PG PH S4-01 (DSC)

TWO YEAR MASTER'S DEGREE COURSE

(CBCS in Accordance with NEP 2020)

SEMESTER - IV

APPLIED ETHICS

PHILOSOPHY

Surya Kumar Bhuyan School of Social Sciences

KRISHNA KANTA HANDIQUI STATE OPEN UNIVERSITY

Subject Experts

1. Prof. Sauravpran Goswami, Dept. of Philosophy, G.U.

2. Dr. Sabitri Devi, Associate Professor, Dept. of Philosophy, Cotton College.

3. Dr. Naba Prasad Nath, Associate Professor, Dept. of Philosophy, Nowgong College

Course Coordinator: Dr. Tejasha Kalita, Assistant Professor, KKHSOU

SLM Preparation Team

UNITS	CONTRIBUTORS
1	Dr. Urmimala Hazarika, Pandu College
2	Dr. V. Pravu, IIT Guwahati
3, 5,10,11,12	Dr. Tejasha Kalita, KKHSOU
4,7	Dr. Naba Prasad Nath, Nowgong College
6,14	Ms Rishika Patgiri, KKHSOU
8	Mr. Nilotpal Deka, Gauhati High Court
9	Dr. Samiksha Gohain, Cotton University
13	Dr. Sudeshna Choudhury, B. Borooah College
15	Dr. Manashi Bora, Nowgong Girls' College

Editorial Team

Content	:	Dr. Tejasha Kalita, KKHSOU
		Dr. Bhaskar Bhattacharyya, KKHSOU
Language	:	Dr. Tejasha Kalita, KKHSOU
Structure, Format & Graphics	:	Dr. Tejasha Kalita, KKHSOU

This Self Learning Material (SLM) is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-Non-Commercial-Share Alike 4.0 License (International)
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/4.0/

ISBN:
Print: April, 2026

Printed and published by the Registrar on behalf of Krishna Kanta Handiqui State OpenUniversity

Head Office: Patgaon, Rani Gate, Guwahati-781017
City Compus: Resham Nagar, Khanapara, Guwahati- 781022

CONTENTS

		Pages
UNIT 1 :	**The Concept of Applied Ethics** Concept of Ethics, Areas of Ethics, Meta Ethics, Normative Ethics, Applied Ethics, Nature of Applied Ethics, Applied Ethics and Philosophy, Applied Ethics and Ethics, Applied ethics and applied philosophy, Different fields of Applied Ethics, three important theories associated with Applied Ethics, some important principles on Applied Ethical discussion	**9-21**
UNIT 2 :	**Human Rights** Human rights, Human rights: what is, Moral rights and Legal rights, Moral Universalism, Rights and Duties, Claim rights and Liberty rights, Right priorities, Contemporary Debates, Interest theory, Will theory	**22-32**
UNIT 3 :	**Bioethics** The Concept of Bioethics, History of Bioethics, Meaning and Definition of Bioethics, Different Area of Bioethics, Conclusion	**33-38**
UNIT 4 :	**Euthanasia** Euthanasia: What it is, Kinds of Euthanasia, Historical Background of Euthanasia, Legal Status, Quality of Life Principle vs Sanctity of Life Principle, Euthanasia and Conventional Ethical Values	**39-49**
UNIT 5 :	**Abortion** Meaning and Definitions of Abortion, The Religious, Socio-Cultural and Legal Issues of Abortion, Utilitarianism, Kantian Ethics and the Problem of Abortion, Abortion and the Ethics of Virtue & Care, Moral Dimension of Abortion and Reproductive Issues and Technologies, Conclusion	**50-57**
UNIT 6 :	**Suicide** Characteristics of suicide, Highlights on historical western thought, Morality and Rationality of suicide	**58-64**
UNIT 7 :	**Capital Punishment** Theories of Punishment, What is Capital Punishment, Debate on Capital Punishment: Is Capital Punishment justified, Capital Punishment in India, Right to Live Argument	**65-75**
UNIT 8 :	**Media Ethics** Media and importance of ethics, Media Code of Ethics, Right of Reply	**76-86**
UNIT 9 :	**Environmental Ethics** Emergence of Environmental Ethics, Perspectives on Environmental ethics, Anthropocentrism, Non-anthropocentrism, Biocentrism, Eco-centrism, Criticisms	**87-97**

UNIT 10 : Moral Agency and Nature **98-109**
Meaning of Moral agency and nature, scope of moral agency and nature, characteristics of moral agency and nature

UNIT 11: Nature as the Expression of the Sublimity **110-121**
Ancient philosophy, Eighteenth century, Romantic period, Victor Hugo, post-Romantic and twentieth century

UNIT 12: Nature as an Artefact **122-133**
Analysis of the concept of Artefact, Artefact, Work, and the Ontology of Artifacts, Making Objects: Productive Action, Productive Intention, On the Characterization and Evaluation of Artifacts, Artworks

UNIT 13: Animal Rights **134-146**
Meaning and Definition of Animal Rights, Consequences of Animal Rights, The Case for Animal Rights, The Case against Animal Rights, Moral Community, Problems of Marginal People

UNIT 14 : War and Its Moral Implications **147-152**
Concept of War, Arguments in Favour of War, Arguments against War, Whether War is morally justified

UNIT 15 : Equality and Justice **153-160**
Meaning of Justice and equality, Relation between Justice and equality, Different thinkers' views on justice and equality

COURSE INTRODUCTION

This course introduces to you the subject of Applied Ethics. Here you will study the concepts and meaning of applied ethics. Except this you will be learned the different issues like environmental ethics, human rights, capital punishment, bioethics, feminist ethics etc. It will also deal with some other topics like abortion, euthanasia etc.

