COURSE
GUIDE

PHL 321
THE CONTEMPORARY ISSUES IN ETHICS

Course Team   Dr. Babajide O. Dasaolu (Course Writer)-Olabisi
                   Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye
                   Prof C. Agulana (Course Editor)-University of Ibadan

NATIONAL OPEN UNIVERSITY OF NIGERIA

CONTENTS   **PAGE**

GENERAL INTRODUCTON

Ethics is one of the core areas in Philosophy as an academic discipline. It deals with values, particularly moral values – how we ought to live, the ideas of right and wrong conduct, freedom, choice, responsibility, equity, justice, punishment etc. By its very nature, ethics touches our moral nerves and without moral values an individual or society cannot live in peace, harmony and tranquility, which are essential ingredients to happiness, satisfaction and human well-being. In other words, ethics plays a vital role in our cognitive and practical life.

Due to human advancements in knowledge and technology, moral values have witnessed a new dimension in the contemporary age. Today, we talk about the nature of moral judgments, conflicts between moral judgments and actions among others. For instance, we want to know what makes an action good and what makes an action bad and see whether an action is to be adjudged moral or otherwise with reference to some ethical theories. This, in a way, has its place in some contemporary issues that confronts our contemporary society. The aim of the course is to expose the student to some of the contemporary issues in ethics such as technology transfer, bio-technology, capital punishment, abortion, euthanasia, same sex marriage, etc.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

In order to achieve the primary aim of this course, the following objectives have been set:

- To understand the meaning and nature of some contemporary issues in ethics.
- To examine their ethical dimensions with regards to their acceptability or otherwise in the society.
- To attempt a philosophical discussion on some selected ethical issues.
- It is hoped that at the end of this course students should be able to have a better understanding of the implications of these ethical issues and their relevance as they progress in their studies.

WORKING THROUGH THIS COURSE

One of the major requirements for proper articulation and maximum efficiency, effectiveness and productivity in this course, is for students to have a copy of the course guide, main course material, and the necessary materials for this course. These will serve as study guide and preparation before lectures. Additionally, students are required to be actively

involved in forum discussion and facilitation. In other words, attendance plus class participation are very important. There are interesting readings that are necessary, which will enhance your understanding of the course. Lecture notes are mere guidelines. This is important as learning how to philosophize and addressing issues within moral precepts do not encourage note learning or memory work. It deals with how you, as an individual, internalise what is being taught in terms of self-reflection with moral logical reasoning.

STUDY UNITS

This course has 14 study units which are structured into 5 modules. Each module comprises of 2-4 study units as follows:

Module 1   Capital Punishment

Unit 1   Defining Punishment
Unit 2   Meaning and nature of Capital Punishment
Unit 3   Theories of Punishment
Unit 4   Arguments for and against Capital Punishment

Module 2   Abortion

Unit 1   Meaning and Nature of Abortion
Unit 2   Views and   Types of Abortion
Unit 3   Arguments for and against Abortion

Module 3   Same Sex Marriage
Unit 1   Meaning and nature of Same Sex Marriage
Unit 2   Arguments for and against Same Sex Marriage

Module 4   Cloning
Unit 1   Understanding Cloning
Unit 2   Arguments for and Against Cloning

Module 5
Unit 1   Is ethics a Science or an Art?
Unit 2   Assumption of Ethics
Unit 3   Some Fundamental Principles of Ethics
Unit 4   Ethics and Religion

REFERENCES AND FURTHER READING

Aigbodioh, J. A. (2004). *Practical Issues in Applied Ethics: The Facts, Arguments and Options,* Ekpoma: Inno Printing Press.

Barcalow, E. (1994). *Moral Philosophy: Theory and Issues,*
Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Baum, R. (ed.). (1976). *Ethical Arguments for Analysis,* 2nd Ed.
New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2001). *"Abortion,"* in Mabol Olaolu & Ebun Oduwole (eds.) *Fundamental Theories and Issues in Ethics,* Ibadan: BEN-EL Books.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2004). "Artificial Human Creation: An Examination of the Cleavage between Theology and Science." *Journal of Philosophy and Culture.* 1 (1).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2008). "From Home to the Laboratory: An Ethical Assessment of a New Reproductive Technology", *DRUMSPEAK: International Journal of Research in The Humanities,1 (1).*

Dasaolu, B. O. (2011). "The Idea of Human Cloning in Contemporary Times: Fears and Prospects." *Journal of Philosophy and Development, 12 (1 & 2).*

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "On Efficient Causation for Homosexual Behaviours among Traditional Africans: An Exploration of the Traditional Yoruba Model." *Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics*, 9 (2)

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "The Techno-Moral Case against Cloning: How Martin Heidegger Justifies the Kantian," *Philosophia: E-Journal for Philosophy and Culture.* 19 (1)

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "Òrìṣàńlá Made me Thus: Arguing for homosexuality using the Yorùbá Thought System as Paradigm," *LASU Journal of Philosophy,* 1 (1&2)

Echekwube, A. O. (1999). *Contemporary Ethics: History, Theories and Issues,* Lagos: Spero Book Ltd.

Ekwealo, C. J. (ed.), (2012). *Applied and Practical Ethics: A Simplified Course Text,* Vol. I. Lagos: African Environmental Ethics and Values Research Group.

Mabol Olaolu & Ebun Oduwole (eds.), (2004). *Fundamental Theories and Issues in Ethics,* Ibadan: BEN-EL Books.

Nagel, E. (1973). "The Enforcement of Morals," in Paul Kurtz (ed.), *Moral Problems in Contemporary Society: Essays in Humanistic Ethics,* Buffalo, N. Y: Prometheus Books.

Olen, J. & Barry, V. (1991). *Applying Ethics: A Text with Readings,* 4th Ed. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Rachels, J. (ed.). (1971). *Moral Problems: A Collection of Philosophical Essays,* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Reid, C. L. (1981). *Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics,* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Ten, C. L. (1991). "Crime and Punishment," in Peter Singer (ed.), *A Companion to Ethics,* Oxford: Basil Balckwell Ltd.

Thiroux, J. P. *Ethics: Theory and Issues,* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

The following links can be used to access materials online:
www.pdfdrive.net
www.bookboon.com

www.sparknotes.com http://ebookee.org https://scholar.google.com/
https://books.google.com/

PRESENTATION SCHEDULE

This course has two presentations; one at the middle of the semester and the other towards the end of the semester. At the beginning of the semester, each student undertaking this course will be assigned a topic by the course facilitator, which will be made available in due time, for individual presentations during forum discussions. Each presenter has 15 minutes (10 minutes for presentation and 5 minutes for Question and Answer). On the other hand, students will be divided by the course facilitator into different groups. Each group is expected to come up with a topic to work on and to submit same topic to the facilitator via the recommended medium. Both attract 5% of your total marks.

Note: Students are required to submit both papers via the recommended medium for further examination and grading. Both attract 5% of your

total marks.

ASSESSMENT

In addition to the discussion forum presentations, two other papers are required in this course. The paper should not exceed 6 pages and should not be less than 5 pages (including references), typewritten in 12 fonts, double line spacing, and Times New Roman. The preferred reference is MLA 6th edition (you can download a copy online). The paper topics will be made available in due time. Each carries 10% of the total marks.

To avoid plagiarism, students should use the followings links to test run their papers before submission:

http://plagiarism.org/
http://www.library.arizona.edu/help/tutorials/plagiarism/index.html
Finally, all students taking this course MUST take the final exam which attracts 70% of the total marks.

HOW TO GET THE MOST OUT OF THIS COURSE

For students to get the most out of this course, she/he must:

Have 75% of attendance through active participations in both forum discussions and facilitation;

Read each topic in the course materials before it is treated in class;

Submit every assignment as at when due; as failure to do so will attract a penalty; Discuss and share ideas among his/her peers; this will help in understanding the course more; Download videos, podcasts and summary of group discussions for personal consumption;

Attempt each self-assessment exercises in the main course material; Take the final exam;
Approach the course facilitator when having any challenge with the course.

FACILITATION

This course operates a learner-centered online facilitation. To support the student's learning process, the course facilitator will: one, introduce each topic under discussion; two, open floor for discussion. Each student is expected to read the course materials, as well as other related literatures, and raise critical issues which she/he shall bring forth in the forum

discussion for further dissection; three, summarizes forum discussion; four, upload materials, videos and podcasts to the forum; five, disseminate information via email and SMS if need be.

CONTENTS   **PAGE**

MODULE 1   CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

UNIT 1   DEFINING PUNISHMENT

1.1.   Introduction

This unit attempts a conceptual clarification of the key term of this module which is punishment. In addition to this, it takes a philosophical excursion into the methods of punishment as well as the moral question attached to punishment.

1.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   to unveil the meaning and nature of punishment;
•   to explain some of the methods of punishment;
•   to discuss different the moral question associated with punishment.

1.3.   Defining Punishment

1.3.1. What is Punishment?

It is important to point it out to you at the outset that the concept of punishment is an ethical concept that has received scholarly attention from different discipline. The moral mien attached to it makes it a subject of philosophical discourse, especially in moral philosophy. Hence, punishment is defined as "a deprivation, taking away from offenders what they value – their freedom, or some of their money when they are fined" (C. L. Ten, 1991:366). Thus, punishment in a simple language is conceived as the consequence for one's action. The consequence most often is in form of harm inflicted on the offender(s). What does this suggest? It suggests that punishment is an infliction of harm by the

rightful authority or the executive power of the state on a person who is judged to have violated a rule or a law. But then, can we regard every infliction of harm on a person as punishment? At what point or instance can we regard such infliction as real punishment or what do we need to justify such infliction of harm as punishment? It is important to let you know that for the infliction of harm on a person or taking away from offenders what they value – their freedom to be regarded as punishment in the real sense of it, five principal elements are identified to be in place by philosophers. J. Olen & V. Barry (1991:254-255) outlined the elements to include (1) involve pain, (2) be administered for an offense against a law or rule, (3) be administered to someone who has been judged guilty of an offense,be imposed by someone other than the offender, and (5) be imposed by rightful authority.

Punishment must involve pain, *harm or some other consequence normally considered unpleasant.* For example, a convicted robber was sentenced to "five-to-twenty" in a Beverly Hill country club; this would not be considered punishment, since ordinarily it would not involve pain or other unpleasant consequences (unless the robber had to pick up the tab.) If he were sentenced to have his hands cut off, this could constitute punishment, though draconian by many people's standard. *The Punishment must be administered for an offense against a law or rule.* While punishment involves pain, obviously not all pain involves punishment. If a robber breaks into your house and steals your stereo, he is not "punishing" you, even though his action satisfies element (1). Although it caused you pain, his action is not taken to punish an offense against a law or rule. However, should the robber subsequently be sent to prison for the crime, then *that* action would be administered for breaking a law and thus satisfy element (2).

The punishment must be administered to someone who has been judged guilty of an offense. Suppose the robber is apprehended and imprisoned, although never judged guilty of the robbery. This would not be considered punishment. However, if he is imprisoned after his conviction for stealing your stereo, then he is being punished.

*The punishment must be imposed someone other than the offender.*It is true that people sometimes speak of "punishing themselves" for transgression. This, however, is not punishment in the strict sense, but a self-imposed act of atonement. Suffering from a twinge of conscience as he listens to the latest Willie Nelson album on your stereo, the robber decides to "punish" himself by listening to Robert Goulet, whom he detests, for two hours each day for a year. Properly speaking, this would not be punishment, although it might qualify as masochism (*the enjoyment of receiving pain).*

The punishment must be imposed by rightful authority. In a strictly legal sense, "rightful authority" would be that constituted by a legal system against which offense is committed. In the case of the robber, "rightful authority" likely would be a court judge and jury.In a less legal sense, the authority might be a parent, a teacher, or some official who has a right to harm a person in a particular way for having done something or failed to do something.

It is, however, important to mention that the sense of punishment which is of moral concern is not the sense which speaks of the punishment of children, animal, maniacs, imbeciles and other categories of person who are not morally responsible for their actions since their condition presupposes that they are rationally defective (J. A. Aigbodioh, 2004:47).

Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   What do you understand by the concept, "punishment?"

1.4.   Methods of Punishment

The history of mankind is replete with various methods of punishing offenders of rules and laws. For instance, The Judeo- Christian Bible in the book of Genesis tells us of Adam and Eve, who were *banished* from the Garden of Eden. This is a form ostracization which is viable in various cultures in the form ofbanishment, excommunication and extradition. These forms of punishment consist in expelling offenders from the society to text their conduct and behaviour elsewhere. Aside this, methods of punishment are well articulated in religious setting, traditional setting and of course in modern time. J. A. Aigbodioh (2004:47-48) enunciates some of the methods punishment o includes:

- Punishment could take the form of severing or cutting off some parts of one's body. For example the Mosaic law of *an eye for an eye, the Sharia law etc.*
- Punishment in the traditional Africa cultures was often meted to the offender by fining (in terms of food items), by being made todo compulsory labour or by being asked to live temporarily in isolation without talking to others, participating in public functions, visiting others among others. Adulterous women were made and are still being made, in some traditional culture, to perform certain rituals publicly and to suffer public disgrace.
- Modern methods of punishment are more retained and applied with greater justification than those of the ancients. They take the form of imprisonment, death by hanging, electrocution or firing squad and fines.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1. Outline and discuss the elements that must be involved before any form of punishment is justified

1.4.1. Moral Question about Punishment

Punishment as one of the perennial concepts that moralists tangle with is polemical and thus associated with some moral questions. These questions are not raise to vilify offenders from facing the consequences or being made to be responsible for their actions, but to provide a tenable justification for any form of punishment meteto (an) offender(s). Some of the moral questions associated to punishment are well articulated by scholars like, Charles Reid (1981), J. A. Aigbodioh (2004), James Rachels (1971), Ernest Nagel (1973), and Robert Baum (1976) to include but not limited to:

- What is the justification of applying punishment to offenders of the law?
- What is the moral basis of punishment?
- If at all we are justified in punishing convicted offenders, should there not be limits to the extents of doing so?
- Given the principle of proportionality that an offence should be punished only in direct proportion to its seriousness, how do we determine the appropriate measure of punishment for a particular offender?

These questions are what ethical theories of punishment generally seek to answer. This we shall discuss in unit 3 of this module.

1.5. Summary

Punishment is conceived as a reward for wrong doing which must involve pains that is administered by rightful authority. It is not the same as self-imposed discipline which is an offshoot of atonement. The methods of punishment were also examined as envisaged from religious, traditional and modern perspectives. The moral questions associated with the concept of punishment from philosophical perspective were also examined. In this unit, we have considered the meaning and nature of punishment. This was done with a critical reflection on what makes punishment to be punishment in the real sense of it. Here five elements were identified as ingredients that must be in vogue before punishment could be justified. This is followed with methods of punishment as envisaged from religious, traditional and modern perspectives and the

moral questions associated with the concept of punishment from philosophical perspective were also examined.

1.6.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Aigbodioh, J. A. (2004). *Practical Issues in Applied ethics: The Facts, Arguments and Options,* Ekpoma: Inno Printing Press.

Baum, R. (ed.). (1976). *Ethical Arguments for Analysis,* 2nd Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Gardiner, G. A. (1956). *Capital Punishment as a Deterrent and the Alternative,* London.

Nagel, E. (1973). "The Enforcement of Morals," in Paul Kurtz(ed.), *Moral Problems in Contemporary Society: Essays in Humanistic Ethics,* Buffalo, N. Y: Prometheus Books.

Oke, M. (2008). "An Indigenous Yoruba (African) Philosophical Argument against Capital Punishment," in *Quest: An African Journal of Philosophy/Revue Africaine de Philosophie,* xxii: 25-36.

Olen, J. & Barry, V. (1991). *Applying Ethics: A Test with Readings,* 4th Ed. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Owoade, M. A. (1988). "Capital Punishment: Philosophical Issues and contemporary Problems in Nigeria," in *Second Order (New Series): An African Journal of Philosophy,* Vol. no. I: 41-61.

Rachels, J. (ed.). (1971). *Moral Problems: A Collection ofPhilosophical Essays,* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers.

Reid, C. L. (1981). *Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics,* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

Ten, C. L. (1991). "Crime and Punishment," in Peter Singer (ed.), *A Companion to Ethics,* Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.

1.7. Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Questions

1. Punishment refers to the act of withdrawing from an offender things that they value such as their freedom or in the case of payment of fine, their money. It has to do with causing harm to an offender by an authority authorized to do so.

2.
   (1) involve pain
   (2) be administered for an offense against a law or rule
   (3) be administered to someone who has been judged guilty of an offense,
   (4) be imposed by someone other than the offender
   (5) be imposed by rightful authority.

UNIT 2   MEANING AND NATURE OF CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

2.1.   Introduction

This unit advances on the previous unit that discussed punishment as a concept. It is important to mention that there are major two types of punishment namely corporal and capital punishment. Our concern here is the capital punishment. Therefore, the meaning and nature of capital punishment will be examined hereunder.

2.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

- unveil the meaning and nature of capital punishment;
- understand the difference between punishment and capital punishment
- discuss different moral questions associated with punishment.

2.3.   Meaning and Nature of CapitalPunishment

2.3.1 What is Capital Punishment?

The issue of capital punishment is very old and not alien to any human society. In ancient Greece (399BCE), Socrates, according to the records, was sentenced to death for his alleged crimes against the Athenian City – State. We are told, in England, that capital punishment existed for over two hundred offences in the last century (Gardiner, 1956:24). The offences in which capital punishment is associated with in England range from defacing Westminster Bridge and consorting with gypsies, to severalcategories of murder (see M. A. Owoade, 1988:41). In Nigeria,

as in several other African countries, the death penalty is the usual punishment for a number of offences ranging from arson, treason, and armed robbery to murder (M. Oke, 2008:2).

Capital punishment is an advanced form of punishment. It is often wrapped in death penalty or the taking of a person life for a crime committed. Capital punishment has held attention through the seventies, even overshadowing debates about the rights of prisoners, prisoner riots, and county jails that were flaming death traps (C. L. Reid, 1981:239). As a result of the involvement of life and given the sacred nature of life, several questions are raised concerning the morality or otherwise of capital punishment.

