructed asymmetric dualisms and cultural hierarchies in which humans and non-humans are incommensurable. Humans, being rational and moral entities, are elevated to the peak, while non-humans are reduced to an inferior status, becoming mere commodities and objects of exploitation. This Anthropocentric-Humanistic order is underpinned by three principles: human exceptionalism, dignity, and perfection. First, humans possess exclusive traits such as language, consciousness, and rationality. Second, humans have dignity due to their capacity for self-determination. Third, humans are capable of free thinking, self-determination, and self-realization, thanks to their autonomous and individual consciousness (Weitzenfeld and Joy, 2014: 5-6). Anthropocentrism and Humanism have been criticized for degrading, misleading, and detaching humanity from nature, harming both sides and disturbing their interconnectedness. Consequently, Posthumanism has emerged as a perspective that attempts to reconcile human-nature relationships, seeking new horizons and addressing the shortcomings of Anthropocentrism and Humanism.

The term Posthumanism was first introduced by the Postmodern scholar Hassan in his essay *Prometheus as Performer: Toward a Posthumanist Culture?*(1977 : 843), where he asserts that the five centuries of Humanistic influence are ending, giving way to Posthumanism. Posthumanism is a philosophical, cultural, and ideological

stance that emerged from growing dissatisfaction with Humanism and Anthropocentrism which have brought humanity to its lowest point. Its aim is to rectify and move beyond the concepts and values of these two philosophies, freeing humans from their androcentric, racist, sexist, and speciesist nature. Drawing from cultural, Postmodern, Postcolonial, and Feminist theories, Posthumanism seeks to debase Humanistic and Anthropocentric ideologies that have long excluded and oppressed women, minorities, non-Western groups, and others, by advocating for their rights. This advocacy extends to include animals and technological entities as well.

Philosophically speaking, Posthumanism signifies the end of man-centered conceptions and the dissolution of existing ontological dualities, such as man-woman, mind-body, human-animal, nature-culture, and subject-object. It represents a new vision of human subjectivity, embedded in a larger, multifaceted ecosystem. Posthumanists emphasize that human development can be healthily effected through coexistence and co-development with different forms of being, rather than being culturally isolated and detached from the rest of nature. By renegotiating human-animal relations, Posthumanism aims to reconnect men with nature and foster a new sense of modesty. The emancipatory goals of Posthumanism are twofold: first, to free the non-human other from Anthropocentric exploitation and dominion by reappraising notions of the human, the real, and the world. And second, to invalidate human exceptionalism by deconstructing the proud, subjective human self and situating it within a complex web of relations and interconnected entities (Sorgner, 2014 : 29; Vinci, 2018 : 230).

Indeed, the goals of Posthumanism extend beyond rectifying and debunking Anthropocentric and Humanistic ideologies. Its agenda transcends the past and present to shape even the future trajectory of humankind. With scientific and technological revolutions, humans are no longer solely part of the natural world but are increasingly embedded in an artificial world mediated by science and technology. Today, humans are developing artificial entities, using techniques like artificial intelligence, biotechnology, and genetic engineering, capable of simulating humans. Furthermore, people are not merely surrounded by these technological artefacts but are actively integrating them into their bodies to enhance their physical, emotional, and cognitive capacities, transcending biological determinism. These ambitious projects aim to make the future evolution more human-made than natural-made[2]. Amidst these plans, animals are also involved in

[2] These aforementioned goals are part of the agenda of Transhumanism, a movement and stance advocating human enhancement through scientific and technological means, aiming to transform human cognition and physique.

the process of enhancement, by being exposed to scientific and technological experiments. Consequently, their nature is expected to undergo drastic changes. These radical plans raise numerous concerns, aspirations, and uncertainties regarding the future and the fate of whole beingness. Particularly noteworthy is the emergence of new forms of artificial beings like AI robots and cyborgs[3], which further complicate ethical considerations and expand the realms of Otherness. These developments prompt serious questions: do humans have the right to intervene and manipulate the biology of animals? How will animals be affected by scientific and technological manipulations, given their inability to protest? Wells explores these questions in his novel *The Island of Doctor Moreau*(2005), depicting animals exposed to scientific experiments to become more human-like and the subsequent suffering they endure due to alterations in their nature and physique.