First unit of this block is 'The Concepts of Applied Ethics'. After going through this unit, you will be able to know the concept of Ethics, Areas of Ethics, Meta Ethics, Normative Ethics, Applied Ethics, and Nature of Applied Ethics. It also explores the relationship of applied ethics and Philosophy, Different fields of Applied Ethics, three Important Theories associated with Applied Ethics, and Some important principles on Applied Ethical discussion

The second unit of this block is Human Rights. It gives you the knowledge of what are Human Rights, Moral Rights, Legal Rights, and Moral Universalism. Apart from this, it also discusses Rights and Duties, Claim Rights, Liberty rights, Right priorities, Contemporary Debates, Interest theory, and Will theory.

'Bioethics' is the third unit of this block. This unit introduces to you the concept of bioethics. After going through this unit, you will be able to know that bioethics is a part of applied ethics. Unlike other traditional ethics, bioethics tries to explore some of the important real-life issues like abortion, euthanasia, animal ethics, environmental issues, stem cell research, and reproductive issues like IVF etc. from the moral perspective. Now let us study and discuss the concept of bioethics in more details.

The name of the fourth unit of this block is 'Euthanasia'. After going through this unit, you will know what is euthanasia and its different aspects, you will also know that Medical Ethics as the part of Applied Ethics. You will be able to analyse the significance of euthanasia as the burning issue of Applied Ethics in contemporary phenomenon, find out the position of euthanasia amidst the conventional-value system of the society and see if euthanasia can be legalized, describe the relationship of euthanasia with Quality-of-Life Principle and Sanctity of Life Principle.

The name of the fifth unit is 'Abortion'. In this unit we are going to learn and discuss about the meaning and definitions of abortion, the religious, socio-cultural and legal issues of abortion, the utilitarianism, Kantian ethics and the problem of abortion, the abortion and the ethics and the problem of abortion, the moral dimension of abortion and reproductive issues and technologies.

The sixth unit is 'Suicide'. After going through this unit, you will know Suicide is an act of taking one's own life intentionally. It can be caused due to extreme form of mental disorders, stress or any other such causes which force themselves to take such drastic step. In this unit we shall discuss the concept of suicide, its characteristics, various Arguments in support of suicide, and various arguments that rejects suicide. We can also analyse whether taking one's own life is morally justified

The seventh unit of this course is 'Capital Punishment'. After going through this unit, one will be able to Know about capital punishment, the frequently discussed issue in

media. You will also know how it is related to the core agenda of philosophy. After going through this unit, you will be able to analyse different theories of punishment and will be able to find out the possible justification for and against capital punishment and will understand its relevance as well as its proper execution in the present social phenomenon.

The eighth unit of course one is 'The Media Ethics'. After going through this unit, you will be able to know that Media ethics is the subdivision of applied ethics dealing with the specific ethical principles and standards of media, including broadcast media, film, theatre, the arts, print media and the internet. The field covers many varied and highly controversial topics, ranging from war journalism to advertising.

The name of the ninth unit of this block is 'Environmental Ethics'. It includes the concepts of Emergence of Environmental Ethics, Perspectives on Environmental ethics, Anthropocentrism, Non-anthropocentrism, Biocentrism, Eco-centrism, and Criticisms.

The name of the tenth unit is 'Moral Agency and nature'. These unit consists of meaning of Moral agency and nature, scope of moral agency and nature, characteristics of moral agency and nature

The eleventh unit is 'Nature as the expression of the sublimity'. Within this unit it is been found the Ancient philosophy, Eighteenth century, Romantic period, Victor Hugo, post-Romantic and twentieth century

The twelfth unit is 'Nature as an artefact'. This unit consists of analysis of the concept of Artefact, Artefact, Work, and the Ontology of Artifacts, Making Objects: Productive Action, Productive Intention, On the Characterization and Evaluation of Artifacts, Artworks

The thirteenth unit is 'Animal Rights'. After going through this unit, you will able to know the meaning of rights and its relation to animals, the arguments for and against animal rights, the values of the lives of the member of moral community etc. You will also able to know which things are wrong to do with animals and will also able to know whether animals possess moral status or not.

The fourteenth unit is 'War and its Moral Implication'. After going through this chapter, you will be able to understand what is war, analyze the justification of war, analyse the negative effects of war, decide whether war is morally right.