In philosophical, political and judicial circles, the debate on capital punishment continues to be lively between those who support and those who oppose the use of capital punishment. In some places, the death penalty has been abolished in deference to the pressure and force of the abolitionists' arguments. This is well captured by Owoade (1988:42) who argues that the debate over capitalpunishment, from the perspective of Western jurisprudence, moves in three directions. These are; first, the moral-humanitarian- religious directions; secondly, the popular direction i.e. the views, prejudices and superstitions of the man in the street, and lastly the scientific directions, i.e. the psychiatric, and sociological views on the subject.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1.What do you understand by capital punishment?

2.3.1. Methods of Punishment

Just as punishment, in its generic understanding, has various ways by which offenders are rewarded for their wrong doing so it is with capital punishment. There are means through which capital punishment is meted out. These include:

Death by hanging Death by electrocution
Death by poisonous substancesDeath by firing squad

2.3.2. Moral Question about Punishment

Capital punishment as one of the perennial concepts that moralists tangle with raises the question of sanctity of human life. This question is built on the puzzle "does capital punishment succeed in deterring potential

murders? Don't we think that instead of deterring criminals from further crime of killing and other heinous crimes that could attract death penalty, capital punishment seems to increase the chances of people getting away with their crime, andso they may not in the least be deterred by the threat of the death penalty?

Self-Assessment Exercise

Is there any difference between punishment and capital punishment? Explain your view.

2.4.   Summary

Capital punishment is conceived as death penalty for crime committed. Some of the means by which capital punishment are carried out include death by hanging, death by firing squad, and death by electrocution among others. The sanctity of human life remains the major moral questions associated with the concept of capital punishment. In this unit, we have considered the meaning and nature of capital punishment. It is arguable from the moral question attached to capital punishment that more than often, capital punishment may not necessarily deter criminals especially the hardened one who could perceive it as a mean of escaping justice. References/Further Reading/Web resources

Gardiner, G. A. (1956). *Capital Punishment as a Deterrent and the Alternative.* London.

Oke, M. (2008). "An Indigenous Yoruba (African) Philosophical Argument against Capital Punishment," in *Quest: An African Journal of Philosophy/Revue Africaine de Philosophie,* xxii: 25-36.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Owoade, M. A. (1988). "Capital Punishment: Philosophical Issues and contemporary Problems in Nigeria," in *Second Order (New Series): An African Journal of Philosophy,* Vol. no. I: 41-61.

Reid, C. L. (1981). Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

2.5.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   Capital punishment is a form of punishment that is advanced in nature. It requires snuffing life out of the offender. It also known as death penalty.
2.   Yes there is a difference between punishment and capital. Punishment is mere inflict of harm on the offender, capital punishment pertains to taking the life of the offender.

UNIT 3   THEORIES OF PUNISHMENT

3.1   Introduction

This unit sets to discuss some major theories of punishment and show their relevance to better our understanding of what punishment is. Thus, the unit exposes the content of some of the theories used in justifying punishment. For instance, Westal Willoughby (1900) categorizes these theories into the Retributive theory, that is, looking to the past and the deed already done, seeking satisfaction, expiation, or vindication; and the Utilitarian theory, looking to the future, to deterrence, to prevention of recidivism, and to the good of the society, including that of the individual offender.

From the above, ethicists have developed four major theories in justification of punishment. These are (1) Retributive, (2) Deterrent, (3) Preventive, and (4) Reformatory, respectively (W. W. Willoughby, 1981:240). Each of these theories has their peculiarities and such will be discussed one after the other in the next section.

3.2   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

-     to understand different theories of punishment;
-     to be able to differentiate between the theories and be able toI dentify which is more appropriate in a given situation.

3.3   Theories of Punishment?

The theories of punishment are better explained with reference to the aims of punishment. This is in two folds: (1) in terms of giving people what they deserve, or (2) in terms of its desirable consequences. In the first category is the retributive theory of punishment; while the second

includes preventive, deterrent, and reformative theories. This, we shall examine one after the other.

3.3.1. Retributive Theory

Retributive theory of punishment is a fundamental theory of punishment that delights in looking into the past and the deed already done, seeking satisfaction, expiation, or vindication (Reid, 1981:239). The term *retribution* refers to punishment given in return for some wrong done (Olen & Barry, 1991:256). Retributive theory of punishment is often explained with reference to *Mosaic Law* and *Sharia Law*. It is a theory of punishment that suggests that "the offenders, because he has voluntarily committed a wrong act,is deservedly punished so that he may suffer for the wrong he has done whether or not the suffering produces any good consequences" (Aigbodioh, 2004:50). As a theory of punishment, retributive theory is one of the major strands on which the argument for capital punishment is built.

3.3.2. Deterrence Theory

The deterrence theory of punishment holds that we should punishin order to discourage others from committing similar offenses (Olen & Barry, 1991:256). This theory functions from dual perspectives. One, it forbids the criminal from committing such crime again and two, it serves as a warning to would-beoffender(s)/criminal(s), not to embark on such action that could bring such severe punishment on them.

3.3.3. Preventive Theory

This theory of punishment holds that we should punish to ensure that offenders do not repeat their offence and by so doing further injure the society (Olen & Barry, 1991:257). The implication of this theory of punishment is that the offender(s) will be prevented from committing another crime and the society at large will be protected from an eventuality that the offender and/or criminal could plunged the society into if allowed to continue living freelyin the society.

3.3.4. Reformatory Theory

The reformatory theory of punishment is essentially to reform the criminals/offenders. This theory stipulates that "one should punish in order to induce people to conform to standards of behaviour they have tended to ignore or violate" (Olen & Barry, 1991:257). Punishment, within the precepts of this theory, is a corrective means by which the offender may be reformed and made to be of good behaviour in the future.

The idea of reformative theory of punishment is to ensure that people emerge from punishment better than they were before, insofar as they will be less likely to breach conventional standards of behaviour. This is made practicable in some of the modern penal institutions where provisions are made for the convicts to learn good acts through the provision of various recreational, educational, and vocational services provided for the inmates.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   Outline and discuss with concrete examples, two theories of punishment.
2.   The deterrence theory of punishment holds that we should punishin order to --------

3.4   Summary

The unit examines four theories of punishment. While retributive theory is seen as that which is an equivalence of the *Mosaic law* and *Sharia law,* others are seen as having utilitarian values thatare often dual in nature. This is particularly where both the criminal/offender and the society are made better as a result of imposing punishment on the offender.

3.5   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Aigbodioh, J. A. (2004). *Practical Issues in Applied ethics: The Facts, Arguments and Options,* Ekpoma: Inno Printing Press.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study,Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Reid, C. L (1981). *Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics,* New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

3.6   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.
i.   Retributive theory
ii.   Deterrence theory

Retributive theory – this is punishment given in return for some wrong done. Mosaic and Sharia Laws are two examples.

Deterrence – this is punishment given to an offender to prevent others from committing same offence.

2.   discourage others from committing similar offenses

3.6   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

UNIT 4   ARGUMENT FOR AND AGAINST CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

4.1.   Introduction

This unit sets to examine arguments advanced for and against the morality or otherwise of capital punishment. This is done with a reflection on the *retentionists* and *abolitionists* views. Those who support retaining capital punishment are the one termed *retentionists* while those who oppose capital punishment are referred to as *abolitionists* (Reid, 1981). Each of these two strands has a contention on which their position is galvanized. It is their views and positions that this unit sets to unravel.

4.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   to understand the difference between the *retentionists* and abolitionists' arguments for capital punishment.
•   to be able to acclimatize with some of the arguments that sustained capital punishment as well as those that kick against its application.

4.3.   Capital Punishment

Here we shall be examining the argument for and against capital punishment. This is fundamental to understanding the essence of capital punishment in order to ascertain its relevance and/or otherwise in the contemporary age.

4.3.1. Argument for Capital Punishment

The *retentionists* argument for the sustenance of capital punishment can be articulated under the following (i) capital punishment deters crime (ii)capital punishment keeps the convicted murderer from killing again

(iii) capital punishment balances the scales of justice (iv) society should not be made to pay the economic costs of life sentences for murders.

(i)   *Capital punishment deters crime* – this argument as articulated suggests that capital punishment is a more powerful deterrence against crime than prison. The more severe the punishment, the greater the risk to the would-be criminal; and the greater the risk to the would-be criminal, the more reason not to commit the crime. Though this is not saying every would-be killer is rational enough to weigh the pros and cons before deciding whether to kill, but it certainly stands to reason that some are. As long as that is true, capital punishment serves its purpose – saving innocent lives.

(ii)   *Capital punishment keeps the convicted murderer from killing again* – In this regard, capital punishment is seen as that which guarantees at least one thing. We do not have to worry that an executed murderer will kill again. Even if every murderer sentenced to life imprisonment without possibility of parole never leaves prison alive, which is highly doubtful, we still have to worry about murders committed in prison. The rest of the society may be protected from these killers, but we should be conscious that the prison guards and fellow inmates are not. More so, since they are already serving the maximum sentence there is nothing to fear from killing again.

(iii) *Capital punishment balances the scales of justice* – murder being the ultimate crime, simple justice requires that the murderer pay the ultimate penalty. After all, deterrence and prevention are not the only purposes of punishing criminals. An equally important purpose is to see that justice is done and moral retribution is taken. That is why we insist that the punishment must fit the crime. Furthermore, society has both the right and the obligation to express its moral outrage over the most heinous crimes committed against it. Both purposes are best served by capital punishment. Prison is just too weak a punishment for many murderers, and a prison term cannot satisfy society's outrage over vicious murders.

(iv)   *Society should not be made to pay the economic costs of life sentences for murders* – When you put murderers away for life you give up all hope of reforming them. That leaves society with the heavy cost of supporting the worst criminals in maximum security prisons until they die. Why should innocent taxpayers foot the bill for the care of depraved criminals who have demonstrated that they have no respect for societal laws and/or human life?

4.3.2. Argument against Capital Punishment

The *abolitionist* argument for the eradication of capital punishment can be articulated under the following (i) every human life has dignity and worth (ii) capital punishment is imposed with class and racial bias (iii) the innocent may die (iv) capital punishment compromises the judicial system.

(i)   *Every human life has dignity and worth* – Capital punishment is nothing more than legalized cold-blooded murder. Whatever crimea man has committed, he is still a human being, and every human life has inherent dignity and worth. This is not to say that one is advocating leniency toward vicious murderers. We have to protect ourselves from them and we have to send a clear signal to other would-be murderers that the society will not tolerate heinous crime. But life imprisonment without possibility of parole is sufficientpunishment and deterrence. To strap a fellow human being into a chair and give him a lethal dose of gas, a lethal jolt of electricity, or a lethal injection is unworthy of a civilized society. Capital punishment should have gone the way of legalized torture and mutilation years ago. It, too, is 'cruel and unusual punishment,' and like them it is morally unacceptable in today's world

(ii)   *Capital punishment is imposed with class and racial bias* – statistics show two very disturbing facts about the way capital punishment is imposed in our society. First, the poor, the underprivileged, and members of minority groups are far more likely to be executed than the rich and the influential. Second, in racists countries, the death penalty is far more likely to be imposed when the victim is a white man than when the victim is a member of the minority group. Regardless of your high-minded principles, capital punishment shows at best a respect for affluent, Whiteman life, not human life in general. Because its implementation is patently discriminatory and therefore unjust, it must be stopped.

(iii) *The innocent may die* – the innocents are often convicted of crime. As tragic as that is when the sentence is a prison term, the tragedy is far worse when the sentence is death. In the former case society can at least make some reparation for the time unjustly served, but no fact is more obvious than the fact that nothing can be done for the dead. To execute even one innocent person is inexcusable, and there is no way in the world that we can rule that possibility not without abolishing the death penalty.

(iv)   *Capital punishment compromises the judicial system* – capital punishment compromises our judicial system in two ways. First, though the point of capital punishment is to present a tough stance against crime, it sometimes has the opposite effect. Juries have been known to strain the evidence to convict defendants of lesser charges – or even to acquit them – when a conviction of first degree murder carries a mandatory death sentence. Second, cases of capital punishment invariably involve years of costly appeals. Not only does that delay justice, but it also subjects the victims' families, as well as the convicts, to years of cruel and unusual punishment.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1. Given your understanding of the *retentionists* and *abolitionists* argument, do you think capital punishment should be retained?

4.4.   Summary

The unit examines the argument for and against capital punishment as advanced by the *retentionists* and *abolitionists*. The argument therein seems to strike a balance such that the idea of capital punishment can and may still retain its essence if imposed by rightful authority for a crime committed.

4.5.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Aigbodioh, J. A. (2004). *Practical Issues in Applied ethics: The Facts, Arguments and Options,* Ekpoma: Inno Printing Press.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study,Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Reid, C. L (1981). Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

4.6.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   This is dependent on the preference you have as a student regarding whether capital punishment should be retained (retentionist) or abolished (proscribed). Your preference and reason or argument for such preference can certainly be different from mine. There is no yes or no answer to this question.

In my own opinion, I think it should be abolished, so I belong to the abolitionist school of thought. My reason for this is because, life is sacred from womb to the tomb. Since we cannot create life, we should not take life as a form of capital punishment. I also think that it is illogical because someone has killed another person either in an armed robbery or kidnapping or whatever situation and the punishment for killing someone is to kill the person that has killed someone. Another means of punishment for grievous offences should be devised as against capital punishment.

End of module Questions

1.   Punishment and capital punishment are one and the same thing. True of false?
2.   The death of Socrates is an example of ---------------- kind of punishment?

MODULE 2   ABORTION

UNIT 1   MEANING AND NATURE OF ABORTION

1.1.   Introduction

This unit sets to examine the meaning and nature of abortion. It among other things unveils the methods and ways of carrying out abortion as well as the moral question attached to abortion.

1.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   to unveil the meaning and nature of abortion;
•   to explain some of the methods and ways of carrying out abortion;
•   to discuss the moral question associated with abortion with particular reference to the nature of the foetus.

1.3.   Meaning and Nature of Abortion

1.3.1. What is Abortion?

Abortion according to C. L. Reid (1981:362) was forcibly broughtto the attention of Americans during the period in which horribly deformed babies were being born to women who had been given thalidomide drugs during pregnancy. It was illegal and women who had taken the tranquilizer on a physician's advice had to decide whether to abort illegally, risk bearing an armless or legless child,or go abroad for a legal abortion at a great expense. This seems to be one of the major incidents that brought the issue of abortion into limelight. However, the proper way to understand abortion is to review its etymological conception. Abortion is derived from two Latin words, *ab* and *oriri* which mean "off or away," and "to be born," respectively. Therefore, abortion

etymologically means "to be born off or away" (Aigbodioh, 2004:101). Aside this, abortion generally is conceived as the untimely termination of pregnancy before due delivery or what Olen & Barry (1991:163) refer to as "the termination of pregnancy." The implication of this suggests abortion as "the expulsion of a fetus from the womb before it is viable, that is, before it can live outside the mother" (J. F. Awajiusuk, 2012:36). While abortion to the Catholic Church is seen as "deliberate and direct killing, by whatever means it is carried out, of a human being in the initial phase of his or her existence, extending from conception to birth" (see Aigbodioh, 2004:101).

Abortion can happen for a number of reasons. These include spontaneous abortion which could be as a result of biochemical factors or because of an injury to the woman, pregnancy got as a result of rape, incest, unwanted pregnancy among others.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1.	What is your understanding of abortion?

1.3.2. Methods of Abortion

There are various methods and techniques by which abortion could be procured in modern orthodox medicine. Some of the methods of abortion may be summed as articulated in Aigbodioh (2004: 104 - 106 and W. T. Osemwegie, 2012: 23-24) in the following manner.

1. *The Dilatation and Curettage (D & C) Technique*: The D & C is one of the oldest techniques of bringing about abortion. D & C as it is often called is the use of a sharp curette (loop-shaped knife) to cut the *conceptus* or baby into pieces and then evacuated through the cervix of the woman. This method involves high possibilities of infection.

2. *Suction Abortion:* This technique consists in the use of a suction apparatus. It is also called uterine aspiration. This method is usually used before the twelfth week of pregnancy. Here, the cervix of the mother is widened and a hollow tube with a suction machine (aspirator) is placed or slide into the uterus to rip up the baby and then suction off; i.e. empty the pieces into a vessel. This does not require the use of a sharp curette and so it is an improvement on the D & C. however, there is still likelihood of infection.

3. *Saline Abortion:* This method is carried out after twelfth week of pregnancy. Here a needle is inserted through the abdominal wall into the amniotic sac where the fetus is planted. The needle

contained a saline solution which the fetus swallows and causes itto die within two hours of dehydration and hemorrhage. Within 24 hours the woman goes into labour and delivers a dead fetus. This method may result in complications and causes psychological problems for the woman.

4.   *Prostagladins Abortion:* This method is similar to the saline abortion. Like the saline abortion, it is performed in later pregnancies usually between 3 to 6 weeks. The procedure is that a physician will inject prostaglandins; a hormones for natural birth and saline injection into the amniotic sac where the *conceptus* is floating which result in a premature delivery and death of the baby.

5.   *Self-induced Abortion:* This form of abortion is carried out with little or no proper medical supervision. In most cases, it is secretly carried out by woman; especially young girls who patronize road side chemists or pharmacy stores to buy abortion pills and some of these pills are swallowed while others are inserted into the body through the virginal which eventually terminate the life of the fetus. Apart from these pills, many also swallow local herbs, take dry-gins etc. this method can easily result in infections and hemorrhaging. Complications may be very severe to cause both death of the woman and the fetus. It is strongly discouraged. It accounts for one of the strong reasons in support of the legalization of abortion.

1.3.3. Moral Question about Abortion

Abortion like any other moral issues raises the question of its morality or otherwise. The central moral question attached to abortion is the question of the biological status of the fetus. That is, at what stage does life begins? This question raises further queries concerning the ontological status of the fetus such as: (i) whetherthe fetus is an individual organism; (ii) whether the fetus is biologically a human being; (iii) whether the fetus is psychologically a human being; and (iv) whether the fetus is aperson.

In response to the question of when life begins, three fundamental perspectives were given. They are (i) Conception (ii) Quickening (iii) Viability.