2. The Ethical Considerations of Moreau's Pursuit of Knowledge

In *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, Derrida (2008 : 16) suggests that humans have been granted authority over animals by God, which prompts scrutiny of how humans wield this power and exercise dominance over all other creatures. Amidst the benefits and drawbacks of technological and scientific progress, non-human animals find themselves subject to the whims of humans and their insatiable quest for knowledge. In Wells' *The Island of Doctor Moreau*(2005), Edward Prendick, an English biologist, embarks on a sea voyage reminiscent of Charles Darwin's. journey aboard the *HMS Beagle*[4]. Surviving a shipwreck, Prendick is rescued by a scientist named Montgomery and taken to his homeland. There, he encounters the secretive and isolated island of Dr. Moreau, populated by caged wild animals and deformed humans exhibiting animal-like traits. Dr. Moreau is a physiologist who conducts clandestine vivisections on animals. Eventually discovered and banished, he retreats from public view, leaving London to pursue his scientific endeavors on a secluded island, away from the ethical constraints of human society.

While divulging the nature of his work to Prendick, Moreau expresses his discontent with civilized societies, which he believes hinder scientific progress and impede humanity's advancement through moral judgments. Being loyal to his experimentations, Moreau abandons the cultural world to embrace a solitary life on

[3] Cyborgs are hybrid beings that are half human and half machine.

[4] Through his journey to South America, from 1831 to 1836, Charles Darwin meticulously garnered extensive data on the region's flora and fauna. These obsrvations played a pivotal role in shaping his theory of evolution and have been thoroughly discussed in his work *The Voyage of the Beagle* (1839).

a desolate island. However, his pursuit of knowledge is driven by selfish motives, lacking any beneficial contributions to human civilization. His cruel vivisection of non-human beings yields no advantages for either humans or animals. Each year, he dispatched Montgomery to procure wild animals from various species, subjecting them to brutal experiments in his laboratory. Prendick described their cries "*as if all the pain in the world had found a voice*"(Wells, 2005: 54). Moreau, through his cruel conduct, mirrors Humanistic and Anthropocentric attitudes. He feels no remorse for his atrocious actions, believing they are a necessity in his pursuit of knowledge. His thirst for scientific achievement and his sense of superiority justify the excesses he commits against his victims. He views animals as mere raw materials for his experiments, asserting that pain is a natural experience in science and should be stimulated if the situation demands it. He informs Prendick "*To this day I have never troubled about the ethics of the matter. The study of Nature makes a man at last as remorseless as Nature. I have gone on, not heeding anything but the question I was pursuing*"(Wells, 2005 : 115). Autonomous and isolated on his island, Moreau escapes both social and moral scrutiny, conducting his operations freely without restrictions. As a self- judge, he fears no external pressure or retribution and feels no obligation to justify his unethical deeds, considering them legitimate. From a Posthuman perspective, Moreau's case highlights the dangers of detaching science from ethics, as ethics serves as the brake and balance of scientific endeavors. The essence of science and technology is to promote benign progress, not to satisfy inhuman selfish desires.

Moreau's hubris and self-obsession drove him to transcend human superiority to the point of deifying himself. He not only transformed the animals physically to appear more human-like but also created a social and moral system called the *Law*. This constitution dictates the rules the deformed humans had to follow, and any violation was met with punishment in his laboratory, the *House of Pain*, where sinners were tortured to correct their behavior. Moreau's intention behind creating these laws was not primarily to civilize his creatures but to discipline them, repress their recurring animalistic instincts, ensure their subjugation and docility, and secure his own safety. The maintenance of *Law* is enforced through ceremonies where the creatures, referred to as *Beast Folk*, gather to recite and reiterate the refrains repeatedly to ingrain them in their minds. Moreau's Law, as will be discussed in the following section, proved to be abusive and beyond the endurance of the *Beast Folk*, irrationally chaining their nature and essence. These human-like creatures remained loyal to their master not out of respect or affection but out of fear, the fear of being traumatized again in the *House of Pain* and facing Moreau's wrath. They continually chanted: "*His is the House of Pain. His is the Hand that makes. His is the Hand that*

wounds. His is the Hand that heals"(Wells, 2005: 89) to remind themselves of his cruelty.