The fifteenth unit of course is 'Justice and Equality'. After going through this unit, you will be able to know that in philosophy, justice is the concept of a proper proportion between a person's desires and the good and bad things that befall or are allotted to him or her. Justice, in its broadest context, includes both the attainment of that which is just and the philosophical discussion of that which is just. The concept of justice is based on numerous fields, and many differing viewpoints and perspectives including the concepts of moral correctness based on ethics, rationality, law, religion, equity and fairness. Often, the general discussion of justice is divided into the realm of social justice as found in philosophy, theology and religion, and, procedural justice as found in the study and application of the law.

While going through this course you will come across some boxes which are put on the left side or right side of the text. These boxes will give us the meanings of some

words and concepts within the text. Apart from this, there will be some broad and short questions included under Activity and Check Your Progress in every unit. Activities will increase our thinking capacity because questions put in Activity are not directly derived from the text. But answers to the short questions are put in the section Answers to Check Your Progress. Besides, there are some text-related questions which are put in Model Questions. These questions will help you in selecting and mastering probable topics for the examination so that you can prepare for the examination with confidence.

UNIT 1 : THE CONCEPT OF APPLIED ETHICS

UNIT STRUCTURE

1.1 Learning Objectives
1.2 Introduction
1.3 Concept of Ethics
1.4 Areas of Ethics
  1.4.1 Meta Ethics
  1.4.2 Normative Ethics
  1.4.3 Applied Ethics
1.5 Nature of Applied Ethics
1.6 Applied Ethics and Philosophy
1.7 Applied Ethics and Ethics
1.8 Applied Ethics and Applied Philosophy
1.9 Different fields of Applied Ethics
1.10 Three important theories associated with Applied Ethics
1.11 Some important principles on Applied Ethical discussion
1.12 Let us Sum up
1.13 Further Reading
1.14 Answers to Check Your Progress
1.15 Model Questions

1.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to :

- define the concept of Ethics
- discuss different fields of Ethics
- know what applied ethics is
- distinguish between Normative Ethics and Meta Ethics
- distinguish between Applied Ethics and Philosophy
- describe Applied Ethics and Ethics
- explain Applied Ethics and Applied Philosophy
- discuss different fields of Applied Ethics
- analyse three theories associated with Applied Ethics
- evaluate some principles on Applied Ethical discussion

1.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you first of all the concept of ethics, three major areas of Ethics – Normative Ethics, Meta Ethics and Applied Ethics. Thus, it makes an attempt to analyse what is the nature of Applied Ethics and its different fields. We have also tried to examine here the difference between Applied Ethics and Philosophy, Applied Ethics and Ethics, Applied Ethics and Applied Philosophy. Besides, three theories and some important principles associated with Applied Ethics will also be discussed.

1.3 CONCEPT OF ETHICS

Ethics is a special branch of Philosophy. Ethics is related to the Greek word 'Ethos', which means custom, habit. The main task of Ethics is to give an account of the ways in which human beings ought to act. So, Ethics can be called the science of character, habits of activity or conduct of human beings. Ethics is a moral Philosophy or Philosophical study about morality, moral problems and moral judgement. Therefore, we can say that as a science of character, ethics systematizes, defends and recommends concepts of right and wrong behaviour.

1.4 AREAS OF ETHICS

The field of ethics is commonly divided into three parts – Meta Ethics, Normative Ethics and Applied Ethics.

1.4.1 Normative Ethics

Normative Ethics is the study of how to determine ethical values. Normative ethics tries to arrive at a moral standard that regulate right and wrong conduct. Normative ethics always deals with some norms and tries to present the norms according to which they evaluate our actions. It tries to give a theory about the appropriate ethical norms and seeks to influence our actions. The key assumption of Normative ethics is that there is only one ultimate criterion of moral conduct, and it may be a single rule or set of principles

1.4.2 Meta Ethics

Meta Ethics is a subject concerned with the study of the foundation of ethics. It investigates the sources from where the principles of ethics come and what they mean. Meta Ethics is a kind of philosophical enquiry or theory, which is also called Analytical Ethics. Meta Ethics is distinct from Normative Ethics. The term Meta Ethics was first introduced by logical positivists. Meta-Ethics is concerned primarily with clarification and understanding of the moral concepts. The term Meta Ethics implies that we are not taking part in the practice of ethics itself. But Meta Ethics reflects on that practice. It is not concerned with providing any ethical norms. In Meta Ethics various ethically significant terms are analysed. One of the most popular ethical terms taken up for analysis is 'good'. The problem of universalizability of moral language is also included within the scope of meta ethics. The Question of whether and in what sense morality is subjective or objective, relative or absolute is all included under the heading of Meta- Ethics.

1.4.3 Applied Ethics

Applied Ethics is a discipline of philosophy that attempts to apply ethical theory to real life situation. Applied Ethics is the study of the use of ethical values.

Applied ethics tries to resolve the controversial and moral issues such as animal rights, environmental concerns, Medical ethics, Media ethics, Bioethics etc.

1.5 NATURE OF APPLIED ETHICS

The word 'Applied' means 'to put into practice'. Applied ethics is an area of ethics. It is a discipline of philosophy, which means philosophy of action. It is the method used to identify morally correct course of action in our life. These ethical principles are applied to solve moral problems in practical life. Thus, Applied ethics denotes the application of principles of ethics in our day to day life.