Some scholars are of the view that life begins at conception, that isthe moment a female germ cell, or *ovum*, is penetrated by male germ cell, *spermatozoon*. This is the period spanning through the first trimester. This position is often associated with the religious people. Others are of

the view that life begins at the second trimester which is the quickening stage. This is the stage at which the mother begins to feel the movements of the fetus. This occurs somewhere between the thirteenth and twentieth weeks while another stage in the development of the fetus is the viability stage. This is the point at which the fetus is capable of surviving outside the womb. The fetus ordinarily reaches viability around the twenty-fourth week (Ollen & Barry, 1991:162-163).

Self-Assessment Exercise

2. -------------------, Quickening and ------------------ are three important question regarding the beginning of life

1.4.   Summary

The unit examines the meaning and nature of abortion. Abortion is conceived as untimely termination of pregnancy which could be intentional or accidental. Five methods of abortion were discussed. The central question that deals with the ontological status of the fetus is examined along the probable responses to the biological and/or the ontological status of the fetus.

1.5.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Aigbodioh, J. A. (2004). *Practical Issues in Applied ethics: The Facts, Arguments and Options,* Ekpoma: Inno Printing Press.

Awajiusuk, J. F. (2012). "Abortion: A Critical Exposition," in C. J. Ekwealo (ed.), *Applied and Practical Ethics: A Simplified Course Text,* Vol. I. Lagos: African Environment Ethics and Values Research Group.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2001). "Abortion," in Mabol Olaolu & Ebun Oduwole (eds.) Fundamental Theories and Issues in Ethics, Ibadan: BEN-EL Books.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Osemwegie, W. T. (2012). "Ethical Issues in Abortion," in C. J. Ekwealo (ed.), *Applied and Practical Ethics: A Simplified Course Text,* Vol. I. Lagos: African Environment Ethics and Values Research Group.

Reid, C. L (1981). Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

1.6.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   Abortion is the killing of a baby in the womb normally referred to as embryo or foetus. This killing could take different forms, deliberate or non-deliberate.

2.   Conception and viability

UNIT 2   VIEWS AND TYPES OF ABORTION

Unit Structure

2.1   Introduction

In this unit attention is given to types of abortion. This is done within the understanding of the three major views (schools) of thought (conservative, libertarian and moderate).

2.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

- to unveil the different schools of thought that relate toabortion;
- to explain the three major types of abortion

2.3   Views and Types of Abortion

2.3.1 Schools of Thought in Abortion

Abortion as a moral issue has been addressed from different perspectives. These perspectives are referred to as schools of thought and they include conservative, libertarian and moderateschools of thought. This will be explained one after the other.

Conservative School of Thought – this school of thought is often associated with the Church, especially the Roman Catholics. To them abortion under any guise is immoral and should not be accepted. In the view of the conservative, "human life starts at conception, that is, as soon as the chromosomes from the sperm of the father and the ovum of the mother are united, then a human being exists that must be valued in the same way as if 'he or she' were already born (J. P. Thiroux, 1995:279). The thought of this school is vehemently against abortion. In fact, they are technically refered to as *pro-life.*

The Libertarian School of Thought – this is a direct opposite of the conservative position. In the view of the libertarian, abortion is always morally justifiable, regardless of the reasons or the time in foetal development. Their position is premised on the absolute right of the mother, and this position is shared by almost all feminists.For instance, Margret Sanger, a feminist, argues that "no woman can call herself free who does not own and control her body" (A. O. Echekwube, 1999:199). To them the fetus is more or less aparasite whose survival hinges on the carrier, that is, the mother.

The Moderate School of Thought – the view of this school is moreor less a go between the conservative and the libertarian. In theirview, abortion should be permitted up to a certain point in feotaldevelopment and/or claim that some reasons, not all, provide asufficient justification for abortion (see E. Barcalow, 1994:235).This position is defended in two ways: one we might maintain thatwhile a fetus is not a person at conception, it becomes a person atsome point before birth. Two, that though a fetus is not fully anactual person before birth, the closer it comes to the ninth month,the closer it transforms from a potential person to an actual person.

Self-Assessment Exercise

> 1. ---------------, Conservative and ------------------ are the three schools of thoughts in abortion discourse

2.3.2 Types of Abortion

Following the different schools of thought in abortion, three major types of abortion are identified. They are spontaneous, induced and therapeutic abortion.

Spontaneous abortion – these are abortions that occurred as a result of internal biochemical factors or because of an injury to the woman. These kinds of abortions are ordinarily termed*miscarriage.* These generally involve no moral issues (Olen & Barry, 1991:163). This kind of abortion do affects the psychological state of the woman/carrier which in any case requires consolation from her spouse, families and relatives for the loss.

Induced abortion – this type of abortion occurs when a pregnant woman deliberately, voluntarily, intentionally, willfully or consciously remove or terminate her pregnancy for reasons that best suit her. These reasons popularly or often range from rape, unwanted babies, incest, poverty, psycho-dysfunctioning or damage, social or economic hardship etc. Unlike the spontaneous abortion; the woman does not feel sorrowful

for the loss of an unexpected baby, neither is she psychologically affected by the loss of the baby (W. T. Osemwegie, 2012:23). This form of abortions happens very early, as when a woman takes a drug such as the 'morning-after pill' in order to prevent the blastocyst from implanting in the uterine wall (Olen & Barry, 1991:163).

Therapeutic abortion – this type of abortion is often carried out to protect and/or safe the life and health of the carrier, that is, the pregnant woman. The pregnancy is terminated following medical advice when it is perceived that the pregnancy poses health challenges or risk to the life of the mother. In this type of abortion the woman may be unhappy, sad about the loss of the baby but she does not have a choice (W. T. Osemwegie, 2012:23).

Self-Assessment Exercise

---

1.   Outline and discuss any two of the types of abortion.
2.   Therapeutic abortion is the type when a pregnant woman deliberately,voluntarily, intentionally, willfully or consciously remove or terminate
3.   her pregnancy for reasons that best suit her. True/ False?

This unit exposes the major views and types of abortion. This is achieved through a peep into the meaning and nature of the different views that is associated with abortion.

2.4   Summary

The unit examined the three views through which abortion is discussed, namely conservative, libertarian and moderate. It discussed the three major types of abortion, that is, spontaneous, induced and therapeutic abortion.

2.5   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Barcalow, E. (1994). *Moral Philosophy: theory and Issues,* Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2001). "Abortion," in Mabol Olaolu & Ebun Oduwole (eds.) Fundamental Theories and Issues in Ethics, Ibadan: BEN-EL Books.

Echekwube, A. O. (1999). *Contemporary Ethics: History, theories and Issues,* Lagos: Spero Book Ltd.

Olen, J. & Barry, V. (1991). *Applying Ethics: A Test with Readings,* 4th Ed. Califonia: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Osemwegie, W. T. (2012). "Ethical Issues in Abortion," in C. J. Ekwealo (ed.), *Applied and Practical Ethics: A Simplified Course Text,* Vol. I. Lagos: African Environment Ethics and Values Research Group.

Thiroux, J. P. *Ethics: Theory and Issues,* New Jersey: Prentice Hall Inc.

2.6   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   Moderate and liberal
2.   Induced and spontaneous
       Induced abortion is the type that happens when a pregnant lady
       brings about the removal or termination of the pregnancy.
       Spontaneous abortion is the type that happened due to some harm
       to the woman. The woman usually has no hand in bringing about
       the termination of the pregnancy. It is rather due to some
       irregularities in the hormonal or biological composition of the
       woman's body at a particular point in time.
3.   False

UNIT 3   ARGUMENT FOR AND AGAINST ABORTION

3.1.   Introduction

This unit sets to examine arguments advanced for and against the morality or otherwise of abortion. This is to further the readers understanding of the views on abortion as earlier discussed. This is done with a reflection on the *Pro-choice* and *Pro-life* contention on the morality and/or otherwise of abortion. Those who support abortion and argue for its permissibility are the one termed *Pro- choice*, while those who oppose it are referred to as *Pro-life* (W. T. Osemwegie, 2012:27-28; C. L. Reid, 1981; Olen & Barry, 1991; A. O. Echekwube, 1999; J. A. Aigbodioh, 2004). Each of these two strands has its contention on which their position is spurred. It is their views and positions that this unit sets to bring to fore.

3.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   to understand the difference between the *Pro-choice* and *Pro-life*;
•   to be able to familiarize with some of the arguments that sustained abortion as well as those that stand against its acceptance.

Here we shall be examining the argument for and against abortion. This is fundamental to understanding the essence of abortion in order to ascertain its permissibility and/or otherwise in thecontemporary age.

3.3.   **Argument for and Against Abortion**

3.3.1. Argument for Abortion

The *Pro-choice* argument for the permissibility of capital punishment can be articulated under the following (i) women have rights over their own bodies (ii) Unwanted pregnancies carry physical and emotional burdens (iii) the alternative to legal abortion is back alley abortion (iv) the woman counts more thanthe fetus.

(i)   *Women have rights over their own bodies* - the main argument here is that an unwanted pregnancy is an invasion of the woman's body, and to force a woman to carry fetus to term is to force her to use her body for purposes she doesn't want to use it for. So the real issue here is whether they have the right to avail themselves of a simple, safe medical procedure to allow themselves to live their lives as they choose. Clearly the answer has to be yes. It is as fundamental a right as one can think of it.

(ii)   *Unwanted pregnancies carry physical and emotional burdens –* the point here is that pregnancy is not easy for women. Apart from the morning sickness, the back pains, the pain of childbirth, and a host of other discomforts in normal pregnancies, the possibility of unforeseen complications poses a real risk to their physical health and sometimes even their lives. To demand that a woman face all that in an unwanted pregnancy is to demand too much. And the unreasonable demands do not even stop there. Unwanted pregnancies carry emotional burdens as well as physical ones. Pregnancy can be a significant interruption in a woman's life, and motherhood can bring a serious disruption of her hopes and plans. Reproductive freedom is not just a slogan. It is a matter of allowing awoman to control her own destiny.

(iii)   *The alternative to legal abortion is back alley abortion –* thisis saying that thinking that the burdens of unwanted pregnancy are minor, but many women don't. If safe, legal abortions are not available to them they will resort to unsafe, illegal abortions. And if the past is any guide, that means serious infections in many cases and in some cases even death, especially for poor women who won't be able to afford anything but back alley abortion.

(iv)   *The woman counts more than the fetus –* the argument here is that the woman counts more than the fetus. It is argued that such position that the fetus counts more than the woman is a single

assumption which cannot be true. To the *Pro-choice,* through this argument a woman is a full-fledged person. She has real desires and fears, real aspirations and memories. She is connected to the world through her family and friends. She cares about her life and her future. At the very most a fetus has only the potential for all that. And though, that is not suggestive of the assumption that the fetus' potential counts for nothing, but that an *actual* full human life out in the world has to count more than a *potential* full human life in the womb.

3.3.2 Argument against Abortion

The *Pro-life* argument for the impermissibility of abortion include the following (i) Abortion is murder (ii) Abortion sets a dangerous precedent (iii) Abortion involves psychological risks to the woman
(iv) Alternative to abortion are available (v) Women must be responsible for their sexual activity

(i)   *Abortion is murder* – the simple fact of this argument in matter of abortion is that it is murder. What you call a 'fetus' is an unborn baby, a human being, and an abortion is nothing but the deliberate killing of that human being.

(ii)   *Abortion sets a dangerous precedent* – the point here in the view of the pro-life is that anything that leads to disrespect for human life is wrong. Whatever else you say about abortion, it certainly leads to disrespect for and a causal attitude toward human life. And that doesn't just hold for abortions of convenience or for sex selection. It holds for therapeutic abortions and abortions of deformed fetuses as well. Once we decide that some human lives can be destroyed because they are inconvenient or not worth living, what is to stop us from killing the severely handicapped, the dysfunctional, the senile, and the mentally ill.

(iii)   *Abortion involves psychological risks to the woman* – the argument here is that a woman and the child she is carrying are as close to each other as any two humans can get. And this is not just biological closeness, but emotional and psychological. Just ask any mother. A woman who intentionally harms her unborn child violates the deepest levels of her unconscious needs and desires, and she is bound to pay a psychological price for it. Many already have, as both psychologists and women who have had abortions can tell you.

(iv)   *Alternative to abortion are available* – the pro-life through this anti-abortion argument posits that the rights advocates of abortion only make it sound as though abortion is the only alternative to rearing an unwanted child. But it is not. Countless couples and individuals are dying to have children but cannot, because of all the abortion mills throughout the country, many of them cannot even adopt a health infant. So, adoption is one alternative to abortion. Even in cases of severely deformed infants there are alternatives. If no one wants to adopt them, there are plenty of agencies and institutions to take care of them.

(v)   *Women must be responsible for their sexual activity* – the onus of this argument is that no woman *has* to get pregnant if she does not want. There are plenty of readily available contraceptives in the market. If a woman doesn't take advantage of them, it is her own fault and she has to take responsibility for her carelessness. To condone abortion is to condone her own irresponsibility. Even worse, it is to condone the killing of innocent life as an after-the-fact form of birth control.

Self-Assessment Exercise

---

1.   Within your understanding of the *Pro-choice* and *Pro-life*, do you think abortion should be legalized? Justify your claim.

2.   Abortion is murder
      Abortion sets a dangerous precedent
      Abortion involves psychological risks to the woman
      Alternative to abortion are available
      Women must be responsible for their sexual activity. These are statements made by Pro-choice people. True or False?

3.4   Summary

The unit examines the argument for and against abortion as advanced by the *Pro-choice* and *Pro-life.* The argument therein seems to strike a balance such that the idea of abortion can and may still retain its essence if the views of the schools of thought in abortion could be sustained.

3.5   **References/Further Reading/Web resources**

Aigbodioh, J. A. (2004). *Practical Issues in Applied ethics: The Facts, Arguments and Options,* Ekpoma: Inno Printing Press.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2001). "Abortion," in Mabol Olaolu & Ebun Oduwole (eds.) Fundamental Theories and Issues in Ethics, Ibadan: BEN-EL Books.

Echekwube, A. O. (1999). *Contemporary Ethics: History, theories and Issues,* Lagos: Spero Book Ltd. Olen, J. & Barry, V. (1991). *Applying Ethics: A Test with Readings,*4th Ed. Califonia: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Omoregbe, J. (1998) Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study, Lagos: Joja Publishers.

Osemwegie, W. T. (2012). "Ethical Issues in Abortion," in C. J. Ekwealo (ed.), *Applied and Practical Ethics: A Simplified Course Text,* Vol. I. Lagos: African Environment Ethics and Values Research Group.

Reid, C. L (1981). Choice and Action: An Introduction to Ethics, New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc.

3.6   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   This is a personal question that depends what your leanings are. Your answer can be different from mine with different arguments. Personally, I am a pro-life and I do not think abortion should be legalized. My reason is that, it is life and I should not take life.
2.   False

MODULE 3   SAME SEX MARRIAGE

UNIT 1   MEANING AND NATURE OF SAME SEX MARRIAGE

1.1.   Introduction
1.2.   Learning Outcome
1.3.   Meaning and Nature of Same Sex Marriage
      1.3.1. What is Marriage?
      1.3.2. What is Same Sex Marriage?
1.4.   Summary
1.5.   References/Further Reading/Web resources
1.6.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.1   Introduction

This unit attempts a conceptual clarification of the key term of this module, namely; marriage, same sex marriage. In addition to this, it takes a philosophical excursion into the nature of same sex marriage, as well as stating the countries in which it is being legalized.

1.2.   Learning Outcome

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   to comprehend the meaning of marriage and same sex marriage;
•   to understand the nature of same sex marriage;
•   to mention the countries in which same sex marriage is legalized.

1.3.   Meaning and Nature of Same Sex Marriage

1.3.1   What is marriage?

Marriage is the world's oldest institution. In Christendom, it is believed that it was instituted by God himself, (Genesis 2:18) and it is as old as man's creation (Bible Dictionary). Marriage therefore, is believed to be a sacred union that exists between a man and a woman. The term marriage has been described elsewhere as "a socially sanctioned union, typically of one man and one woman, in this connection called husband and wife. Typically, they form a family, socially, through forming a household, which is often subsequently extended biologically, through children. It is found in all societies, but in widely varying forms" (Ibrahim B. Syed, 2019:1). In Islam, marriage has been defined as "a

contract that results in the man and woman living with each other and supporting each other within the limits of what has been laid down for them in terms of rights and obligations" (Ibrahim B. Syed, 2019:4). Furthermore, "it is a mutual contract between a man and a woman whose goal is for each to enjoy the other, become a pious family and sound society (Ibrahim B. Syed, 2019:4).

Marriage according to Lord Bughley refers to, "the voluntary union for life of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others" (Duhaime, L., n.d.). In Islam, the function of marriage has been stated thus:

Marriage acts as an outlet for sexual needs and regulates it so one does not become a slave to his/her desires. It is a social necessity because through marriage, families are established and the family is the fundamental unit of every society…Marriage is the only legitimate way to indulge in intimacy between a man and a woman (Ahmad B. Dogarawa, 2009:2).

It has further been canvassed that:

Marriage exists to bring a man and a woman together as husband and wife to be father and mother to any children their union produces. It is based on the anthropological truth that men and women are different and complementary, the biological fact that reproduction depends on a man and a woman, and the social reality that children need both a mother and a father (Anderson, 2013).

Traditionally, marriage, according to Henry Tichler, "is the socially recognized, legitimized, and supported union of individuals of opposite sexes" (Tichler, 2004:296). He goes further to characterize marriage as involving some basic elements viz:

(1)   It takes place in a public and usually formal manner; (2) it includes sexual intercourse as an explicit element of the relationship; (3) it provides the essential for legitimizing offspring; that is, it provides newborns with socially accepted statuses, and (4) it is intended to be a stable and enduring relationship (Tichler, 2004:296).

Tichler's definition and characterization of marriage is typical of the traditional and religious sense of marriage, and it is the sense in which "marriage" was known for many decades. However, with the advent of liberal voices for the recognition of same-sex couples, there have been several calls for re-conceptualization of the term marriage, to the extent that marriage is now regarded as *the union of two people living together*

as spouses in a family. This characterization fits same-sex marriage quite well. Indeed, it is in this sense that same-sex marriage is basically seen as involving "two people of the same-sex living together as spouses/family" (Tichler, 2004:296). The notion of same-sex connotes so many other notions describing a certain intimate relationship having to do with people of the same sex attracted to each other. Thus, the idea of same-sex involves homosexuality, gay and lesbianism. These terms simply refer to activities of persons having sexual feelings or orientation to persons of their own sex. The terms homosexual and gay are mostly used to characterize the males, while the term lesbian refer to the female homosexuals.