Another instance is that Prendick, initially conceived as a moral being freshly come from human civilization, displayed a nauseous and repugnant attitude towards Moreau's vivisection practices. He questioned the purposelessness of Moreau's experiments and felt pity for the suffering inflicted on those uplifted beings. He often heard the cries of animals being vivisected, but he was particularly frightened upon hearing what he thought were the cries of a human coming from the laboratory. Prendick entered a hysteric state, believing that Moreau was not only vivisecting animals but also humans, fearing that he might be the next victim. He speculated that the creatures he met on the island might be humans transformed into animals rather than the vice versa. In his panic, Prendick fled the enclosure, running for his life to escape Moreau's clutches. However, when Moreau eventually explained the nature of his work, Prendick learned that the cries came from a humanized puma and this appeased his distress. So while the idea of vivisecting humans horrified him he did not receive the news of vivisecting animals with the same shock; he accepted it as a cruel yet bearable act. Moreover, when Moreau was killed by the puma he was vivisecting and the Beast Folk began to gradually abandon their master's Law, Prendick desperately and insistently reminded them of Moreau's wrath, claiming that he still existed and watched them from the heavens. He tried to re-inculcate in them the laws by proclaiming that "*the Master and the House of Pain will come again. Woe be to him who breaks the Law*"(Wells, 2005: 190), he zealously tried to revive the same laws he once questioned. After becoming the only human left on the island and after feeling that his life was on the line, his morality faltered. He grew more hateful and ferocious than Moreau, killing any creature he suspected. This situation aligns with a point discussed by Wolfe (2003: 1), that many who claim to oppose humanism can still be "*humanists to the core*". Initially, Prendick's attitude seemed humane, but he ended up more cruel than Moreau when it came to self-preservation. He even contemplated exterminating all the remaining creatures on the island, effectively committing genocide, but he lacked sufficient ammunition to fulfill this impulse. Additionally, when Moreau was murdered, Prendick and Montgomery decided to euthanize all the animals awaiting vivisection instead of releasing them. This act demonstrats that animals are deemed insignificant, being mere objects for human use. Their lives were considered valuable only as long as they served a purpose of humans. So, once Moreau died, their usefulness was perceived to have ended, highlighting the Anthropocentric view that animals exist solely to serve man. This very idea is

revisited in the modern age, incorporating non-human beings into increasingly complex scientific plans.

3. Embodiment and Embeddedness

With the overarching progress of science and technology, the cognitive and biological metamorphoses of humans have become possible, making its way from fiction to reality. This drastic transformation profoundly impacts human perceptions of themselves and the world around them. Importantly, this transformative biological process extends to include even animals, being able to alter their bodies and acquire qualities similar to those of humans. However, ethically speaking, this inclusion might prove oppressive to animals, as they lack agency to decide for themselves whether to accept or refuse these alterations. They find themselves once again at the mercy of humans and their unquenchable pursuit of knowledge, being compelled to experience a new sense of embodiment and embeddedness[5]. Moreau's humanoids, who were once animals, are unwillingly subjected to live in a deserted island and, trapped in the *House of Pain*, where they endure the harshest sufferings to acquire new human forms they did not opt for. Even worse, they are subjected to the *Law*, which not only strips them of their physical freedom but also restrains their animalistic nature. They are forced to claim an identity they feel alienated from but obliged to endure out of fear from torture, and have to chant hymn-like verses to conform to the new norms imposed upon them

> "Not to go on all-fours; that is the Law.
> Are we not Men?
> Not to suck up Drink; that is the Law. Are
> Are we not Men?
> Not to eat Fish or Flesh; that is the Law.
> Are we not Men?
> Not to claw the Bark of Trees; that is the
> Law. Are we not Men?
> Not to chase other Men; that is the Law.
> Are we not Men?".(Wells, 2005: 88)

[5] Embodiment refers to the notion that the identity and experience of humans are primarily formed by their material bodies and contact with the physical world. Human subjectivity is not shaped solely by rationality but is also the outcome of perceptions and sentience. while embeddedness refers to the interactions between humans and their environments; humans are not isolated entities but rather part of a whole complex system. Therefore, their identities and experiences are shaped and influenced by interactions with others.