Applied ethics has its impact in various areas of life such as Journalism, law, medicine, engineering, business etc.

Applied ethics is used to solve various problems in personal and professional lives. It defines, organizes and explains ethical issues which have their application in daily life.

Thus, Applied ethics attempts to study the application of ethics to real life situation.

Brenda Almond is the co-founder of the society for Applied Philosophy stated that "Applied ethics is a philosophical examination, from a moral standpoint of a particular issue in private and public life that are matters of moral judgement".

LET US KNOW

Brenda Almond is Emeritus Prof. of moral and social philosophy at the University of Hull. She studied philosophy under A.J. Ayer at University College and University of London. She is the President of the Philosophical Society of England and Vice President of the society for Applied Philosophy. Her books include –The Fragmenting Family, Exploring Ethics, Moral Concerns, The Philosophical Quest.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q1: State whether the following statements are true or false:

(a) Ethics is a science of human conduct. (True/False)

(b) Ethics is divided into two primary areas. (True/False)

(c) Meta ethics tries to resolve the controversial issues like abortion and euthanasia. (True/False)

(d) Applied ethics focuses its attention to actual practical problems related to our lives. (True/False)

Q2: What are Normative ethics and Meta ethics? (Answer in about 20 words)

.....

.....

Q3: Write on the nature of Applied Ethics. (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

.....

Q4: State the three areas of Ethics.

.....

Q5: Name the moral issues related to environmental ethics and applied ethics

.....

.....

Q6: What is the meaning of the Greek word 'Ethics'?

.....

1.6 APPLIED ETHICS AND PHILOSOPHY

The term 'philosophy' literally means 'love of wisdom'. Philosophy is basically an attitude and an activity of human mind. Philosophy may be considered as the sum total of all knowledge. It refers to a way of living and thinking. Philosophy is taken to be a pure disinterested search for knowledge. The activity of philosophizing should lead towards wisdom, virtue or happiness. The history of philosophy is as old as mankind. A philosopher is always interested in grasping the essential nature of things. So, Philosophy is a critical and analytical investigation into the concepts employed in different fields of human thinking.

Applied ethics cannot be separated from philosophy. Because as an important field of ethics, applied ethics is a part of philosophy. Philosophy discusses such problems as the ideal or the purpose of life, the norms of right actions and the theories of good and evil. Applied ethics not only studies ideas and theories from the general studies of goodness and right actions but also finds out the way to solve these problems. On the other hand, Philosophy can only analyse and clarify moral problems but can not help to solve these problems.

1.7 APPLIED ETHICS AND ETHICS

Literally, Ethics means the science of custom or habits of man. It is the science of the habitual conduct of man. Ethics stresses more on manners, morals as well as character of human beings. Ethics deals with morality of human acts through the medium of natural reasons. Ethics teaches us how to judge accurately the moral goodness or badness of any human action. Ethics is considered to be the study dealing with the philosophical aspect of human action and trying to assess the question of right and wrong and also judge the moral consequences of such human action and inactive.

So, Ethics gives us theoretical direction to lead our lives. But Applied Ethics gives us practical direction of how to apply ethical principles to real life situations. Applied ethics as an area of ethics analyses, clarifies, and also tries to solve moral problems.

1.8 APPLIED ETHICS AND APPLIED PHILOSOPHY

The word 'applied' is a technical term describing a variety of new philosophical enterprises. Applied means "to put into practice". Applied Ethics focuses more closely on ethical discussion. But **Applied Philosophy covers within its scope the metaphysical,**

epistemological and ethical discussion. Applied Philosophy is the application of philosophy to everyday problems. Applied Philosophy discusses metaphysical issues like man's place in nature, the nature of personhood, the social implications of scientific and technological change etc.

Applied ethics likes to resolve controversial moral issues.

Both Applied ethics and Applied philosophy are sometimes used as synonymous. But the area of Applied Philosophy is broader than the area of Applied Ethics because Applied Philosophy covers within its discussion metaphysical, epistemological and ethical aspects. But Applied Ethics discusses only the ethical aspects of our lives.



ACTIVITY

- What do you mean by Applied philosophy? Do you think it is relevant in the present context?

  ……

  ……



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q7: State one moral issue related to applied ethics.

.....

Q8: Can ethics be separated from philosophy? (Answer in about 70 words)

.....

1.9 DIFFERENT FIELDS OF APPLIED ETHICS

There are various fields of Applied Ethics. Some of these are given below–

- Animal Ethics.
- Bioethics.
- Business Ethics.
- Computer Ethics.
- Educational Ethics.
- Environmental Ethics.
- Hospitality Ethics.
- Human right issues (eg. gender Ethics, sexism, classism, racism, capital punishment)
- International Ethics (eg. world hunger)
- Legal Ethics.
- Marketing Ethics.
- Media Ethics/Journalism
- Medical Ethics.
- Military Ethics
- Neuro Ethics.
- Public Administration.