Self-Assessment Exercise

---
1. The traditional conception of marriage is as between either man and man or woman and woman. True or False?

1.3.2 What is same sex marriage?

Same-sex marriage, also known as gay marriage, is a marriage entered into by people of the same sex, either as a secular civil ceremony or in a religious setting. The requirements of a marriage in a country depend on its applicable laws and regulations. In most religious countries, it is imperative that a marriage only takes place between a man and a woman who are bond together to form a family based on both religious and national laws, whereas in some countries that have a rather liberal view on religion, religious law does not play any significant role in a marriage contract between two individuals but rather the provisions of applicable laws. In the Nigerian contest, a legal and legitimate marriage relationship must occur only between a man and a woman, unlike some countries whereby a legal and legitimate marriage may also take place between persons of the same sex.

The practice of same-sex marriage (or gay-marriage as mostly used in the western world) is not a recent thing as some people would want to believe. Though the first law providing for people of same- sex marriage was enacted in the 21st century, precisely in the Netherlands, in April 2001, the practice of same-sex marriage has been there right from ancient times. Historian John Boswell records that the first performance of same-sex marriage between child emperor Elagabus to Hierocles, his chariot driver, as the husband. He is also said to have married Zoticus, an athlete in a lavish public ceremony in Rome. Nero, the first Roman Emperor, is recorded in history to have engaged in same-sex marriage. He married two other males on different occasions.

The first was Pythagoras, with whom Nero was the bride. He later married Sporus, a young boy, and here took the role of the groom. These were done in a public ceremony with all the solemnities of matrimony (Frier, B.W., 2004).

Medieval times accord the same-sex marriage between Perodias and Munho Vandilas in the Galician municipality of Rairiz de Veig, Spain. This union occurred April 16, 1061 and was conducted by a Priest in a small chapel.

The contemporary period witnessed a heightening of gay rights activism in the 1970s, especially in the western world. Though gay people were not initially interested in marriage as they deemed it to be a traditional institution, they successfully laid the seed for recognition of such unions. The search for legal recognition of same-sex relationship took root between the 1980s and 1990s. Denmark was the trail blazer in recognizing a legal relationship between same- sex couples in 1989. In 2001, the Netherlands became the first nation to legally recognize same-sex marriage and since then, many countries have followed suit, viz: Belgium (2003), Spain (2005), Canada (2005), South Africa (2006), Norway (2009) Sweden (2009), Portugal (2010), Iceland (2010); Argentina

(2010) Denmark (2012), Brazil (2013), France (2013), Urguguay (2013) New Zealand (2013) United Kingdom, Luxembery (2015), United States (2015), Ireland (2015), Finland (2017). It is believed that more than 20 nations so far, have legally recognized same sex marriage.

Self-Assessment Exercise

2. Same-sex union is a union entered into by people of similar sex. True/False
3. The practice of same sex union can be found through out all periods of human history. True/False?

The above chronicle, one may argue, does not suggest that same- sex marriage is yet a global phenomenon. But it should be noted that when it began during the Roman Empire and the medieval period, a lot of people took it merely as an isolated phenomenon. But today, the phenomenon has become somewhat ubiquitous around every continent of the world. Meanwhile, it is imperative to note that same-sex marriage is not entirely a western phenomenon. In Africa for instance, there are some traditional societies that recognize and accept the marriage between two women; one taking the role of the man (husband), and the other taking the role of the wife. But this type of marriage is regarded as non-sexual. In Nigeria for instance, it has been recorded that same-sex

marriage is recognized in the southern part of the country. Leo Igwe (2009) notes that in Igbo culture, a woman could marry another woman (as a wife) to perpetuate her inheritance and family lineage, if, for instance, her husband is dead and she had no child for him.

Also, in a childless marriage, where the husband is alive, the wife can take the initiative to marry a younger woman for her husband. This arrangement is also common among the Ibibio, and other sub- cultures. Female same-sex marriage is also practiced in Kenya, among the Gikiyu, Nandi, Kamba, Kipsigis people. There, such marriages are not propelled by homosexuality but is a way of sustaining family lineage and inheritance; especially for families without sons. (Lilian, L.A., & et.al 2013: 35). According to Paul (2011), such traditional practices have been aspects of the traditional practices and were protected under Article II (1) of the 2010 constitution. Paul notes that a case in point was referredto by Justice Jackson Ojwang, where Kibserea, an 85-year-old childless widow married a single mother of two boys who was in her thirties, named Jesang. Kibserea paid a dowry to Jesang's father and atraditional Nandi wedding ceremony was held in 2006. Kibserea had also promised to choose a mature man to satisfy Jesang's sexual needs. In this wise, Kibserea became the socially and legally recognized husband of Jesang, and of course the father of her wife's children. Paul, citing the *Journal of Ethnology notes that:* "… a female husband is a woman who pays bride wealth for, and thus marries (but does not have sexual intercourse with) another woman. By so doing, she becomes the social and legal father of her wife's children." (Paul C., 2011).

1.4. Summary

Marriage is the world's oldest institution which is believed to be a sacred union that exists between a man and a woman. Same-sex marriage is also known as gay marriage which is a marriage entered into by people of the same sex. The first law providing for people of same-sex marriage was enacted in the 21st century, precisely in the Netherlands, in April 2001. In this unit, we have considered the meaning of marriage and same sex marriage. On the meaning of marriage, Lord Bughley refers to marriage as "the voluntary union for life of one man and one woman to the exclusion of all others." Similarly, Henry Tichler (2004) defines marriage as "the socially recognized, legitimized, and supported union of individuals of opposite sexes". Same-sex marriage is a marriage entered into by people of the same sex, either as a secular civil ceremony or in a religious setting. Thus, the foregoing shows that while the western practice of same-sex marriage is propelled by homosexuality, the sub-Saharan Africans practice is borne out of the need to perpetuate the lineage and

inheritance of the family, which could be argued, is based on the traditional demand of marriage.

1.5.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Ahmad, B. D. (2009). Marriage and Divorce in Islam. Available at https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/23194/, accessed on May 15, 2021.

Bible Dictionary, "The institution of marriage dates from the time of man's original creation". Available at www.bible.dictionary.org/marriage, accessed on May 15, 2021.

Chamie, J.f., & Mirkin, B. (2011). Same-sex marriage: A new social phenomenon. Population and Development Review, 37(3), 529-551.

Choi, P. (2016, May 20). Same-sex marriage and the global anti-christian movement. *Global Alliance Newsletter.* Available at www.intercp.org/2013/05/same-sex-marriage-and-the- global-anti-christiaan-movement, accessed on May 15, 2021.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "On Efficient Causation for Homosexual Behaviours among Traditional Africans: An Exploration of the Traditional Yoruba Model." *Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics*, 9 (2)

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "Òrìṣàńlá Made me Thus: Arguing for homosexuality using the Yorùbá Thought System as Paradigm," *LASU Journal of Philosophy,* 1 (1&2)

Duhaime, L. (n.d.). Duhaime's Law Dictionary: Marriage Definition. Available at www.duhaime.org/Legal-Dictionary/Term/Marriage., accessed on May 17, 2021.

Frier, B.W., (2004). Roman Same-Sex Weddings from the Legal Perspective. Classical Studies Newsletter, Volume X.

Gerber, P., Tay, K., & Sifri, A. (2014). Marriage: A Human Right for All? *Sydney Law Review,* 36,643-667.

Ibrahim B. Syed (2019) 'Same Sex Marriage and Marriage in Islam.' Available at http:/www.irfi.org/articles/articles_151_200/same_sex_marriage_and_marriage_i.htm, accessed on May 15, 2021.

Igwe, L. (2009, June 19). Tradition of same gender marriage in Igbo land. *Nigerian Tribune.* 13.

KJV Bible

Lilian, L.A., Sibonile, E.E., Lia, L., & Jane, S., (2013). Gender and Language in Sub-Saharan Africa. John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Paul C. (2011, October 20). Traditional same-sex marriage approved by kenyan court. Available at www.care2.com/causes/traditional-same-sex-marriage

Ryan T. Anderson (2013) Marriage: What it is, why it Matters, and the Consequences of Redefining it. Available at http://www.heritage.org/research/reports, accessed on May 18, 2021.

Ticher, H. L. (2004). Introduction to Sociology. (8th ed). Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth Press

1.6.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   False
2.   True
3.   True

UNIT 2   ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST SAME SEX MARRIAGE

2.1   Introduction

This unit attempts an exposition into the debate about same sex marriage. The debate comes from two camps, whereby one is in support and the other against same sex marriage.

2.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   discuss the arguments for same sex marriage;
•   discuss the arguments against same sex marriage.

2.3.   Arguments on Sex Marriage

The intellectual debate over same-sex marriage has been for several years, and the debate has recently succeeded in gaining same-sex couples some of the same benefits regularly bestowed upon different sex couples in the private and public sectors in some countries. They have thus far been unsuccessful, however, in gaining world-wide recognition of same-sex unions as marriages. In view of the aforementioned, this section shall expose some of the arguments for and against same-sex marriage.

2.3.1. Arguments for Same Sex Marriage

Homosexuality is normal: Homosexuality is a normal variant within the human condition. In some useful aspects, homosexuality might be likened to left-handedness, another normal variant in the human condition. Interestingly, cultural and social pressures often encourage left-handed children to become right-handed althoughevidence indicates that such a forced conversion can cause multiple problems, including learning disorders and stuttering. Historically, religions have

condemned left-handedness, justifying this with many biblical passages, including Matthew 25:32-34. Many religious schools punished students who used their left hands (Alhassan, A.B., 2017). Perhaps even more pertinent is that in 19th century Europe, homosexuals were referred to as "left-handed" (Chris, M., 2019). However, the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Counseling Association, the American Psychiatric Association, the American Psychological Association, the National Association of School Psychologists, the National Association of Social Workers, the National Psychoanalytic Association have all declared that homosexuality is normal (Robinson, B.A., 2017).

Love thy Neighbor: Supporters of same-sex marriage acknowledge there are passages in the Bible that condemn same-sex marriage but they note that biblical traditions grew out of different times with different customs and different needs. Leviticus, for example, widely cited as the basis for God's opposition to homosexuality, also declares that God wants children who curse their parents to be put to death (20:9)

However, the overwhelming message of the New Testament is love, not hate. Jesus never once mentions homosexuality. It is clear that what is important in the Bible is not a family structure based on biology or even heterosexual relationships but the quality of love exhibited in relationships, observes Episcopal priest Rev. Jay Emerson Johnson (Articles of Faith: Biblical Values for American Families). Therefore, if same-sex couples exhibit such love they deserve world-wide acceptance.

Religious and Personal Liberty: Appeals to religious freedom must be rooted in consistent teaching and practice. But the Catholic Church, for instance, does not recognize marriages after divorce, unless the partner seeking to remarry obtains an annulment. Yet it has been willing to accord divorced partners who remarry under civil law the same privileges it accords marriages performed within the Church. The examples opponents to same-sex marriage cite as interfering with religious liberty have all occurred under existing anti-discrimination laws. Are they advocating overturning those laws? In most of these cases religious institutions are not being forced to conform to laws they find morally repugnant. Rather, they are being asked to decide whether they will continue to accept significant government subsidies that come with certain strings attached, as was the case with Catholic Charities involvement with adoptions in Massachusetts and Illinois. Personal liberty is compatible with religious freedom. If exemptions need to be made to accommodate religions that should be possible. The courts have for many years been reviewing and ruling on cases that test the boundary line between religious freedom and equal protection.

Amendments to countries' constitutions to limit marriage to a union of a man and a woman single out one class of men for discrimination. Support seems driven primarily by profound personal discomfort with homosexuality, not a desire to defend the institution of marriage. Indeed, the debate about same-sex marriage may have spurred a dramatic increase in violence toward gays and lesbians. According to political scientist Gary Segura: in 2008, crimes in America against gay men and lesbians accounted for seventy-one percent of all hate-motivated murders and fifty-fivepercent of all hate- motivated rapes. He concludes, "there is simply no other person in society who endures the likelihood of being harmed as a consequence of their identity than a gay man or lesbian" (Amicus Brief). Moral disapproval alone should not be a sufficient reason to deny rights to a minority. Unless a clear and imminent danger exists, countries do not and should not regulate family life on the basis of parental characteristics.

Self-Assessment Exercise

1.	Same sex marriage is normal is one of the arguments for same sex union. True or False

2.3.2. Arguments against Same Sex Marriage

Same sex marriage is a sin: The acceptance of same-sex marriage legitimizes and gives society's blessing on homosexual behavior. Almost all major religions condemn homosexuality as sinful behavior (See William Witt, Hermeneutics of Same-sex Marriage. March 4, 2012. http://willgwitt.org/hermeneutics_of_same- sex practice/). Leviticus, the third book of the Hebrew Bible says, "Thou shalt not lie with mankind, as with womankind: it is abomination" (Leviticus 18:22). The New Testament affirms this view, noting, "… God gave them over to shameful lusts. Even their women exchanged natural relations for unnatural ones…Men committed indecent acts with other men, and received in themselves the due penalty for their perversion" (Romans 1:26-27). Islam teaches that homosexuality is a vile form of fornication punishable by death (Guide to Understanding Islam). Orthodox Judaism considers it an "abomination" and punishable by death (Rabbi Amsel). In 2003, the Southern Baptist Convention came to a resolution which stated that "'same-sex marriage' would conveya societal approval of a homosexual lifestyle, which the Bible calls sinful and dangerous both to the individuals involved and to society at large" (On Same-Sex Marriage, June 2003). Similarly, the Evangelical Presbyterian Church believes, "[H]omosexual practice is a distortion of the image of God as it is still reflected in fallen man, and a perversion of the sexual relationship as God intended it to be" (Position Paper on

Homosexuality).

Same-sex "marriage" would further isolate marriage from its procreative purpose: Traditionally, marriage and procreation have been tightly connected to one another. Indeed, from a sociological perspective, the primary purpose that marriage serves is to secure a mother and father for each child who is born into a society. Now, however, many Westerners see marriage in primarily emotional terms. Among other things, the danger with this mentality is that it fosters an anti-natalist mindset that fuels population decline, which in turn puts tremendous social, political, and economic strains on the larger society. Same-sex marriage would only further undercut the procreative norm long associated with marriage insofar as it establishes that there is no necessary link between procreation and marriage. This was spelt out in the *Goodridge* decision in Massachusetts, where the majority opinion dismissed the procreative meaning of marriage. It is no accident that the countries that have legalized or are considering legalizing same-sex marriage have some of the lowest fertility rates in the world. For instance, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Canada have birthrates that hover around 1.6 children per woman--well below the replacement fertility rate of 2.1.

Same-Sex Marriage Endangers Children: "Marriage is fundamentally about the needs of children," says David Blankenhorn, author of The Future of Marriage and the founder and president of the Institute for American Values. "(W)hat children need most are mothers and fathers" (Robert P. George and Ryan T. Anderson, April 23, 2007.). The mother and the father bring different and important traits to child rearing. Psychiatrist Harold M. Voth of the Menninger Foundation wrote in 1978, "One of the most important functions of parenting is to evoke, develop and reinforce gender identity and then proceed to shepherd the developing child in such a way as to bring his psychological side into harmony with his biological side and therefore develop a solid sense of maleness or femaleness . . ." (Report of Commission on Sexual Orientation and the Law. State of Hawaii). Children are better off when raised by both a father and mother. Child Trends, a leading independent nonpartisan research concludes;

Research clearly demonstrates that family structure matters for children, and the family structure that helps children the most is a family headed by two biological parents in a low-conflict marriage. Children in single parent families, children born to unmarried mothers, and children in step-families or cohabiting relationships face higher risks of poor outcomes . . . . There is thus value for children in promoting strong, stable marriages between biological parents . . . . [I]t is not simply the presence of two parents . . . but the presence of two biological parents

that seems to support children's development. (Kristin Anderson Moore, Susan M. Jekielek and Carol Emig, June 2002)
The Catholic Church raises to a moral principle "the right of the child to be born from one father and one mother who are father and mother both from a biological and a legal point of view" (Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church).

We know from biology that two males or two females cannot have a marital union that is biologically open to new life. This means that, in order for a same-sex couple to conceive a child, the couple would have to take either sperm or an egg from someone who is a stranger to their relationship. So, in order to conceive a child, a same-sex couple would have to overlook the child's right to be raised by both of his or her biological parents.

Religious Liberty: The acceptance of same-sex marriage can be said to be a threat to religious freedom. The Catholic Church defines 'religious freedom' as meaning "that all men are to be immune from coercion on the part of individuals or of social groups and of any human power, in such wise that no one is to be forced to act in a manner contrary to his own beliefs, whether privately or publicly, whether alone or in association with others, within due limits" (Dignitatis Humane. Pope Paul VI. December 7, 1965). If same-sex marriage is widely accepted, churches will be forced to aid and abet behavior contrary to their moral teachings. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops notes, Changing the legal term "marriage" is not one change in the law, but rather amounts to thousands of changes at once. The term "marriage" can be found in family law, employment law, trusts and estates, healthcare law, tax law, property law, and many others. These laws affect and pervasively regulate religious institutions, such as churches, religiously-affiliated schools, hospitals, and families... When Church and State disagree on what the term "marriage" means … conflict results . . . as the State will apply various sanctions against the Church for its refusal to comply with the State's definition" (Marriage: Unique for a Reason. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops).

Self-Assessment Exercise

> 2. Same-Sex Marriage Endangers Children is an argument put forward by those in support of same sex union. True or False

2.4.   Summary

According to the supporters of same-sex marriage, homosexuality is a normal variant within the human condition. It was pointed out that even Jesus Christ never mentioned homosexuality in his response to the Pharisee's question but emphasized 'love' as the most supreme of all laws. Opponents of same-sex marriage posit that same sex-marriage is a sin against God. Furthermore, it does not conform with the ideal of marriage, which is supposed to be between man and woman. In this unit, we have been able to discuss the arguments for and against same-sex marriage. Advocates of same-sex marriage see homosexuality as a normal variant within the human condition and should be accepted generally. On the other hand, the reasons given by opponents of same-sex marriage are grounded on biological stance, religious stance and purpose of the institution of marriage. With respect to the institution of marriage, these opponents argue, same-sex couples are simply not similar to different sex couples, because marriage by definition, morally and practically requires a man and a woman.