Through Moreau's *Law*, the *Beast Folk* were denied the nature they used to enjoy as animals. They were not allowed to be quadrupeds and were forced to walk on two legs like men. They were deprived of eating meat, sucking blood, chasing animals or humans. The irrationality of these laws lies not only in their inaptitude for the animal kingdom but also in their invalidity within human societies. For instance, some of these humanoids came from carnivorous backgrounds and were forced to become vegetarians, even though consuming meat is common among humans. Additionally, Moreau imposed monogamy, restricting each male to one female, even though polygamy is accepted in certain human societies. In fact, the *Beast Folk* chant the verse "*Are we not Men*?" not out of genuine belief in their new embodiment but to eschew their master's whip, as they still carry the traumatic scars they wish to avoid reliving. Away from Moreau's gaze, they sometimes secretly unleash their animalistic behavior, longing for their former state. For instance, Prendick observed some of them dressed like humans but behaving like animals, walking on all fours and kneeling to drink directly from the stream. As Lyotard (1988 : 28) states, animals, by failing to defend themselves, are always the ones to suffer the most without the ability to protest the damages inflicted on them, and this makes them "*a paradigm of the victim*". The *Beast Folk*, unable to confront Moreau, found no one to defend them against his atrocities.

The *Beast Folk* suffered not only from physical and behavioral alterations, but were also unjustly classified within the same category, making Moreau an apostle of Humanism. Humanists, by creating a set of universal rules, endeavor to unify all humans under common norms, disregarding their ethnic, cultural, religious, and linguistic backgrounds. Those who do not fit in this mold are relegated to the realm of Otherness and inferiority. Similarly, Doctor Moreau follows the same path. The animals he vivisects come from different species with varied essences and shapes, some are carnivores, others herbivores; some are mammals, others oviparous. Despite these differences, they are all subjected to the same scientific processes, forced to coexist, and obey the same *Law*. Derrida (2008 : 48) believes that gathering all animals or any nonhuman beings in the common category of "animal"[6] is not just an injustice but a crime. Moreau's humanoids, despite being metamorphosed, still exhibit discernible features of their original nature, highlighting the fallibility of Moreau's creation. His failure to transform them into real humans resulted in creatures that look more anthropomorphic than genuinely human. Yet, the *Beast Folk* come to identify themselves according to the contrasts

[6] Derrida meant that using the word "animal" in its singular form is unjust because animals are not one unified entity, but rather consist of different species with distinct natures.

and differences of their bodies. As an instance, when the Ape-Man[7] meets Prendick for the first time, he scrutinizes Prendick's hands in amazement, comparing them to his own. Finding the same number of digits, he notes the similarity, as apes and humans share the same number of fingers. However, some of the Ape-Man's fellows have deformed hands with three, two, or no fingers, depending on their species of origin. This indicates that the deformity of these humanoids is contingent on their primitive anatomy.

The attitude of Moreau, Montgomery, and Prendick towards the *Beast Folk* is biased, complex, and dissimilar. The bond between Moreau and his creatures is that of a creator and a created. After humanizing the animals, Moreau does not consider them truly part of the human race; he neither treats them as his equals nor feels any obligation or respect towards them. He believes that agonizing them during vivisection is not an immoral act but rather a scientific requisite to humanize them. Once the process is done, he leaves them to face their fate on the island under the *Law*. He neither attempts to understand their nature nor cares for their sentience. He only appeares to check their compliance with his standards and restrains them from reverting to their animality. Moreau believes that although his creatures may appear uncanny and eyesores to others like Prendick, after vivisecting them, he considers them unquestionably humans. Yet, his conviction temporarily fades as he observes them more closely. In fact, what dissuades Moreau about his humanoids is their deformity, relapsing behaviors, and cognitive deficiencies, igniting his scientific craze to create more perfect rational beings. This authorizes him to use any means necessary and take the required time to reach his end. Consequently, animals suffer from the shortcomings of his scientific knowledge; the more he fails in his experiments, the more animals experience pain.