- Research Ethics.
- Sexual Ethics.
- Ethics in social work.
- Sports Ethics.

- **Animal Ethics**

The main concept of Animal Ethics is that non-human animals should be treated with the same consideration and similar interest as human beings. Animals are used in laboratory for dissection, in biomedical research. It is the duty of every human being to show kindness towards the animals.



Peter Singer is an Australian Philosopher and Prof. of Bioethics at Princeton University and Laureate Professor at the Centre for Applied Philosophy and Public Ethics at the University of Melbourne.

- **Bioethics**

Bioethics literally means "life ethics". It is a very broad term and a very broad field of study. Bioethics is a discipline with ethical issues raised by new developments in the field of medicine and biological science. Bioethics makes us seek after what is good and right and what is pleasant life. This makes life lovable and pleasant to live with people and in harmony with the environment. This is total Bioethics. Bioethics education stresses on improving the quality of human life. Some important issues of Bioethics are Abortion, Euthanasia, Surrogate mother, Cloning, Biotechnology, Birth Control technology, Disability rights, Genetic research, and Mental health etc.

- **Business Ethics**

Business Ethics examines the moral controversies relating to the social and moral responsibilities in business practices. Business ethics analyses the problems and dilemmas created by business practices. Business ethics focuses its attention mainly on the question of policy. All problems arising in business sector should be managed with appropriate attention to ethical concern.

- **Computer Ethics**

The field of computer is very broad. In this field computing professionals have to face certain situations where they will have to make ethical decisions. As a field of Applied Ethics computer ethics helps the computing professionals to make decisions regarding professional and social conduct.

- **Educational Ethics**

The major aim of education should be to harmonize people, to enlighten both mind and hearts of individuals on right living. Educational ethics helps to identify moral dilemma in the field of education and offers alternative solution.

- **Environmental Ethics**

Environmental ethics studies the moral relationship of human being to the environment. The main objective of Environmental ethics is the conservation of life on earth. Environmental ethics is a new area of philosophy and it emerged as an academic discipline only in 1970. The protection of the natural environment is the practical and moral concern for mankind. The main purpose of Environmental ethics is based on promoting this view. Nature has provided climate, water, soil, air, place etc. in our lives. In today's world we face a range of environmental problems, such as global warming, deforestation, reduction in biodiversity etc. So, it is our duty to preserve our environment. This is the main aim of Environmental ethics.

- **Hospitality Ethics**

Hospitality is the relation between the guest and the host. Hospitality ethics is a discipline which studies the usage of hospitality and how it is applied to real life situation – That means how the friendly and generous relation between the guest and the host should be maintained.

- **Human Right Issues**

Human Rights are the basic rights and freedom, to which all human beings are entitled. Human right education helps us to develop a positive self image and for the all round development for human personality. Human right issues include gender ethics, sexism, classism, racism, capital punishment etc. Applied ethics helps us to solve the problems that arise regarding these issues.

- **International Ethics**

International ethics is concerned with the ethical obligations among the different nations. International ethics provides guidelines to overcome conflicts among them and shows the way as to how moral outcome can be achieved.

- **Legal Ethics**

Legal ethics provides an ethical code that governs the conduct of persons engaged in the practice of law and in legal sector. Legal ethics deals with the study and application of what is right and wrong, good and bad in the practice of law. Legal ethics assists the law profession and provides practical rules, regulations and guidelines that will protect both the public and the lawyer.

- **Marketing Ethics**

Marketing ethics is the area of Applied Ethics which deals with the moral principles behind the practices and regulations of marketing.

- **Media Ethics/Journalism**

Media ethics analyses and examines specific ethical principles in the field of broadcast, media (the main means of mass communication, especially television, radio and newspaper) films, theatre, journalism etc. Media persons and journalists have to face different challenges. Ethics of Media and Journalism comprises the principles of ethical and good practices which help the media persons and journalists to solve different problems faced by them.

- **Medical Ethics**

Medical Ethics is as old as Hippocratic oath. The Hippocratic Oath dates back to 460 BC where the Greek physician emphasized the moral ethical values and respect for the human person. Medical Ethics is one of the important areas of Applied Ethics. It is mainly concerned with the application of general principles to moral problems of medical profession. Medical Ethics analyses the way how moral decisions are made in the field of medicine. In medical profession knowledge is directed to alleviating human suffering, elevate human well being and prolong human life. Medical ethics deals with such issues and helps the physicians and other health professionals to solve the ethical dilemmas, which arise from the changed scenario of health care and increasing decline of moral values associated with medical fraternity and healthcare delivery.

- **Military Ethics**

The members of the armed forces should lead a disciplined life. Members will have to act in a manner established by military tradition. Military ethics consists in a set of practices

and philosophy which will help the members to act a disciplined life guided by the values and standards of morality.

- **Neuro Ethics**

Neuro Ethics is the branch of medicine and biology concerned with nervous system. Neuro ethics is the ethics of neuroscience. There are tremendous developments in the field of neuroscience. Neuro ethics deals with the ethical issues related to the development in neuroscience and offers suitable solutions to solve the dilemmas.