2.5.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Alhassan, A.B., (2017). "Left Handedness, The Bible and The Quran: Implication for Parents and Teachers". Research & Reviews: Journal of Educational Studies

Amicus Brief. ACLU of Northern California and LAMBDA Legal Defense and Education Fund. 2010. http://www.nclrights.org/site/DocServer/2011_03_01 EQCA_et_al Amicus_Brief.pdf?docID=8241

Articles of Faith: Biblical Values for American Families.http://www.clgs.org/resource-library/articles-faith-biblical-values-american-families

Chris, M., (2019). "Half a Century of Handedness Research: Myths, Truths; Fictions, Facts; Backwards, but mostly Forwards." Brain Neurosci Adv.

Compendium of the Social Doctrine of the Church. http://www.catholicculture.org/culture/library/view.cfm?recn um=7215

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "On Efficient Causation for Homosexual Behaviours among Traditional Africans: An Exploration of the Traditional Yoruba Model." Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics, 9

(2)

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "Òrìṣàńlá Made me Thus: Arguing for homosexuality using the Yorùbá Thought System as Paradigm," LASU Journal of Philosophy, 1 (1&2)

Dignitatis Humane. Pope Paul VI. December 7, 1965. http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_cou n cil/documents/vat-ii_decl_19651207_dignitatis-humanae_en.html

For national fertility rates, see: *http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/geos/sw.html* For more on the growing disconnect between marriage and procreation, see:

http://marriage.rutgers.edu/Publications/SOOU/SOOU2003. pdf

Guide to Understanding Islam. http://www.thereligionofpeace.com/Quran/026-homosexuality.htm

Kristin Anderson Moore, Susan M. Jekielek and Carol Emig, Marriage from a Child's Perspective: How Does Family Structure Affect Children, and What Can We Do About It? Child Trends Research Brief. June 2002. http://www.childtrends.org/files/marriagerb602.pdf Leviticus 18:22

Marriage: Unique for a Reason. The United States Conference of Catholic Bishops.http://www.marriageuniqueforareason .org/religious-liberty-faq/Matthew 22:35-40

On Same-Sex Marriage (June 2003). http://www.sbc.net/resolutions/amResolution.asp?ID=1128

Position Paper on Homosexuality. http://www.epc.org/about-the-epc/position-papers/homosexuality/

Rabbi Amsel, Homosexuality in Orthodox Islam. http://www.lookstein.org/resources/homosexuality_amsel.pd f

Robert P. George and Ryan T. Anderson, "Our Marital Future", National Review. April 23, 2007. http://www.nationalreview.com/articles/220636/ourmarital-

future/robert-p-george

Robinson, B.A., (2017). Reparative Therapy: Statements byProfessional Associations and Their Leaders.ReligiousTolerance.org. http://www.religioustolerance.org/using-reparative-therapy-1.htm

2.6.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   True
2.   False

End of the Module Questions

1.   Love thy neighbor is one of the arguments put forward --------
      same sex marriage
2.   Highlight three arguments against same sex marriage.

MODULE 4   CLONING

UNIT 1   UNDERSTANDING CLONING

1.1.   Introduction

This unit attempts a conceptual clarification of the key term of this module, cloning. In addition to this, it takes a philosophical excursion into the history of cloning as well as the types and usesof cloning.

1.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

- comprehend the meaning of cloning;
- understand the historical evolution of cloning;
- discuss different types and uses of cloning.

1.3.   Understanding Cloning

1.3.1. What is Cloning?

The word clone is used in many different contexts in biological research but in its most simple and strict sense, it refers to a precise genetic copy of a molecule, cell, plant, animal, or human being. In some of these contexts, cloning refers to established technologies that have been part of agricultural practice for a very long time and currently form an important part of the foundations of modern biological research.

Indeed, genetically identical copies of whole organisms are commonplace in the plant breeding world and are commonly referred to

as "varieties" rather than clones. Many valuable horticultural or agricultural strains are maintained solely byvegetative propagation from an original plant, reflecting the ease with which it is possible to regenerate a complete plant from a small cutting. The developmental process in animals does not usually permit cloning as easily as in plants. Many simpler invertebrate species, however, such as certain kinds of worms, are capable of regenerating a whole organism from a small piece, even though this is not necessarily their usual mode of reproduction. Vertebrates have lost this ability entirely, although regeneration of certain limbs, organs, or tissues can occur to varying degrees in some animals.

Although a single adult vertebrate cannot generate another whole organism, cloning of vertebrates does occur in nature, in a limited way, through multiple births, primarily with the formation of identical twins. However, twins occur by chance in humans and other mammals with the separation of a single embryo into halves at an early stage of development. The resulting offspring are genetically identical, having been derived from one zygote, which resulted from the fertilization of one egg by one sperm.

At the molecular and cellular level, scientists have been cloning human and animal cells and genes for several decades. The scientific justification for such cloning is that it provides greater quantities of identical cells or genes for study; each cell or molecule is identical to the others.

At the simplest level, molecular biologists routinely make clones of deoxyribonucleic acid (DNA), the molecular basis of genes. DNA fragments containing genes are copied and amplified in a host cell, usually a bacterium. The availability of large quantities of identical DNA makes possible many scientific experiments. This process, often called molecular cloning, is the mainstay of recombinant DNA technology and has led to the production of such important medicines as insulin to treat diabetes, tissue plasminogen activator (tPA) to dissolve clots after a heart attack, and erythropoietin (EPO) to treat anemia associated with dialysis for kidney disease.

Another type of cloning is conducted at the cellular level. In cellular cloning copies are made of cells derived from the soma, or body, by growing these cells in culture in a laboratory. The genetic makeup of the resulting cloned cells, called a cell line, is identical to that of the original cell. This, too, is a highly reliable procedure, which is also used to test and sometimes to produce new medicines such as those listed above. Since molecular and cellular cloning of this sort does not involve germ cells (eggs or sperm), the cloned cells are not capable of

developing into a baby.

The third type of cloning aims to reproduce genetically identical animals. Cloning of animals can typically be divided into two distinct processes, blastomere separation and nuclear transplantation cloning.

2.3.1. Self-Assessment Exercise

---

1.   In your own words, describe what cloning means

2.3.2. History of Cloning

In 1903 Herber Webber, a U.S. department of agriculture personal, was the first to use the word 'clon' which later was spelled clone. According Clone Safety, Webber's definition of a 'clon' was "any group of cells or organisms produced asexually from a single sexually produced ancestor" (Clone Safety). The first historically noted cloning was with frogs. This cloning was done by Robert Briggs and Thomas King in 1952. This idea of cloning frogs was first offered up by Hans Spemann in 1938 (Clone Safety). In 1963 China created clones of carp. According to Wikipedia Tong Dizhou performed the process by "inserting the DNA from a cell of a male carp into an egg from a female carp" (Clone Safety; Wikipedia).

During the years of 1994 and 1997 scientists Neal First, Ian Wilmut, and his colleagues at Roslin institute contributed to the cloning of Dolly the sheep. 1994 - Neal First makes genetic copies of calves from embryos whose cells then divide until they reach about 120. 1995 – Wilmut builds onto First's experiment by using sheep embryos instead and inactivating the embryos before transferring the nuclei from the embryos into sheep eggs. 1996 - Wilmut and his colleagues had a successful cloned sheep that everyone knows as Dolly. 1997 – Wilmut and his colleagues officially went public with their successful cloned sheep (ahc.umn). This progress in cloning brought up many questions about the ethics and safety of cloning causing President Bill Clinton to place a five-year ban on cloning in 1997 (ahc.umn). In 1998 The University of Hawaii had successfully clone three generations of mice (ahc.umn).

In 2003 the U.S. House passed the Human Cloning Prohibition Act. Canada followed close behind by also banning cloning in 2005. Unlike the U.S. and Canada, South Korea allows scientists to continue attempts at cloning. Also, in 2005 "United Nations past a non-binding declaration calling on all Member States to ban all forms of human cloning" (UN, 2005). During history, after Dolly, many different animals have been

cloned, including Rhesus monkey, Gaur (first endangered species cloned), cattle, a cat, a dog, a rat, a mule, horse, water buffalo, and a camel have all beencloned. (Donald, 2020: 552)

2.3.3. Types of Cloning

There are three types of cloning, Therapeutic, Reproductive, and DNA Cloning (Human Genome Project).

Therapeutic: The purpose of this cloning is to grow stem cells. They use the stem cells to harvest organs and help treat diseases not for human cloning. (Human Genome Project) According to the Stem Cell Center the definition of therapeutic cloning refers to "the removal of a nucleus, which contains genetic material, from virtually any cell of the body (a somatic cell) and its transfer by injection into an unfertilized egg from which the nucleus has also been removed. The newly reconstructed entity then starts dividing. After 4-5 days in culture, embryonic stem cells then can be removed and used to create many embryonic stem cells in culture" (Stem Cell Centre).
Many times, while attempting therapeutic cloning the embryo is destroyed, causing many people to be skeptical of this type of cloning (CBSE).

Reproductive: Reproductive cloning is the most commonly known of the three types of cloning. Reproductive cloning is a technologically based way of creating an animal with the same nuclear DNA as the animal's DNA it was taken from (Human Genome Project). Dolly the sheep was created by reproductive cloning (Human Genome Project). And according to the Human Genome Project this was cause by a process called "'somatic cell nuclear transfer' (SCNT), scientists transfer genetic material from the nucleus of a donor adult cell to an egg whose nucleus, and thus its genetic material, has been removed. The reconstructed egg containing the DNA from a donor cell must be treated with chemicals or electric current in order to stimulate cell division. Once the cloned embryo reaches a suitable stage, it is transferred to the uterus of a female host where it continues to develop until birth" (Human Genome Project).

DNA: DNA cloning is also known as "Molecular cloning, Gene cloning, and Recombinant DNA technology" (CBSE). According to genome.gov "Gene cloning, also known as DNA cloning, is a very different process from reproductive and therapeutic cloning." According to the Human Genome Project, DNA cloning is the "transfer of a DNA fragment of interest from one organism to a self-replicating genetic element such as a bacterial plasmid. The DNA of interest can

then be propagated in a foreign host cell." What this is saying is DNA cloning is making copies of DNA fragments (Human Genome Project; CBSE)

2.3.4. Self-Assessment Exercise

> 2.   The three types of cloning are ----------, ----------- and DNA?

1.3.6 Uses of Cloning

Reproductive Uses: Reproductive cloning could be used by cloning animals and then using the cloned animals for drug testing and other treatments. This could also be used to produce perfect foods like dairy (National Human Genome Research Institute, 2020). Also, Reproductive cloning can be used to rebuild populations. "In 2001, researchers produced the first clone of an endangered species: a type of Asian ox known as a guar. Sadly, the baby guar, which had developed inside a surrogate cow mother, died just a few days after its birth. In 2003, another endangered type of ox, called the Banteg, was successfully cloned. Soon after, three African wildcats were cloned using frozen embryos as a source of DNA. Although some experts think cloning can save many species that would otherwise disappear, others argue that cloning produces a population of genetically identical individuals that lack the genetic variability necessary for species survival" (National Human Genome Research Institute, 2020).

Therapeutic Cloning Uses: Therapeutic cloning can be used "to grow tissues in the laboratory that can be used to grow healthy tissue to replace injured or diseased tissues." This is saying that in the future once this use is perfected many diseases will be cured."In addition, it may be possible to learn more about the molecular

causes of disease by studying embryonic stem cell lines from cloned embryos derived from the cells of animals or humans with different diseases." In the future we will be able to prevent diseases. (National Human Genome Research Institute, 2020).

DNA Cloning Uses: DNA cloning can be used to study the human genome and figure out what genes contribute to certain diseases (CBSE).

1.3.   Summary

Cloning refers to a precise genetic copy of a molecule, cell, plant, animal, or human being. There are three types of cloning, Therapeutic,

Reproductive, and DNA Cloning. Cloning can be used for reproductive, therapeutic and DNA purposes. In this unit, we have considered the meaning, history, types and uses of cloning. We were made to understand that the term 'clone' is being used in many different contexts in biological research. In some of these contexts, cloning is said to refer to established technologies that have been part of agricultural practice for a very long time and currently form an important part of the foundations of modern biological research.

1.4.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

ahc.umn
    http://www.ahc.umn.edu/bioethics/prod/groups/ahc/@pub/@ahc/documents/asset/ahc_75696.pdf

CBSE.
    http://www.cbse.ucsc.edu/sites/default/files/ThreeTypesCloning.pdf

Clone Safety. http://www.clonesafety.org/

Dasaolu, B. O. (2004). "Artificial Human Creation: An Examination of the Cleavage between Theology and Science." *Journal of Philosophy and Culture*, 1 (1).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2008). From Home to the Laboratory: An Ethical Assessment of a New Reproductive Technology, *DRUMSPEAK: International Journal of Research in The Humanities*,1 (1).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2011). "The Idea of Human Cloning in Contemporary Times: Fears and Prospects." *Journal of Philosophy and Development,* 12 (1 & 2).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "The Techno-Moral Case against Cloning: How Martin Heidegger Justifies the Kantian," *Philosophia: E-Journal for Philosophy and Culture.* 19 (1)

Donald, W.L., (2020). *Vertebrate Biology: Systematics, Taxonomy, Natural History, and Conservation*. JHU Press.

Dovey, Dana. 2015. The Science of Human Cloning: How Far We've Come and How Far We're Capable of Going, Medical Daily, Jun 26, 2015.

Evers, Kathinka (2002). European Perspectives on Therapeutic Cloning. New England Journal of Medicine, 346(20), 1579- 1582. Doi: 10.1056/NEJMsb020527

National Human Genome Research Institute, (2020). Cloning Fact Sheet. Available on: https://www.genome.gov/about-genomics/fact-sheets/Cloning-Fact-Sheet

Jensen, Eric A. (2016). The Therapeutic Cloning Debate: Global Science and Journalism in the Public Sphere. Abingdon-on-Thames: Routledge.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1998). Clones and Clones: Facts and Fantasies about Human Cloning. New York, NY: W.W. Norton & Company.

Stem Cell Centre. http://www.stemcellcentre.edu.au/For_the_Public/Types_of_ Stem_Cells/Somatic_Cell_Nuclear_Transfer__SCNT or_T herapeutic_Cloning.aspx

UN, (2005). General Assembly Adopts United Nations Declaration on Human Cloning by Vote of 84-34-37. https://www.un.org/press/en/2005ga10333.doc.htm

1.5.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   Cloning refers to replication of the exact gene of a plant, molecule, animal, human being or cell. The word 'clon' was first used in Agricultural contexts.

2.   Therapeutic cloning, and reproductive cloning

UNIT 2   ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST CLONING

2.1.   Introduction

This unit attempts an exposition into the debate about cloning. The debate comes from two camps, whereby one is in support and the other against cloning.

2.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

- discuss the arguments for cloning;
- discuss the arguments against cloning.

2.4.   Arguments on Cloning

2.4.1. Arguments for Cloning

Cure for infertility: The most straightforward reason why someone may want to reproduce through cloning is to have a genetically related child. Currently, those who want a child but cannot produce an embryo because they are infertile, can either use a donor embryo and carry it to term (or have it carried to term by a surrogate), or adopt a child. In neither case, however, will the child be genetically related to them. Cloning would allow these people to have a genetically related child. Moreover, if a couple uses the female partner's egg in the cloning procedure, then the child could be genetically related to both rearing parents, as it would share his mitochondrial DNA with the woman whose egg was used, and the nuclear DNA of the woman's partner who provided the somatic cell. Many deny that individuals have a justified interest in having a child that is genetically related to them (Bartholet, 1999; Levy and Lotz 2005). Regardless of whether the desire to have a child who is genetically related is ethically problematic in some way, it is often considered a sufficient reason to allow people access to other cures for infertility – namely in-vitro fertilization (IVF).

Therefore, it may also provide a plausible basis for allowing access to cloning technologies.

Increase Health/Well-being for Children: Cloning may also be desirable for parents who do not necessarily want a child who is genetically related to them, but who want a child who is expected to have a high level of health and/or well-being. Cloning would enable parents to have a child with a genome identical to that of a person with good health and/or other desirable characteristics. John Harris (2004, pp. 29-30) stresses the point that cloning allows parents to provide someone with a 'tried and tested' genome, not one created by the genetic lottery of sexual reproduction and the random combination of chromosomes. If we choose our cell donor wisely, Harris argues, we will be able to protect the clone from many hereditary disorders and many other genetic problems. Furthermore, SCNT could be used in combination with gene editing technologies like CRISPR/Cas9 (a type of enzyme, used in gene editing technologies).

This could be used to create 'near' clones, which have the same genotype as a very healthy donor, but with subtle improvements. It is not clear how effective such a technique would be. The effects of genes on health and well-being are relative to the environments in which they are expressed. Subtle environmental changes between generations could turn a genome associated with health to one associated with serious disease. However, if the relevant environmental conditions remain the same, cloning could be the most effective way to create a child with the greatest expected health/wellbeing.

A 'replacement child': In 2009, Panos Zavos, a controversial fertility doctor in the US, claimed to have created cloned embryos using tissues from three deceased people, one of them a young girl who had died in a car crash (Jones, 2009). He said his intent was to study the cloning procedure, not to create babies. However, he stressed that in the future, cloning could be used to create genetic copies of deceased loved ones. For example, parents whose child had died could create a genetically identical 'replacement child'. Again, this could be used in combination with gene editing technologies, to produce near clones of a deceased child. Parents who had tragically lost a child due to some genetic disease, could produce a clone of that child with the fatal flaw corrected. However, the motivation of cloning a child as a replacement is based on erroneous assumptions about cloning. The idea that by cloning a child we would create a copy of that same child embodies the view that identity is solely determined by our genes. But this type of genetic determinism is clearly false. Though genes influence our personal development, so does the complex and irreproducible context in which our lives take place. We know this from studying monozygotic

twins. Notwithstanding, the fact that such twins are genetically identical to each other and, therefore, sometimes look very similar and often share many character traits, habits and preferences, they are different individuals, with different identities (Segal, 1999). Cloning a deceased child would not produce an identical child, but a different child, just as 'standard' reproduction does.