As for Montgomery, living on the island among those creatures reflects a lot about his biased attitudes towards them. Sometimes he treats them mercifully, other times brutally as he fails to find an adequate category to classify them in. They are neither completely humans nor completely animals, so Montgomery's conduct towards them is as conflicted as their nature. The *Beast Folk* are overwhelmed by the clashing exigencies of both their natural instincts and their inculcated cultural norms, vacillating between the intrinsic call of nature and the extrinsic restrictions of morality. They are caught in "*A series of propositions called the Law . . . battled in their minds with the deep-seated, ever-rebellious cravings of their animal natures*"(Wells, 2005: 124). However, Montgomery became accustomed to these

[7] In the novel, each humanoid is referred to by his or her species of origin; for example, Ape-Man, Leopard-Man, Dog-Man, Hyena-Swine-Man, etc.

creatures despite their peculiarity and adapted to life on the island to the extent that he preferred never to return to his homeland, finding it difficult to interact with humans. Similarly, Prendick, who yearned to come back to the human civilization, became disillusioned upon returning to England. He alienated himself from society and entertained the possibility that the humans around him may be just humanized creatures, similar to the ones he used to live with on the Island of Moreau. In fact, his attitude towards the *Beast Folk* is nebulous and malleable. At times, he regards them with pity, while at other times with disgust, fear, and distrust. His attitude shifts according to the condition and the situation he has been through.

4. Human Hubris and Animal Dignity

The aimelessness of Moreau's experiments and his hubristic pursuit of knowledge raise many concerns over the idea of evolution being guided by irrational technology and science. His endeavor to uplift animals to a human-like form did not bridge the gap between humans and non-humans but rather widened it and deteriorated the conditions of animals. This demonstrates that uplifting those beings is not always an act of human generosity or an orientation toward a symbiotic coexistence. After decades of experiments, Moreau failed to achieve his goal and brought no benefits to humankind. His reckless actions resulted in a deformed species, an outcome of a long process of pain, indicating that humans should cease to impose their desires on other beings and learn to live in harmony, accepting existing diversities and differences. Unlike humans, animals are not endowed with rationality, agency, and language, yet they are sentient beings. By banishing his morality and humane emotions, Moreau failed to perceive and understand the pain he inflicted upon his creatures. Escaping his country, he believed not only in his superiority over animals but also over human civilization that once hindered his so-called scientific research. His self-pride inveigled him to the point that he perceived himself as a deity, only to end up relegated to an animalistic status because of his cruelty. Moreau falls within the category of what Wolfe (2003 : 101) calls "*the animalized human*". Banishing morals does not signify elevation to a God-like standing but rather a descent into savagery.

Moreover, Moreau was overwhelmed by the relapsing nature of his humanoids, who consistently returned to their feral behavior and form. He had to continually reinstruct them in the *Law* and drag them back to his laboratory. His scientific creations were continually challenged by the reassertion of the animal's inherent nature. As he informed Prendick that "*as soon as my hand is taken from them the beast begins to creep back, begins to assert itself again*"(Wells, 2005: 120). This

underscores the triumph of nature over civilization and the superiority of natural evolution over artificial evolution. The former is genuine, strong, persistent, and creates a lasting effect, while the latter is weak, fleeting, selfish, and ephemeral. Once Moreau was killed, his *Law* gradually dissolved, and "*the stubborn beast flesh grows day by day back again*"(Wells, 2005: 118). With the *Beast Folk* liberated from the *Law* and the *House of Pain*, animalistic traits took over their moral norms, reverting them to their feral state and bringing their master's rules to decay. Moreau's demise was at the hand of his vivisected puma. When she escaped his laboratory, he pursued her into the wilderness, and they ended up killing each other. This denouement highlights Moreau's pride, cruelty, and indifference which blinded him to his own finitude and vulnerability as a human being. Death brought him back to modesty, reminding him of his insignificance in the universe. In a way, his end was ironic as he was terminated by one of the creatures he once deemed inferior. "*Mortality resides there, as the most radical means of thinking the finitude that we share with animals, the mortality that belongs to the very finitude of life*"(Derrida, 2008 : 28). This philosophy, invoked by Derrida, forms a fundamental pillar of the Posthuman theory, which seeks to move humans away from their Humanistic and Anthropocentric aloofness, and guide them towards a more interchangeable relationship with non-human life forms. That is to ensure a balanced hybrid evolution led by both nature and techno-science.