- **Public Administration**

In Public Administration a cordial relationship between administrators and the public should be maintained. During the completion of daily duties a public administrator will have to establish and maintain ethical behaviour with the employees also. Public administrative ethics attempts to give decisions which are based upon ethical principles and what the general public and employees would accept as correct.

- **Research Ethics**

In research, a systematic investigation should be made in order to establish facts and to reach new conclusion. So, the rights of people as well as their privacy should be protected to carry out the research work. Research ethics deals with the application of moral principles to a variety of topics involved in the field of research work. It also offers guidelines for the protection of the researchers.

- **Sexual Ethics**

Sexual ethics includes monogamy versus polygamy, sexual relations without love, homosexual relation and extramarital affairs etc. When some conflicting situations arise then sexual ethics provides guidelines to resolve these problems.

- **Sports Ethics**

Sports ethics deals with the moral issues and dilemma that arise in the field of sports. Ethics in sports is very essential for building a good sports career of a sports person. Sports coaches are expected to conform to ethical standards in a number of areas: humanity, relationship, commitment, co-operation, integrity, advertising, confidentiality, safety and competence. Sports ethics helps sports persons by providing ethical guidelines to resolve difficult issues to them.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q9: What do you mean by bio-ethics? (Answer in about 20 words)

.....

.....

Q10: Point out three fields of applied ethics.

.....

.....

Q11: What is environmental ethics? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

.....

Q12: Give some examples of environmental problems.

.....

.....

Q13: State whether the following statements are true or false:

a) Philosophy investigates the concept employed in different fields of human thinking.

b) The area of Applied philosophy is not broader than the area of Applied Ethics.

c) Applied Philosophy is the application of philosophy to everyday problems.

Q14: What is the main difference between Applied Philosophy and Applied Ethics? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

.....

Q15: What do you mean by the term "Applied"?

.....

Q16: State five different fields of Applied Ethics.

.....

.....

1.10 THREE THEORIES ASSOCIATED WITH APPLIED ETHICS

Applied ethics is an application of normative principles to medical fields. As there are basically three different kinds of Normative Ethics, there are also three basic theories associated with applied ethics.

Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics and Virtue Ethics are the three theories related with Applied Ethics.

Utilitarianism: Where practical consequences of various policies are evaluated on the assumption that the right policy will be one, which seeks to promote the greatest happiness for the largest number of people. According to Utilitarianism, an action is morally right if the consequences of that action are more favourable rather than unfavourable.

Deontological Ethics: It is based on rules. It is an obligation to perform 'right' action, regardless of actual consequences. Deontological Ethics is sometimes called duty ethics.

Virtue Ethics: Virtue Ethics is one of the oldest normative traditions of western philosophy. It is derived from Aristotle's Ethics. Virtue Ethics emphasizes the role of character and virtue in moral philosophy rather than either doing one's duty or acting in order to bring about good consequence.

1.11 SOME IMPORTANT PRINCIPLES ON APPLIED ETHICAL DISCUSSION

- Personal benefit – Personal benefit is an action which produces benefit to the individual.
- Social Benefit -Social benefit is an action which produces benefit to the society as a whole.
- Principle of benevolence – This principle insists on helping those in need.
- Principle of paternalism – This principle assists others in pursuing their best interest or the interests of their choice.
- Principle of harm – Not to harm others.

- Principle of honesty – Not to deceive others.
- Principle of lawfulness –One is not supposed to violate the law.
- Principle of autonomy – This principle acknowledges a person's right to due process and fair distribution of benefit. Compensation is to be given for any harm done to the person.
- Rights – It acknowledges a person's right to life, right to information, right to privacy, free expression and safety.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q17: State whether the following statements are true or false—

a) Utilitarianism is based mainly on rules. (True/False)
.....

b) Virtue ethics is a type of normative ethics.(True/False)
.....

c) Principle of honesty is an important principle of Applied Ethics.(True/False)
.....

d) Applied ethics do not give importance to social benefit.(True/False)
.....

Q18: State the three theories associated with Applied Ethics.
.....
.....

Q19: State five important principles which are commonly applied to Applied Ethics.
.....
.....

Q 20: What do you mean by 'Duty Ethics'? (Answer in about 20 words)
.....
.....

1.12 LET US SUM UP

- Ethics is a special area of philosophy and it is a philosophical study about morality.
- Meta Ethics is a subject concerned with the study of the foundation of ethics. It investigates the sources from where the principles of ethics come. And it is a kind of philosophical enquiry or theory, which is also called Analytical Ethics
- Normative Ethics is the study of how to determine ethical values. Normative ethics tries to arrive at the moral standard that regulates right and wrong conduct.
- Applied Ethics is a discipline of philosophy that attempts to apply ethical theory to real life situations. Applied Ethics is the study of the use of ethical values.
- Applied ethics can't be separated from philosophy. Because as an important field of ethics, applied ethics is a part of philosophy. It not only studies ideas and theories from the general point of view of goodness and right actions but also finds out the way to solve these problems.