A saviour sibling: A further possible motivation for engaging in cloning is to create a child who could act as a tissue donor for a sick sibling. For example, if a child has a blood disease, the treatment of which requires a hematopoietic stem cell transplantation, stem cells from the umbilical cord blood collected after the birth of the younger clone could be used for transplantation to the progenitor. The creation of such 'saviour siblings' is already permitted using pre-implantation genetic diagnosis and IVF. Cloning could potentially be a more effective method for producing children who are saviour siblings. In sum, cloning could significantly expand our procreative options. The two clearest motivations for using cloning will be as a cure for infertility and to create saviour siblings. As we already allow people to access reproductive technologies for these purposes, these appear to be justified reasons for allowing people to access cloning techniques. An argument is owed for why producing children through cloning is more unethical than using other reproductive technologies (or standard sexual reproduction).

Self-Assessment Exercise

1. Cloning may also be desirable for parents who do not necessarily want a child who is genetically related to them, but who want a child who is expectedto have a high level of health. This is an explanation of what kind of argument for cloning.
   a. Cure for infertility
   b. A 'replacement' child
   c. A savior sibling
   d. Increase well-being for child

2.4.3. Arguments against cloning

Cloning is Unnatural: That cloning is unnatural and therefore wrong is one of the most often heard arguments against cloning (see, for example, The President's Council on Bioethics, 2002, chapter 5) but also one of the least convincing. To say that something is 'unnatural' can be interpreted in various ways. Perhaps the most obvious sense in which cloning is unnatural is that it is artificial – it is the product of

purposeful human activity. It seems implausible, however, that all that is artificial is bad as this implies that all medicine is bad. Another sense in which cloning is unnatural is that it is unusual. It is not what we normally do. But why would the 'unusualness' of something make it wrong? Many new technologies are unusual. We do not generally think that this provides a good reason not to develop or use them. To determine whether we should develop or use new unusual technologies, we typically look at the expected consequences of doing so.

Cloning threatens autonomy: Many fears that cloning threatens the autonomy of a child, by locking them into particular futures. This may be bad in itself, or bad because it might reduce the clone's wellbeing. In its report 'Human Cloning and Human Dignity: An Ethical Inquiry', the President's Council on Bioethics (2002) wrote that being genetically unique is "an emblem of independence and individuality" and allows us to go forward "with a relatively indeterminate future in front of us" (Chapter five, section c). Such concerns have formed the basis of strong opposition to cloning. As discussed above, the concern that a clone's identity and individuality is threatened relies on the mistaken belief that who and what we become is entirely determined by our genes. Sharing the same genome with another organism does not threaten identity, and monozygotic twins are proof of this. Furthermore, it is not clear how cloning threatens an agent's autonomy in a more significant way than normal reproduction. Each child is somewhat limited in the life plans they can pursue because of their genes; cloned or not. As long as an equivalent number of life plans are open to a clone as there are to a normal child, and clones are not coerced into pursuing particular life plans, they can live just as autonomously as normal children.

The clone will be treated as a means: Cloning arouses people's imagination about the clone, but also about those who will choose to have a child through cloning. Often dubious motives are ascribed to them: they would want a child that is 'just like so-and- so' causing people to view them as objects or as commodities like a new car or a new house (see, for example, Putnam, 1997, pp. 7-8). They would want an attractive child (a clone of Scarlett Johansson) or a child with tennis talent (a clone of Serena Williams) purely to show off. Dictators would want armies of clones to achieve their political goals. People would clone themselves out of vanity. Parents would clone their existing child so that the clone can serve as an organ bank for that child. The conclusion is then that cloning is wrong because the clone will be used as a mere means to others' ends.

Complex family relationships: Another concern is that cloning threatens traditional family structures. Similar fears have been echoed in

debates about homosexuals adopting children, IVF and other assisted reproduction techniques. But cloning may present unique problems by blurring generational boundaries. A clone does not have genetic parents in the traditional sense and this may alter family structures. However, it is not clear that generational blurring would lead to a cloned child being more confused about his family ties than some children are now.

Self-Assessment Exercise

2. a number of persons are afraid that cloning is a threat to the independence of the child by restricting the child to certain futures. This is an explanation of what type of argument against cloning.
a. the unnatural nature of cloning
b. threat to autonomy
c. the clone will be treated as a means
d. complex family relations

2.5.   Summary

All things considered, whether or not cloning is permissible depends on the weight of the reasons for doing it, and the weight of the reasons against doing it. We have argued that there are cases in which individuals may be justified in using cloning technologies as a means for reproduction, especially when this is the only way to create a child who is genetically related to the donor, or to produce a child to act as a saviour sibling. Furthermore, the arguments adduced against cloning do not provide strong reasons to believe these specific uses of cloning technologies would be unethical.

2.6.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Ahlberg J, Brighouse H (2011). An Argument against Cloning. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 40(4): 539–566.

Bartholet, E. (1999). *Family Bonds: Adoption, Infertility, and the New World of Child Production.* Boston: Beacon Press.

Brock DW (1998). Cloning Human Beings: An Assessment of the Ethical Issues Pro and Con. In: Nussbaum MC and Sunstein CR (eds.) *Facts and Fantasies about Human Cloning*, pp. 141–164. New York: Norton.

Buchanan A, Brock DW, Daniels N and Wikler D (2000). *From Chance to Choice: Genetics & Justice.* New York: Cambridge

University Press.

Dasaolu, B. O. (2004). "Artificial Human Creation: An Examination of the Cleavage between Theology and Science." *Journal of Philosophy and Culture,* 1 (1).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2008). From Home to the Laboratory: An Ethical Assessment of a New Reproductive Technology, *DRUMSPEAK: International Journal of Research in The Humanities*,1 (1).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2011). "The Idea of Human Cloning in Contemporary Times: Fears and Prospects." *Journal of Philosophy and Development*, 12 (1 & 2).

Dasaolu, B. O. (2018). "The Techno-Moral Case against Cloning: How Martin Heidegger Justifies the Kantian," *Philosophia: E-Journal for Philosophy and Culture*. 19 (1)

Devolder K (2013) Cloning. In Zalta EN (ed). The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2013 Edition), URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/cloning/ >.

Fawcett JT, Arnold FS (1973). The Value of Children: Theory and Method. *Representative Research in Social Psychology*, 4(3):23-25

Feinberg J (1980). "A Child's Right to an Open Future". in Aiken W (ed.) *Whose Child? Parental Rights, Parental Authority and State Power,* pp.124–153. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.

Harris J (1997). "Goodbye Dolly: The Ethics of Human Cloning. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 23(6): 353- 360.

Harris J (2004) *On Cloning*. London: Routledge

Jones D (24 April 2009). Clones, cowboys and resurrecting thedead. Guardian. Retrieved from http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/belief/2009/apr/2 4/religion-ethics-cloning-embryos

Kass LR (1998). *The Wisdom of Repugnance: Why We Should Ban the Cloning Of Humans*. Valparaiso University Law Review 32(2): 679–705.

Levick SE (2004). *Clone Being: Exploring the Psychological and Social Dimensions*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

Levy N, Lotz M (2005). Reproductive Cloning and a (kind of) Genetic Fallacy. *Bioethics*, 19(3): 232–250

New York Times (10 June 1997). Clinton Seeks to Ban Human Cloning but Not All Experiments. Retrievedfrom http://www.nytimes.com/1997/06/10/science/clinton-seeks- to-ban-human-cloning-but-not-all-experiments.html.

O'Neil O (2002). *Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics* (Gifford Lectures 2001). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pence G (1998). *Who's Afraid of Human Cloning?* Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.

Putnam H (1997). "Cloning People", in J. Burley (ed.), *The Genetic Revolution and Human Rights*, pp 1-13. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sandel MJ (2007). *The Case against Perfection. Ethics in the Age of Genetic Engineering*. Cambridge, MA: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Savulescu J (1999). Should we Clone Human Beings? Cloning as a Source of Tissue Transplantation. *Journal of Medical Ethics* 25: 87–95.

Segal NL (1999). *Entwined Lives: Twins and what they tell us about Human Behavior*. New York: Plume.

The President's Council on Bioethics (2002). *Human Cloning and Human Dignity: An Ethical Inquiry*. Washington, D.C.: The President's Council on Bioethics.

2.7.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   D- Increase well-being for child

2.   B. threat to autonomy

End of Module Questions

1.   When it is argued that cloning tends to be a threat to traditional family values   similar to other concerns already expressed in relation to IVF and other artificial reproductive technique   is argument from --------- ?
2.   Three types of argument in support of cloning are -------, -------- and -----?
3.   --------- is the argument that child creation is acts as a tissue donor for a sick sibling?

MODULE 5

UNIT 1   IS ETHICS A SCIENCE OR AN ART?

Unit Structure

1.1.   Introduction

By now, you probably are aware of the fact that all disciplines – in the arts and various sciences – originated from philosophy. What you may not be sure of is what the criteria are that qualifies any discipline, say, ethics, as one or the other. Put, in other words, is the philosophical discipline of ethics a science or an art? What is even science? In this lecture unit, you will find out possible answers to these related questions, among other ones.

1.2.   Learning Outcomes

By the end of this unit, you will be able to:

- define science
- explain the two views of science to determine which one aligns with ethics
- discuss the relationship, if any, between science and ethics.

1.3.   What is Science?

Science, as a concept, derives from two words: s*cientia* – a Latin word that means knowledge – and *wis en*s chaff – a German word which

means systematic and organised knowledge (Randi, 2012.). Therefore, science descriptively is a body of systematic or organised knowledge. The two keywords here – systematic/organised and knowledge – are very instructive. Knowledge, a somewhat natural property of human beings' curious disposition, is also the objective of scientific inquiries, and not surprisingly so. But unlike other kinds of knowledge pursuits, the scientific brand of same is allegedly systematic and organised. What makes this the case deserves a probe. But we shall have to return to this subject much later in this discourse. In the meantime, it appears, from the foregoing etymological analysis of science that, an early answer to our running question: whether ethics is a science or not, must be rendered in the affirmative.

Ethics, as we have seen from previous units' discussions, is a systematic and organised pursuit of knowledge in the moral realm. If ethics is thus a science, it means we can infer that its inquiries into the field of human values and morality are conducted in such a manner that is not different from those subjects that we generally attuned to regarding as scientific (Chemistry, Physics, Biology, and so on). But you also know this is not the case. If this observation accords with reality and in line with our descriptive exercise in this unit, it follows that we must quickly abandon our earlier assent that ethics is not a science.

Ethics, we are saying, differs in kind to the 'sciences' of Chemistry and Physics, among others. But perhaps, there is a middle ground to this conundrum. Could ethics, in certain aspects, be a science and in other regards be not? To do this, we may have to point out that there are at least two conceptions of science: the maximalist and minimalist accounts. According to the maximalist view, science, alongside being a systematically organised knowledge edifice, is guided by a unique methodology. This methodology involves making empirical observations about facts of reality and ultimately deducing general or natural causal laws from these with which future events can be adequately predicted and even manipulated. The minimalist view, however, is that science is any activity that involves a methodological and coherent study of any aspect of reality.

Clearly, then, and on the maximalist view, ethics is not a science, but conversely, that is, on the minimalist conception of science has shown that ethics is a science. It is important for us to note, in addition to all what you have been reading thus far that science as it is conceptualised today, is essentially the idea of the founders of the Royal Society of London, the oldest organisation for the advancement of science in the world, chartered in 1662. Christopher Wren, Robert Boyle, and other

founders were interested in the new 'philosophy' or natural science that was then emerging with the experimentations and observations of men like Nicolaus Copernicus, Galileo Galilei, Sir William Gilbert and Johannes Kepler (Randi, 2012).

Self-Assessment Exercises

1. On the maximalist view, ethics is a science. True/False?

1.3.1. The Relationship between Ethics and Science

Ethics and science share in the similar business of generating general laws to explain phenomena of the physical universe and of human behaviours. One is to describe these phenomena while the other is to prescribe how human behaviours ought to be tailored. This is why ethics is said to be a prescriptive science, unlike the 'core' sciences that are descriptive. What this implies is that whereas science tells us what the case (and what is likely to be the case in future) is, ethics tells us what ought to be the case (and, hence, what we ought to do).

These differences, notwithstanding, a plethora of similarities may be easily found in the two vocations of ethics and science. First of all, no humanistic science is possible without adherence to ethical strictures (Schweitzer, 1962). Although, it may not necessarily be the case that science is anti-human. For, at first blush, the overarching aim of science is satisfying human curiosity and making humans better able to cope with the limitations of natures. It often appears to most sceptical people's minds that many of the activities of science are too impersonal, therefore anti-human – to be left un-critiqued. And since ethics keep close tabs, more or less, to human well-being, it means such concerns against the activities of science would necessarily occupy the front-burner of its discourses. Therefore, there must, of necessity, be an ethical underpinning for every scientific practice and theory (Donnant, 2003).

Conversely, ethics would benefit a lot from science. Because ethics is overtly preoccupied with abstract, normative and conceptual issues vis-à-vis human conduct, the need to get a good grip on the facts of every matter of ethical inquiry becomes important. Take the ethical evaluation of certain issues in environmental science – say, the science of climate change – for example (Attfield, 2011). How else would ethicists be able to, via their analytical and argumentative methodology of inquiry, find out the rate of global warming? How, furthermore, would they be able

to find out the anthropogenic dimension to the latter problem (of global warming/climate change) without relying on data being supplied by concerned scientists working in these fields?

For science to function positively, a thorough consideration of ethical values – like autonomy, truth, non-maleficence and beneficence – must be adhered to (Agulanna, 2010). Many – or, rather, all – of the current and future innovations of science ought to be ethically evaluated also. If such considerations were borne in mind, such inventions that now threaten to annihilate humanity from the face of the planet, like nuclear bombs would have been averted or at least better regulated. Ethical studies are imperative while considering issues of allocation of scarce medical resources and carrying out of risky or controversial medical procedures (such as physician-assisted suicide, abortion, etc.). What this examination points to, is that although some sceptics (perhaps, of the maximalist school of science) may be restrained in consenting to the fact that ethics is a science, what no one may deny is the symbiotic relationship between the two seemingly disparate disciplines. This is what you have been intimated in this unit.

Self-Assessment Exercises

2. Science needs some ethical values such as -----------, truth, ----------- and beneficence to function positively

1.4.   Summary

The following is a summary of what we have discussed in this unit:

•   Science is systematic and organised knowledge.
•   Ethics is a systematic and organised pursuit of knowledge in the moral realm.
•   The maximalist view is that ethics is not a science.
•   Conversely, the minimalist conception ethics is a science.
•   Ethics, like science, to repeat, share in a similar business of generating general laws   to explain phenomena.
•   No humanistic science is possible without adherence to ethical strictures.

We have basically discussed two things in this lecture unit. We started with an analysis of the concept of science. Your knowledge of ethics, of course, was assumed, and rightly so. It emerged from this first consideration that ethics, at least from the point of reference of the

minimalist view of science, is a science. It is, of course, not the case that ethics, from the angle of the maximalist account, is a science.

Related to the first is the second task of this unit, is the nature of the relationship that possibly exists between science and ethics. What may be surmised from the latter task is that there is a genuine reason for scientists to take cognisance of ethical theories and submissions in their vocation. Ethicists, too, would benefit from trends and discussions that animate the enterprise of science. The two disciplines, thus, need to complement, not diverge from, each other.

1.5.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Agulanna, C. (2010). "The Requirement of Informed Consent in Research Ethics: Procedure for Implementing a Crucial

Ethical Norm in African Communal Culture," in European Journal of Scientific Research, Vol. 44, No. 2

Attfield, R. (2011). "Climate Change, Environmental Ethics and Biocentrism". In Ved

Nanda (Ed.) Climate Change and Environmental Ethics. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Donnant, A. E. (2003). "Science and Ethics", Magazine

Dorff, E. N. (1998). Matters of Life and Death: A Jewish Approach to Modern Medical

Ethics.Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society.

Frankena, W. K. (1995). Ethics. New Delhi: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
        Ozumba, G. O.

 (2001). A Course Text on Ethics. Onitsha: O.O.P. Publishers Limited.

Randi, J. (2012). "The Scientific Method" Available online at

https://physics.ucr.edu/~wudka/physics7?Notes_www/nod   es5.html. Accessed on August 13, 2019.

Schweitzer, A. (1962). Civilisation and Ethics. London: Unwin Books.
        Wallace, W.

 (1997). The Element of Philosophy: A Compendium for Philosophers and   Theologians. New York: Alba House

1.6.   Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercises

1.   False
2.   Autonomy, non-maleficence

UNIT 2   ASSUMPTION OF ETHICS

1.1.   Introduction

In this unit, we shall examine the basic presupposition of ethics. From the beginning of this course, you should have realised, especially when we try to define ethics and morality, that actions that have moral values are actions done voluntarily and freely. In doing such actions, the performer is held responsible. Owing to the foregoing, we can deduce that ethics is based on two major assumptions: freedom and responsibility.

1.2.   Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   explain the basic assumption of ethics
•   discuss the concept of freedom
•   discuss the concept of responsibility
•   explain determinism and its relationship with freedom and responsibility

1.3.   Assumption of Ethics

Ethics is built on the basic assumption that actions that have moral values are actions done willingly and freely, and any action performed under this condition places responsibility on the human subject. This

assumption seems understandable and straightforward. However, critical examination of it would raise several questions: how do we act freely and willingly? In other words, what are free or voluntary actions? What is freedom or freewill? Are we completely free? What is responsibility?

1.3.1 Freedom

Freewill or freedom is the belief that man is free and accountable for all the decisions he made. He must be held responsible for the consequences that arise from such decisions. Freedom entails the capacity of "self-determination" which means someone has the capability to decide what to do and what to avoid. B. M. Laing describes freedom as the capacity that human being possesses to initiate occurrences as against mere transmission of occurrences (Laing, 1929:469). This means that the person has the ability to originate an action.