Conclusion

H.G. Wells, in his work, *The Island of Doctor Moreau*(2005), portrays the calamities that science and technology can cause when detached from moral and social surveillance. In the modern age, under the guise of scientific research, some pursue irrational goals selfishly and forcefully, leaving the less privileged to bear the consequences. Moreau, by escaping the moral judgments of human civilization, relocates to a secluded island to conduct his illegal speciesist experiments on non-human animals, achieving nothing but self-satisfaction. His hubristic attitude entitles him to deify himself, subjecting his creations to infinite ordeals and bulldozing them into two clashing forces. Remorseless, Moreau embodies the fanatical Humanistic and Anthropocentric tenets of human superiority and exceptionalism, which has misled Western culture for centuries. This has culminated in oppressive dualities, with animals relegated to the bottom of the social hierarchy, waiting for humans to either assert their rights or at least grant them respectable treatment. Amid these excesses and violations, Posthumanism emerges as an emancipatory stance aimed at dismantling the boundaries delineated by Humanism and Anthropocentrism, seeking to narrow the divide between humans, non-human beings, and nature. In light of techno-scientific development, Posthuman theory steers towards a symbiotic evolution and a fresh reconceptualization

of human-animal relationships, wherein the dignity of all entities is respected and preserved. It posits that humans are not standalone or superior entities but rather part of complex natural systems, experiencing both embodiment and embeddedness with other life forms.

References

DE JONGE Eccy, (2011), "An Alternative to Anthropocentrism: Deep Ecology and the Metaphysical Turn" in, BODDICE Rob (Ed.). *Anthropocentrism: Humans, Animals, Environments*, Boston, Brill, pp.307-319.

DERRIDA Jacques, (2008), *The Animal that Therefore I Am* (MALLET Marie-Louise, Ed.; WILLS David, Trans.), New York, Fordham University Press.

HASSAN Ihab, (1977) "Prometheus as Performer: Towards a Posthumanist Culture?", in, *The Georgia Review*. 31(4), pp.830–850.

KREBBER André, (2011), "ANTHROPOCENTRISM AND REASON IN DIALECTIC OF ENLIGHTENMENT CRISIS AND ANIMAL SUBJECT" in, BODDICE Rob (Ed.). *Anthropocentrism: Humans, Animals, Environments*, Boston, Brill, pp.321-339.

LYOTARD Jean-François, (1988), *The Differend: Phrases in Dispute* (VAN DEN ABBEELE Georges, Trans.), UK, Manchester University Press.

RUSEN Jorn, (2021), *Humanism: Foundations, Diversities, Developments*, London, Routledge.

SORGNER Stefan Lorenz, (2014), "Pedigrees" in, RANISCH Robert and SORGNER Stefan Lorenz (Eds.). *Post- and Transhumanism: An Introduction*, New York, Peter LANG Edition, pp.29-47.

VINCI Tony M, (2018), "POSTHUMANIST MAGIC: Beyond the Boundaries of Humanist Ethics in Lev Grossman's The Magicians" in, TARR Anita and WHITE Donna R. (Eds.). *Posthumanism in Youg Adult Fiction: Finding Humanity in a Posthuman World*, USA, University Press of Mississipi, pp.227-246.

WEITZENFELD Adam and JOY Melanie, (2014), "An Overview of Anthropocentrism, Humanism, and Speciesism in Critical Animal Theory" in, NOCELLA II Anthony J. *et al*,(Eds.). *Defining Critical Animal Studies: An Intersection Social Justice Approach of Liberation*, New York, PETER LANG, pp.3-27.

WELLS Herbert George, (2005 [1896]), *The Island of Doctor Moreau*, Broadview Press.

WOLFE Cary, (2003), *Animal Rites : American culture, the Discourse of Species, and Posthumanist Theory*, London, University Of Chicago Press.

Authors' biographies

1. **Mrs. Selma MEGUETTEF** is currently a Ph.D. student in Literature and Interdisciplinary Approaches at the University of Algiers 2 (Abou El Kacem Saadallah). She has served as a part-time lecturer at the University of Blida 2, Algeria, where she obtained her master's degree in Literature and Civilization. Her current research focuses on the intersections of Posthumanism, Transhumanism, and Science Fiction, investigating how modern technological and scientific advancements affect human identity and experience, with a particular emphasis on philosophical and literary dimensions.

2. **Prof. Houria Ait Ammour** is a professor of American Literature and Civilisation at the department of English (University of Algiers 2). Her research lies at the intersection of Comparative Literature, Twentieth and Twenty First Century American Literature and Civilisation, Postcolonial Studies and Translation and interpreting. She is the author of several articles published in national and international peer reviewed journals and contributor to several anthologies specialised in Twentieth Century American writings.