- Applied Philosophy covers within its scope the metaphysical, epistemological and ethical discussion. Applied Philosophy is the application of philosophy to everyday problems.
- Bioethics is a discipline with ethical issues raised by new development in the field of medicine and biological science.
- Business Ethics examines moral controversies relating to the social and moral responsibilities in business practices. It analyses problems and dilemmas created by business practices.
- Environmental ethics studies the moral relationship of human beings to the environment. The main objective of Environmental ethics is the conservation of life on earth.
- Medical Ethics is one of the important areas of Applied ethics. It is mainly concerned with the application of general principles to the moral problems of medical profession.
- Neuro Ethics is the branch of medicine and biology concerned with nervous system. Neuro ethics is the ethics of neuroscience.
- Sports ethics deals with the moral issues and dilemma involved in the field of sports. Ethics in sports is very essential for building a good career of an ideal sports person.
- Virtue ethics is derived from Aristotle's Ethics. It emphasizes the role of character and virtue in moral philosophy rather than either doing one's duty or acting in order to bring about good consequence.

1.13 FURTHER READING

1) Rachels, J (ed). 1997, *Moral Problems,* Harper Collins Publishers.
2) Singer, Peter, 2011, *Applied Ethics*, Oxford University Press.
3) Singer, Peter, 1979, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge University Press.
4) John, H. Piet & Ayodhya Prasad. *An Introduction to Applied Ethics.*

1.14 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: (a) True (b) False (c) False (d) True

Ans to Q No 2: Normative ethics is the study of how to determine ethical values and Meta ethics studies the concepts of ethics.

Ans. to Q No 3: Applied ethics is an area of ethics. Applied ethics tries to resolve some controversial moral issues involved in the field of medicine, law, Journalism, business etc.

Ans to Q No 4: Normative Ethics, Meta Ethics, and Applied Ethics

Ans to Q No 5: Animal rights, Medical ethics, Media ethics

Ans to Q No 6: Greek word 'Ethica'

Ans to Q No 7: Animal ethics

Ans to Q No 8: Applied ethics can't be separated from philosophy. Because as an important field of ethics, applied ethics is a part of philosophy. Philosophy discusses such problems as the ideal or the purpose of life, the norms of right actions and the theories of good and evil. Applied ethics not only studies ideas and theories from the general studies of goodness and right actions but also finds out the way to solve these problems.

Ans to Q No 9: Bioethics is a discipline with ethical issues raised by new development in the field of medicine and biological science.

Ans to Q No 10: abortion, euthanasia, Surrogate mother

Ans to Q No 11: Environmental ethics studies the moral relationship of human being to the environment. The main objectives of Environmental ethics is the conservation of life on earth.

Ans to Q No 12: Global warming, deforestation, reduction in biodiversity etc.

Ans to Q No 13: (a) True (b) False (c) True

Ans to Q No 14: Applied philosophy covers within its scope epistemological, metaphysical and ethical discussion. But Applied Ethics discusses ethical issues only and tries to resolve controversies arising from these issues.

Ans to Q No 15: The term Applied means to 'put into practice'.

Ans to Q No 16: Five important fields of Applied Ethics are– Animal Ethics, Bioethics, Environmental Ethics, Medical Ethics, Research Ethics.

Ans to Q No 17: (a) False (b) True (c) True (d) False

Ans to Q No 18: Utilitarianism, Deontological Ethics, Virtue Ethics.

Ans to Q No 19: Personal benefit, social benefit, principle of benevolence, principle of harm, principle of autonomy

Ans to Q No 20: It is based on rules. It is an obligation to perform 'right action' irrespective of actual consequence

1.15 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very Short Questions

Q 1: What is environmental ethics?

Q 2: What are the three parts of ethics?

Q 3: What do you mean by applied ethics?

Q 4: What is sports ethics?

Q 5: What do you mean by medical ethics?

B) Short Questions (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Distinguish between:

a) Applied Ethics and Philosophy.

b) Applied Ethics and Ethics.

c) Applied Ethics and Applied Philosophy

Q 2: Do you find any relationship between applied ethics and philosophy? Briefly explain

Q 3: Briefly explain the relationship between applied ethics and ethics.

Q 4: What do you mean by applied ethics? Explain briefly with reference to applied philosophy.

D) Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Explain briefly the different areas of ethics.

Q 2: Name five important principles related with Applied Ethics. Discuss.

Q 3: Discuss briefly— Environmental Ethics, Bioethics, Medical Ethics, Animal Ethics, and Research Ethics.

Q 4: What are the different fields of Applied Ethics? Explain

Q 5: Discuss the nature of Applied Ethics

Q 6: Explain the theories associated with applied ethics.