John Bourke described freedom (liberty) in three different ways: Capricious freedom, neutral freedom and rational freedom, which can be recaptured respectively. Capricious freedom does not give room to choosing; nobody can predict the next action of himself or that of others. Such freedom has neither contact nor direction. He described this type of freedom thus;

Capricious freedom" is simply that "freedom" which a person is said to possess in virtue of which all his actions are sheerly undetermined. It is the "freedom" of chance …. It may be described as "freedom from"; but whether by that is understood a freedom from this or that particular determining cause, or from all determining causes whatever, it is not a freedom in respect of which we could be said to be capable of choosing (Bourke, 1938:227).

Neutral freedom' is the freedom to do or act within different alternatives. That is we can express ourselves in either this or that way when we find ourselves between equal or contrary alternatives, such as: to do good or bad, to act in the right or wrong way. This description agrees with J.P. Sartre's position that freedom is to choose or not to choose from alternatives. "Freedom is the freedom to choose… not to choose is, in the fact, to choose not to choose" (Sartre, 483).

Rational freedom, he said, is the freedom that brings about a result of some particular kinds. The latter description of freedom seems to present the possibility of absolute freedom. The question is, can we have absolute freedom at all? Is freedom possible such that we can do what we like without any obstructions, disturbances, and interruptions?

1.3.2. Libertarianism as a Form of Freedom

Libertarianism is a metaphysical position which holds that human actions are not in any way determined. Everything human being engaged in is out of his or her free will. Libertarianism is against any form of compatibility (the position that freewill or freedom of action can still be found in a determined world). It is an absolute concept of freedom of action. Libertarianism position is that human beings, as agents have freewill, therefore determinism is false. Libertarianism is used to describe free thinkers that believed that freewill is opposed to determinism. Libertarianism is a recent view of metaphysics. Nevertheless, the position has long been postulated by philosophers from the ancient period, although not with the name or term libertarianism. Epicurus has theorised a similar position in the ancient period of philosophy. Recent scholars, who theorised about libertarianism, although not all of them accepted the claim, include Robert Nozick, Hugh McCann, Alfred Mele, Peter van Inwagen, Carl Ginet, Roderick Chisholm, Robert Kane, and so on.

In the ancient period, Epicurus followed the atomists and posited that everything in the universe is made up of atoms, including man. He argued that the movement of atoms has no deterministic tendencies. Epicurus is said to have modified his atomic theory so that not only could atomic motion result from atoms own weight and form the impacts of other atoms. But it could also occur, spontaneously as a minimal deviation from its existing trajectory – a swerve (cf. Furley, 1999:205). This was introduced to preserve the ascription of moral responsibility.

Robert Kane and Peter van Inwagen followed Epicurus in holding an extreme position of libertarianism. They are of the opinion that the even human "will" does not have control over actions. Other libertarians posited that psychological events that prompt actions do not have a physical explanation. They believed that one's actions are not determined by anything prior to a decision. The question we need to examine, therefore has to do with either human being are free absolutely or not.

Self-Assessment Exercise

> 1. The position which holds that human actions are not in any way determined is known as ---------------------

1.3.3. Responsibility

A person is morally responsible for his action if it is as a result of his conscious power. No responsibility falls on a person whose act is compelled. That is actions from all of the following factors: external forces, unconscious states that are inaccessible to meditations, and the inevitable consequences of juvenile situations. Responsibility could be said to be the admittance of the consequences of the actions someone took either praise or blame. In other words, to be responsible for a thing is for such a person to admit without resistance that he took an action willingly and consciously; whatever the outcome may be, he or she must be ready to accept it.

If the above description of responsibility if taken admittedly, it follows, therefore, that for a person to be responsible for an action; such a person must have acted consciously and willingly without coercion or compulsion. If this is the case, the question is, do we act in such a way that our actions are consciously taken and not determined by some circumstances beyond our control? Is it the case that our actions are not coerced?

1.3.4. Are Individuals Completely Free?

Affirming the question above will trigger serious implications. For instance, if we claim that human beings are completely free, it follows, therefore, that; we selected our biological parents, we decided our place of birth, and so on. Meanwhile, denial of the question follows therefore, that, there are some factors, which limit our freedom. Such that, given those factors, we cannot but behave in line with the influences they have in our day to day life pattern.

We shall be looking at these factors, which account for some of our actions, under two perspectives: internal factors and external factors. It should be noted, however, that the debate on internal and external factors is to argue for and against the existence of freedom and responsibility.

1.4.   Determinism

Determinism is a metaphysical position which seems to hold that all actions or events in the universe have a condition that necessitates them. Philip stokes (2003) defined determinism as "the view that whatever happens has to happen for every event is the inevitable, hence necessary outcome of its specific, preceding causes, which themselves were the necessary result of yet previous causes" he added that "the chain of cause and effect might be seen as determined by God or the laws of nature" (Stoke, 2003:211). In furtherance of this Maher writes that determinism "denote the philosophical theory which holds, in opposition to the doctrine of free will, that all man's volitions are invariably determined by pre-existing circumstances" (Mahar, 1908. online). Determinism, according to Bourke (1938) is "a theory in general which denies our power of choice" He went further to identify two main senses of determinism. The first one he called "natural determinism" which is the view that determinism is external, through natural forces and that human being has no control of it. The second sense of determinism identified by Bourke is what he called internal determinism, which is like the opposite of external or natural determinism.

There are many types of determinism, such as, ethical determinism, theological determinism, physical determinism, psychological determinism, etc. Ethical determinism, which is our concern here, is the belief that men's actions are determined by what they see as good. That is the choices someone makes are based on what such a person felt to be good human are not free, when someone makes a choice it is based on the deliberation of what we think to be good.

Thomas Aquinas, Plato and Socrates held a similar view. According to them, no human being would do something he knows to be evil; all that man would choose is what such a person thinks is good. For Aquinas, if anybody rejects a good thing, it is because such a person sees the bad aspect of such a thing. And when an individual chooses what is good, it is based on the fact that such a person do not see the bad or evil aspect of such an act. Plato and Socrates hold the belief that nobody who knows that something is bad will choose to do such a thing. Anyone that does any bad thing is ignorant of the fact that such a thing is bad. This seems to imply that we are not free at all; hence we ought not to be held responsible for our action.

Prior to J.S. Mill, determinism is not strictly separated from concepts like necessary cause and fatalism, but Mill and some philosophers after

him, usually objected to such terms – necessary cause and fatalism – because they believed that, determinism does not suggest external compulsion as necessary cause and fatalism seems to imply, rather, motives and volitions are the determining factors of human actions.

Philosophers all over the ages have argued for one form of determinism or the other. This they do in order to give room for human responsibility and freedom of action. While some held that there is no chance for human freedom of action or freewill, others argued that even in the face of determining factors man have the choice to choose freely and must be held responsible for any choice he made. The above position has paved the way to the emergence of two main trends of determinism, hard determinism and soft determinism.

1.4.1. Hard Determinism

Hard determinism is a form of determinism that denied human freedom in any action he takes. Hard determinism like soft determinism can be derived from all the types of determinism – ethical determinism, theological determinism, psychological determinism, physical determinism, historical determinism, etc. According to hard determinists, man's freedom is illusory. That is to say, everything man does is based on the way forces that compelled him have decided.

Democritus, an ancient philosopher, theorised that everything in the world, including man is made up of atoms. And the behaviours of things are based on the atoms they are made up of (Stoke, 2003:27). Therefore all actions are determined not freely, but rather by the substance one is made up of. Zeno, another ancient philosopher, opined that there is nothing like freedom, all what we have is an absolute law of nature that governs everything (Russell, 1948:254). Barunch Spinoza took the theological types of hard determinism. In his view, God is the determining factor of all things. Spinoza holds that everything in the universe is a part or extension of the nature of God. Bertrand Russell said Spinoza determinism shows that "Only ignorance makes us think that we can alter the future; what will be, will be, and the future is as unalterably fixed as the past" (Russell, 1948:574). It appears, therefore that all events in the universe are chronologically arranged by God or nature. Just as God determined all events in the universe, human actions are not left out, because human beings are also part of the universe. There are inherent problems from Spinoza denial of any form of human freedom. In a sense that, how and where can we position wickedness, sin and evil, since everything is part of God, with the attributive nature of God?

Self-Assessment Exercise

> 2. A position that denies human freedom in any action it takes is known as --------

1.4.2. Soft Determinism

In order to account for moral judgment and hold a man responsible for his actions, in the world of determinism, scholars theorised that there is a form of determinism that give room to freedom of will. In other words, scholars advanced the argument that even though actions of man are determined, there are still some volitions or choices that man makes, which he must be responsible for. Apart from this ethical point of view that soft determinism sprung from, soft determinism also advances some forms of theological point of view to defend the attribute of God. In the sense that, religious leaders and scholars argue for a kind of freedom of choice and action for them to explain the problem of evil.

Owing to the foregoing, Saint Augustine of Hippo posited that although God is omniscient, he knows every action of man before man embarked on it; nevertheless, it is not God that pushed man to take such action. God foreknowledge is not the cause of man action; therefore, man is free to make any decision. Augustine position has a wide range of acceptance among Christians. Another philosopher, Epictetus, in order to justify and make man accountable for his actions posited that, although some things are not in our control, yet we have a lot of things in our control. He noted that things like our opinion, desire, pursuit, aversion, our actions and so on, are in our control and we must be responsible for them.

1.4.3. Fate/Fatalism, an Extreme Form of Determinism

Fate or fatalism is the doctrine that all events are subject to inevitable necessity. Human being has no chance of controlling any event with their action. All things have been preordained. Fatalism does not give room for human action at all. Man has no power to influence or control events, no initiative, no freedom; man is subject to superior force or forces. Fatalism believes that "what will be will be" because every event has been preordained. The causes of events are outside ourselves, that whatever occurs to us does so regardless of what we do. We cannot act, since events are beyond our control, and there are no alternatives, therefore, deliberation is illusory.

1.4.4. Causation as a Form of Determinism

Causation is a position that seems to suggest that certain thing caused the other. That is given a certain condition; there is a necessary step that follows. Causation has a widespread orientation like determinism, it is also sometimes referred to as determinism. In other words, causation and determinism are used interchangeably. Causation states that given a condition A, B follows. Anytime that A occurs under that same condition B must follow. Causation is usually described in terms of cause and effect. So when one is thirsty, for instance, what must follow is that one will have to drink water.

There are trends in the discussion of causation just as we have in determinism. Scholars advocate for a different thing to be the cause of things. Some claim that God is the cause of all events, while some advocated for psychological causes of events. In short, all the types of determinism we have are also types of causality. Causation or causality has been a topic of philosophical discussion since the ancient period. As a matter of fact, we can say, it is the beginning of Ionian philosophy. In the sense that, the Ionian philosophers' (Thales, Anaximander, Aneximenes) discussions about the primary substance, which every other thing were made, were in a way looking at what caused other things to take effect.

Aristotle also established the subject (causality) and made it prominent when he identified four causes of things: material cause, formal cause, efficient cause, and final cause (Lawhead, 2002:78). These are what bring about a change of things; from potential to actuality; from matter to forms; from one substance quality to another. Donald Davidson argues in his essay, 'Actions, Reasons and Cause', for a kind of determinism which seems to be compatible with causal determinism. He says the reasons or a purpose for an action is taken itself as a cause for that action (Davidson, 1963:685-700). In other words, Davidson claims that when an action was carried out, the doer has a reason that motivated or driven him/her to embark on that particular action. Therefore the reason or the motivating factor is a causal determinism for such an action.

1.5.   Summary

Below is the summary of what we have discussed in this unit that:

- The basic assumption of ethics centred on freedom and responsibility.
- Those actions that have moral values are actions done willingly and freely, and any action performed under this condition places responsibility on the human subject.
- The concept of freedom and responsibility has been threatened with the belief that some certain elements influence human actions.
- Determinism has   many strands,   and   these are ethical determinism, theological determinism, physical determinism, psychological determinism, etc.
- In the overall analysis of the concept of determinism, human beings have, at least, freedom of choice, which places responsibility on their actions.
- Fate or fatalism is the doctrine that all events are subject to inevitable necessity; as such human being has no chance of controlling any event with their action.

Our elaborated analysis thus far reveals to us; (1) that determinism is real. (2) Absolute freedom is not certain. The question then is, are we responsible for our (moral) actions in the face of this deterministic tendencies? Human actions are not determined such that man is not responsible for them. There is no single action someone can take that does not have an alternative. Bourke put the illustration thus:

When we say of an action which we have done that we were "free" to do it or that we did it freely, or again, that we chose to do it, we do certainly mean that we were free to do it only because we were also free not to do it, or to do something else; and again, that we chose to do it only in the sense that we chose it in preference to and as against one or more other possible actions, any one of which we could equally well have chosen (Bourke, 1938:278).

Although the alternative available might be that such a person will not take any action at all, the fact still remains that human's attempt to avoid the consequences of not taking action would itself be a responsibility. Therefore the outcome of our actions must be accepted. It is obvious that when we get our desired result, we assumed that we are responsible for it, but when it is the other way round, we seem to

suggest that we are not responsible. This portrays that we are not indifferent to praise and blame.

1.6.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Bourke, J. (1938). "Responsibility, Freedom and Determinism." Journal of Philosophical

Studies,   Vol.   13,   No.   15.   Available   on
      http://www.jstor.org/stable/3746126.   Accessed   04/11/2014,
      09:05

Furley, D. (1999). Routledge History of Philosophy. Vol. II, From Aristotle to Augustine.

      New York: Routledge Publishers

Laing, B.M. (1929). "Freedom and Determinism." Journal of Philosophical Studies, Vol. 4, No. 16

Lawhead, W.F. (2002). The Voyage of Discovery: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy,(2nd ed.), Wadsworth

Machan, T. (2004). "A Brief Defense of Free Will." In John R. Burr & Milton Goldinger

(Eds). Philosophy and Contemporary Issues. Upper Saddle River N. J.: Pearson. pp., 33-39

Maher, M. (1908). "Determinis" The Catholic Encyclopedia, (New York: Robert Appleton

Company. Available on http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/04756c.htm. Accessed 1 November 2014.

Russell, B. (1948). A History of Western Philosophy and its connection with political and

social circumstances from the Earliest Time to the Present Day. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Stokes, P. (2003). Philosophy 100 Essential Thinkers. (Enchanted Lion Books).

1.7.   Possible Answers to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   Libertarianism
2.   Determinism

UNIT 3   SOME FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES OF ETHICS

3.1.   Introduction

It is significant to note that ethics, as a systematic study, has fundamental principles. This is its fundamental truth or proposition that serves as the foundation for a system of belief or behaviour or for an ethical chain of reasoning. In this unit, and for this level of our study, we shall discuss respect for the autonomy of others, beneficence, non-maleficence and justice.

3.2.   Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, you will be able to:

•   explain the basic principles of ethics
•   explain the kinds of moral principle
•   discuss the importance of each of the principles for human social relation
•   discuss the reflections of the principle of ethics.

3.3.   Fundamental Principles of Ethics

The principles of ethics are called moral principles. They are also called fundamental principles of moral law. The moral law is the law that guides all human beings to do what is good and avoid what is bad. The moral law is practically based obliged to it. The obligation 1993:59). The moral law is also nature'.

The laws are universal, that is to say, they are applicable in all time and places. They classified the 'dos' and 'don'ts' human societies. These principles are different from State laws which are man-made. According to Cicero, the natural law is "the law above the laws", and man-made laws are valid if and only if they conform to the natural law (Cf. Lawhead, 2002:98).

3.4.   Kinds of Moral Principles

The moral principles are the standard measure of ethical norms that human's conducts and behaviours must conform with. In other words, they are guides that stipulate the way we should behave. In fact, they show us what we must do and what must be avoided. There are two kinds of moral or ethical principles, namely; the positive principles, and the negative principles.

The positive principles classify the conducts that we should do and how we should behave. These include dignity and respect for human life, autonomy and respect for the right the others, justice, honesty, kindness, truthfulness, altruism, hospitality, generosity, fidelity, and so on.

Conversely, the negative principles proscribe some certain actions and behaviours that are seen to be wrong. Such actions and behaviours as murder, adultery, suicide, hatred, stealing, bribery, cheating, and so on are to be avoided. To be concise, all the opposing actions to the positive principles are to be avoided because they are capable of destroying both the performer of such actions and the society at large.

According to Immanuel Kant, in his work Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals, the moral law is inbuilt in human's rational will.

3.5.   Four Fundamental Ethical Principles

All the moral principles, both positive principles and negative principles, mentioned above, are fundamental principles. However, we shall examine four principles below, because each of the other principles can be categorised under at least one of these four principles. The principles are respect for the autonomy of others, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice.

3.5.1. The Principle of Respect for the Autonomy of Others

The word "autonomy" is a Latin word which means "self-rule" or independence. This principle states that we have an obligation to respect the autonomy of other persons, that is, to respect the decisions made by other people concerning their own lives. This principle is also called the "principle of human dignity". It restricts or limits our interference in the affairs of human persons. However, human persons in this sense are reasonable or competent or mature adults.

German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, is a major proponent of the ethical principle of autonomy, which is also referred to as 'autonomy of the will' or 'freewill.' According to Kant, a rational person should act independently of any influence. The 'will', he argues must be free to operate   independently of influences   such as;   appetite,   desire, satisfaction, happiness and so on. Also, the 'will' should be free to act in accordance with its own law. He added that the will is in line with human nature.

To this end, Andrews Reath says Kant shows that the human person should have "not only a capacity for choice that is motivationally independent, but a lawgiving capacity that is independent of determination by external influence and is guided by its own internal principle–in other words, by a principle that is constitutive of lawgiving" (Reath 2006). Additionally, Kant argues that freewill is the foundation of the dignity of 'human nature', which is an end in itself.

This principle of humanity and in general of every rational nature, as an end in itself (which is the supreme limiting condition of the freedom of action of every human being) is not borrowed from experience. First, because of its universality, since it applies to all rational beings as such and no experience is sufficient to determine anything about them. Second, because in it humanity is represented not as an end of human beings (subjectively), that is, not as an object that we of ourselves actually make our end, but as an objective end that, whatever ends we may have, ought as law to constitute the supreme limiting condition of all subjective ends, so that the principle must arise from pure reason (Kant, 2002:67).

To be precise, the ground of all practical lawgiving lies in firstly the objective rules that are also universal, which makes it fit to be a law of nature. Secondly, it lies in subjective rules, which are an end. But the subject of all ends is every rational being as an end in itself.

3.5.2. The Principle of Beneficence

The principle of beneficence states that we have moral obligations to act for the interest or benefit of others by helping them in preventing or removing possible evils or harms. We have an obligation to perform actions that bring good always. In other words, we must take the proper steps to prevent harm. The principle of beneficence aims to benefit others, and it is similar to the principle of non-maleficence. However, while the former states that evil or harm should be prevented, the latter says one should not cause evil. On the other way round, while no prevention of harm might make a person to violate the latter, it makes someone to violate the former. However, adopting this corollary principle frequently places us in direct conflict with respecting the autonomy of other persons.

Self-Assessment Exercise

> 1. The principle of beneficence states that we should do harm or evil to others. True/False

3.5.3. The Principle of Non-Maleficence

We need to make some clarifications before we move on. The clarifications have to do with some terms that seem related to non-maleficence but are quite different. If such clarifications are not made, one might easily think they are the same thing. It is not "non-malfeasance," which is a technical legal term meaning wrongful conduct by a public official. Also, it is not "non-malevolence," which means that one did not intend to harm, or not to wish evil to others. The principle of non-maleficence holds that we have an obligation not to inflict harm on others. It is closely associated with the maxim *primum non nocere* (first, do no harm). And do not increase the risk of harm to others. It is wrong to waste resources that could be used for good. The principle of beneficence and the principle of non-maleficence are close to each other, though they have a difference. However, they agreed that every one of our actions must produce more good and avoid harm.

The principle of non-maleficence states that we should act in such a way that we do not cause evil or harm to others. We should ensure that harm and all kinds of evil are avoided. This includes avoiding the risk of harming anybody. As noted earlier, this principle is not about intention or wish not to harm; therefore, one can violate the principle even if he or she does not have the intention to harm them initially but harm others accidentally. In another way round, if someone deliberately or non-

deliberately exposed others to harm or evil or unnecessary risk, he or she has violated this principle.

3.5.4. The Principle of Justice

The principle of justice is one of the most pronounced of all the ethical principles. The principle states that we have the moral obligation to make available or give to others whatever they are owed or they deserve. The principle of justice is central to many of the principles. In fact, it encompasses many of the principles. For instance, it entails the principles of equality, fairness, impartiality and so on. Accordingly, Justice is cardinal to the continued existence of humanity. Western philosophers from ancient till now devote considerably to the concept of justice. They regard justice as the most important of all virtues to foster social relationships and to sustain a society. The term justice involves respecting individuals as free and rational agents.

According to Plato, justice is a virtue that gave birth to rational order. It is through justice that each part of the society performs a proper role and not meddling with the right performers of others. In Aristotle's view justice involves in the lawful, fair and equitable distributions. For Saint Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, justice requires the giving to all people their due in relational distributions or give-and-take connections. Thomas Hobbes believed justice is a non-natural virtue that came about as a result of the voluntary agreements of the social contract to function as a necessary means of orderliness for civil society. David Hume classified justice as services in public utility by protecting property. For Kant, the principle of justice is related to the principle of autonomy. Accordingly, justice is a virtue whereby we respect the freedom, autonomy, and dignity of others by not interfering with their voluntary actions so that their rights to think and act from the 'will' is not violated. John Rawls described justice in terms of supreme equal liberty and opportunity on basic rights and duties for all members of a society, were socio-economic inequalities requiring moral justification in terms of equal opportunity and beneficial results for all (Rawls, 1999:18-26).

Self-Assessment Exercise

---

2. The four fundamental principles of ethics are --------------, beneficence, justice and, ------

---

3.6.   Further Reflection of Principle of Ethics

As noted earlier, the principles of ethics are universal and objective; however, these features do not indicate that the principles are absolute or rigid. According to Omoregbe, the universality of the principles of ethics means they are applicable in all ages and societies. But to classify them as absolute or rigid would mean there is no situation or circumstance where an exception can take place. He argues that moral principles do allow for an exceptional situation. His illustrations show that when we are confronted with two or more circumstances where we must choose one ethical principle, we must choose the most reasonable. For instance, it would be reasonable to lie in order to save a life. The same way it would be reasonable to steal foodstuffs in order to save one's life from starvation (Omoregbe, 1993:63-66). He warned that the exceptional situation should not be misinterpreted as relativism. Relativism is an ethical term that holds that there are no universal or objective moral principles. It claims that each society determines what is right or good and what is bad or wrong on its own.

3.7.   Summary

Below are a summary of what we have discussed in this unit:

• Ethical principles are also called moral principles, and they are the standard measure of ethical norms that human's conducts and behaviours must conform with.

• They are also called fundamental principles of the moral law.

• The moral law is the law that guides all human beings to do what is good and avoid doing what is bad.

• The moral law, also called natural law or law of nature, are based on reason.

• Ethical principles could be positive or negative; the positive principles classify the conducts that we should do and how we should behave, while the negative principles proscribe some certain actions and behaviours that are wrong, which we should avoid.

- The fundamental principles include but not limited to respect for the autonomy of others, beneficence, non-maleficence, and justice.

- The principle of autonomy states that we have an obligation to respect the decision of others concerning their lives.

- The principle of beneficence holds that we have an obligation to prevent possible harm on others.

- The principle of non-maleficence states that we have an obligation not to inflict harm on others.

- The principle of justice states that we have the moral obligation to make available or give to others whatever they are owed or they deserved.

By way of conclusion, let us state categorically that the moral laws and the principles of ethics are indispensable, universal and objective. They apply to all ages and societies. Obeying them is necessary for the growth of the society. They are rules that are innate in every reasonable individual. We are all familiar with them by instinct; therefore, whether they are part of state laws or not, we ought to obey them naturally. And it would be better if state actors allow them to be the foundation of state laws.

3.8.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Hobbes, T. (1651). *Leviathan or the Matter, Form, & Power of a Common-wealth Ecclesiastical and Civil*. London: Green Dragon Press.

Kant, I. (2000). *The Critique of Practical Reason*. Blackmask Online.

Kant, I (2002). *The Groundwork for the Metaphysics of Morals*. Edited and translated by Allen W. Wood, New Haven and London, Yale University Press.

Lawhead, W.F. (2002). *The Voyage of Discovery: A Historical Introduction to Philosophy*, Second Edition. Belmont: Wadsworth Group.

Omoregbe, J. I. (1993). *Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study*. Lagos: Joja Educational and Research Publishers Ltd.

Pomerleau, Wayne P. (2019). "Western Theories of Justice." Internet

Encyclopedia of   Philosophy. Available   online
https://www.iep.utm.edu/justwest/

Accessed 8 August 2019

3.9.   Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercise

1.   False
2.   Non-maleficence

UNIT 4   ETHICS AND RELIGION

4.1.   Introduction

Thus far in this course, you have learnt so much about ethics and morality. In the course of that, you must have seen some religious undertones in what ethicists said to be good, bad, right, wrong, and what constitutes the good life. Therefore, in this unit, we shall be looking at the relationship that exists between ethics and religion. We shall examine the possibilities of the existence of ethics without religion and that of religion without ethics.

4.2.   Learning Outcomes

At the end of this unit, you will be able to:

• discuss the relationship between ethics and religion
• state explicitly the points of divergences between ethics and religion
• describe the roles ethics plays in religion.

4.3.   The Relationship between Ethics and Religion

The relationship between ethics and religion is dated back to antiquity. The one that preceded the other is difficult to know, and there have been debates on this from time immemorial. (For instance, Plato in ancient Greek, through Socrates, had asked Euthyphro if morality is as a result of God's commands or it existed before the commands). However, religion, like ethics, is preoccupied with the right conduct of human beings (Omoregbe, 1993:7). Though the major concern of religion is the

worship of supernatural being, as a secondary function, it states how worshippers must relate with their fellows and others in the society.

4.4.   The Major Link

Majority of our moral thoughts have religious undertones. Ancient society's codes of conducts, from where we developed some of our ethical ideas, are deeply connected to religious belief. For instance, most people agree that actions such as murder and adultery are wrong irrespective of circumstances. The major world religions shared these views and incorporated them. They are in their ancient codes of conduct, and these traditions really guide social intuitions.

The major link between religion and ethics is best explained with the "Golden Rule". The Golden Rule is captured thus: "Do unto others as you would wish them to do unto you". To put it the way you would want to be treated. Virtually all of the world's great religions contain in their religious manuscripts some correspondence of this Golden Rule. And it is the basic ethics that guides all religions. If this is adhered to, happiness will follow. Apart from the golden rule, there are many other teachings and practices of what is right or wrong, good or bad, virtuous or vicious, from a religious point of view. Below is the way some of the world popular religions express the Golden Rule.

Self-Assessment Exercise

---
1. What does the Golden Rule say?
2. Religion helps in the development of ethics. True/False?

4.4.1. Religions Expression of the Golden Rule

Judaism – What is hateful to you, do not do to your fellowman. This is the entire law; all the rest is commentary (Talmud, Shabbat 3id). Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself (Leviticus 19:18)

Christianity – All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, Do ye so to them (Matthew 7:1).

Islam – No one of you is a believer until he desires for his brother that which he desires for himself (Sunnah. 40 Hadith of an-Nawawi 13).

Confucianism – Do not do to others what you would not like yourself. Then there will be no resentment against you, either the family or in the state (Analects 12:2).

Buddhism – Hurt not others in ways that you yourself would find hurtful (Udana Varga 5, 1). Having made oneself the example, one should neither slay nor cause to slay As I am, so are other beings; thus let one not strike another, nor get another struck. That is the meaning (Dhammapada).

Hinduism – This is the sum of duty, do nothing onto others what you would not have them do unto you (Mahabharata 5, 1517). Wound not others, do no one injury by thought or deed, utter no word to pain thy fellow creatures (The Law Code of Manu).

Taoism – Regard your neighbour's gain as your gain, and your neighbour's loss as your own loss (Tai Shang Kan Yin P'ien).

Zoroastrianism – That nature alone is good, which refrains from doing another whatsoever is not good for itself (Dadisten I-dinik, 94, 5).

4.5.   Existence of ethics or religion without the other

Having established the links between ethics and religion, and out of curiosity, the question would be: is ethics possible without religion? In other words, can we be ethical without being religious? This question could also be asked the other way round: can we be religious without being ethical?

As hinted earlier that ethics and religion have been coexisting from antiquity, and which one preceded the other is a debate, so is the existence of ethics without religion. It is argued in some quarters that ethics cannot exist without religion. St. Augustine, Soren Kierkegaard and many others hold this view dearly. As a matter of fact, Plato's dialogue mentioned earlier is a debate that attempted to argue from both sides. While Plato's interlocutor, Socrates, intended to argue for the futility of religious undertone in ethics, thereby establishing the possibility of ethics without region, his co-discussant, Euthyphro, argues that ethics is grounded in religion and that it would not be possible to have ethics without religion.

In line with Euthyphro's position stated above, people make an important argument concerning ethics and religion. For many people, "morality and religious faith go hand in hand" (Traer, 2009:8). Based on

this claim, rather than relying on rational arguments, some people view the rightness or wrongness of actions on the condition that God commands them. Some moral philosophers do not view the arguments based on divine command as being rationally secure. They believe, in line with Socrates' position that we can determine if an action is right or wrong through rational thinking. Therefore, if God only commands what is right then, deductively, this makes divine commands unnecessary. In other words, the knowledge of what is right or wrong is possible through rational thinking without relying on any divine commandments.

However, R. Traer argues that the discussion on the divine command arguments is relevant to ethics for numerous reasons. Firstly, there is no unanimous agreement by people on what action is right or wrong. Therefore, it remains unclear how we can determine what is right and wrong merely through rational thinking. Secondly, the fact that many people in the universe make religion their ethical guidance, "the moral teachings of a religious tradition … to persuade the public to embrace a higher moral standard" should not be undermined (Traer, 2009:9). Even though many people may insist that rational arguments should justify ethical principles and decisions, Traer argues that the contemplation of religious arguments must not be left out from the study of ethics. Even if individuals personally do not choose to accept religious arguments as valid within ethical discussions, it is a resolution that entails vigilant consideration.

If ethics deals with morality, then, the view that its source is in religion is primitive, and has much influence till now, though, many have disputed that. In an attempt to defend the view that morality emanated from religion, J. S. Mackenzie argues that modern thoughts upturn the "relation not to proceed from the idea of God to the idea of morality, but rather from the idea of morality to the idea of God." (Mackenzie, 1900:474). Furthermore, Mackenzie argued that if we try to justify that there can be the possibility of ethics without religion, we would need to find the source of our moral actions in the conscience. According to him, the conscience is created by God; hence, we are back to the position we attempted to avoid.

Conscience needs to be disciplined and educated, the way Aristotle said character traits must be nurtured, in order to be reasonable. If that is the case, reason rather than conscience would be the source of morality as such ethics would be able to stand without religion. Reason as the basis of morality is a theory the German Philosopher, Immanuel Kant,

posited. Kant had argued that every action must be subjected to thorough reason. Accordingly, reason is primed on the 'categorical imperatives': "act in accordance with a maxim that can at the same time make itself a universal law." (Kant, 1998: 44), and "act that you use humanity, whether in your own person or in the person of any other, always at the same time as an end, never merely as a means." (Kant, 1998:38).

Mackenzie claims that Kant attempt is not successful. Thus he posed the teaser that there is the doubt that whether reason as the "source of moral obligation is not a somewhat dry one, whether it can of itself furnish us with any real content for the moral life." (Mackenzie, 1900:475). However, the quest for the possibility of ethics without religion is not to search for the foundation upon which ethics is built. The search for ethical foundations has pushed those who argue that ethics cannot exist without religion to posit that the foundation is what connects all classical ethical theories. There might be differences in other aspects.

The position of philosophy is not to look for foundation, but to search if a person can be moral, even if such a person does not subscribe to any religion or believes in the existence of God.

Obviously, if we are to look for foundation, it will be extremely difficult to bypass religion as the foundation of ethics. The reason is that society and religion are hardly separated. In every human society, there has been a myth of creation in which supernatural plays prominent roles. Ever since then, man has subscribed to one religion or the other for the proper ordering of the society. Doing away with foundation, then to address the issue at hand, it is safe to say that many people in the society do not profess any religious belief and are morally upright, and live exemplary lives (Omoregbe, 1993:7). If the above is the case, it follows that ethics can exist without religion.

Having established the existence of ethics devoid of religion, the question is: can religion exist without ethics? In other words, can someone be religious without being ethical? If the argument that religion is the foundation of ethics is sustained, then it would be good to argue that ethics is a lead way to religious perfection. This is because God issues commandments, rules, codes of conduct or morality that would aid the adherents of religious beliefs to perfection. Owing to the above, we can conclude that religion cannot exist without ethics. In this sense, ethics is a watchdog to religion. It scrutinises worshippers actions if they cohere with their religious beliefs. It also scrutinises religious

beliefs if they are coherent with the attributive nature of God that religion proclaims.

4.6.   The Role of Ethics in Religion

Though religious tenets are built on ethics, morality is not the major concern of religion. The major concern of religion, as noted earlier, is worship: adorations through rites and devotions. Ethics, on its own part, is concerned with morality. Religion dabbles into morality indirectly as an indispensable condition for true worshipping. Based on the foregoing, ethics or morality is the judge of religion; it judges both religion and its adherents. It judges religion by revealing the inherent immoral actions religion preaches or encourages; that would make humanity to know that such religion is a false one. It judges adherents of a religion, by showing light on the numerous immoralities that many people who belong to the religion engage in. For an illustration, if a religion that grounds its rules or commandments on the divine should do what is obviously in contrast with the nature of God that it professes, then such a religion must be rejected.

4.7.   Summary

Here is a brief summarised point of what we have discussed in this unit:

- Majority of our moral thoughts and ideas are developed from ancient codes of conducts and have a religious undertone.
- The major link between ethics and religion can be best explained with the "golden rule" – "Do unto others as you would wish them to do unto you".
- The major difference between ethics and religion is: while the primary role of ethics is morality, religion's primary assignment is worship, it only dabbles into morality as a secondary duty.
- There is a disagreement between scholars if either of ethics or religion can exist without the other.
- Arguably, while ethics can exist without religion, religion cannot exist without ethics.
- The major role ethics play in religion is a watchdog, to show the inconsistencies of religious people with the norms of their religion, and to show incoherence within the norms and values of a religion.

In this unit, we have examined the relationship that exists between ethics and religion. It is observed that the relationship is so robust and dated back to time immemorial, such that, it is very difficult to separate them from each other. We realised that while it a matter of debate which of the two proceeded, their connectivity is unarguable. Apart from the fact that religion dabbles into ethical domains by teachings and practices of what is right or wrong, good or bad, virtuous or vicious, the major link of ethics and religion is the 'golden rule'. Virtually all the major world religions profess a version of the golden rule. Therefore, by way of conclusion, whichever religious belief you share, it is important for you as a member of society to always scrutinise yourself, and all your actions with the golden rule. This is so even if such actions emanate from religious creed before you carry them out.

4.8.   References/Further Reading/Web resources

Kant, I. (1998). *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*. Translated and edited by Mary Gregor; with an introduction by Christine M. Korsgaard. Cambridge: University Press.

Mackenzie, J. S. (1900). "The Source of Moral Obligation." *International Journal of Ethics*, Vol. 10, No. 4. pp. 464-478. Available on www.jstor.org/stable/2375956. Accessed: 01-08-2019)

Müller, D. (2001). "Why and How Can Religions and Traditions be Plausible and Credible in Public Ethics Today?" *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, Vol. 4, No. 4

Is Theological Ethics Relevant Philosophers? pp. 329-348 http://www.jstor.org/stable/27504207. Accessed: 20-01-2016.

Omoregbe, J I. (1993). *Ethics: A Systematic and Historical Study*. Lagos: Joja Educational and Research Publishers Ltd.

On   Ethics and   Religion, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dE9EFZhSqR0&t=81s

On   Ethics and   Religion, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wRHBwxC8b8I&t=22s

On   Ethics and   Religion, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=UisxYorDNr4

Traer, R. (2009). *Doing Environmental Ethics*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.

4.9.   **Possible Answer to Self-Assessment Exercises**

1.   "Do unto others as you would wish them to do unto you"
2.   True