UNIT 2: HUMAN RIGHTS

UNIT STRUCTURE

2.1 Learning Objectives
2.2 Introduction
2.3 Human Rights
  2.3.1 Human Rights: what it is
  2.3.2 Moral Rights and Legal Rights
  2.3.3 Moral Universalism
2.4 Rights and Duties
  2.4.1 Claim Rights and Liberty Rights
  2.4.2 Rights Priorities
2.5 Contemporary Debates
  2.5.1 Interest Theory
  2.5.2 Will Theory
2.6 Let us Sum up
2.7 Further Reading
2.8 Answers to Check Your Progress
2.9 Model Questions

2.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to

- identify what human rights are and the issues pertaining to human rights
- discuss the different philosophical positions in the human rights discourse.
- understand human rights in the social, legal and political contexts
- understand the relationship between rights and duties
- evaluate human rights issues critically

2.2 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we will be discussing issues pertaining to human rights. Human rights are one of the important issues being discussed in the contemporary world. Human rights are generally considered to be those inalienable rights that are bestowed upon a human being by the virtue of being a member of the human family.

2.3 HUMAN RIGHTS

In this chapter, we shall deliberate upon the philosophical issues involved with respect to human rights and we shall try to see how it is related to duties. Can there be a moral justification for human rights? Are human rights and moral rights same? What are the different aspects of human rights? These are some of the issues we will be discussing in the subsequent sections of this chapter. To do this exercise, let us start with the question- what this issue of human rights is all about?

2.3.1 Human Rights: What it is

Before getting into a philosophical discussion of human rights, let me give a brief historical account of the human Rights Declaration. Instead of focusing on how many of such **human rights are possible, international institutions like the UN was laid stress on the fundamental prerequisites for every human being to lead a minimal good life.** For instance, have you ever given a thought as to what are all the things you need to lead a basic good life? The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), the European Convention on Human Rights (1954) and the International Covenant on Civil and Economic Rights (1966) have outlined certain rights for every human being for leading a good life and it should be the aspiration for every nation to ensure that these rights are made available to every citizen.

We know that the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948) came out with a list of basic human rights. This naturally entails such questions were there no human rights before? Or are human rights merely some constitutional rights or are they something more than that?

2.3.2 Natural Rights and Legal Rights

Can somebody harm you? Can somebody take your property without your knowledge? Do you feel that any such type of action is wrong? If it is wrong, did you ever think why it is wrong? You may come up with an answer saying that you have a right of not to be harmed and that also you have a right of owning your property. The next question will be who gave you these rights? Or how did you get/ acquire these rights? You can come up with an answer that these rights are provided to you according to our legal system. Can we ask further? Let us assume, if the legal system did not provide you with a right of not being harmed, does it mean that you do not enjoy a right not to be harmed? Or do you think that whether legal system accepts or not, you have a right not to be harmed? Answers to these questions shall make us dwell on the philosophical issue of human rights. In the subsequent paragraphs we shall discuss the philosophical rationale for the human rights.

We come across primarily two main positions here. One position holds that human rights are basically an outcome of specific social-cultural contexts and there is nothing like natural human rights. This can be a sort of moral relativism. According to this school, in the context of human rights, whatever is claimed as human rights is nothing but a branch of legal rights given in the laws of individual states or other institutions. As against this, the other position is that there is a natural moral right with which every human being is bestowed with. These natural rights are common to all individuals irrespective of their culture, social class, or any other such types of contingencies. This school takes the moral rights to be universal. Thus, this position resorts to one or the other sort of moral universalism. This means that there is a moral right, which we can identify through our reason and which is beyond any social and historical contingencies and every human

being irrespective of his/her race, culture, colour, caste, religion, creed, language, gender does possess such rights. This suggests that these moral rights are universally true.

By accepting the position of moral universalism, we are given the scope for seeing if 'human-made' laws are correct. That is, we can have an evaluation of a legal system on the basis of whether it is in accordance with the moral law. Aristotle made such claims in his Nicomachean Ethics. In distinguishing between 'natural justice' and 'legal justice', Aristotle writes, 'the natural is that which has the same validity everywhere and does not depend upon acceptance.'

The other camp, legal positivists, talks of legal rights as the only possible rights. The moral rights are not rights as such, rather, they are moral claims. For utilitarian thinker Jeremy Bentham, there cannot be any moral rights existing prior to any legal system. Whether a particular right is there for a person or not, in this scheme of thought it is judged by the fact as to whether that right has been given in the legal system. If it is available in the legal procedures, then that right is allowed and if it is not, then there is no such right. Though this account seems rather simple, yet it has serious problems.



LET US KNOW

Moral relativism: It is a concept that moral judgments are true or false only relative to some particular standpoint and it holds that no standpoint is absolutely true or false.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q1: What is natural justice? (Answer in about 20 words)

.....

.....

Q 2: State the name of a utilitarian thinker.

.....

.....

2.3.3 Moral Universalism

As we raised in the initial part of our discussion, we have seen that it might be possible and, as a matter of fact, it needs to be possible, for us to evaluate a particular legal procedure. There can be a legal system, which can reject outright certain rights given to certain segments of the people to enjoy. In this case, are we not making an attempt to evaluate whether the laws, which are discriminatory, are taking care of the 'rights' of all the people? If we find that certain laws are discriminatory, we claim that it is against the 'rights' of the people. When we make such types of arguments, we presume a certain kind of 'right' over and above the legal rights. These rights can be argued as moral rights and which can be considered independent of any social or historical conditions and, therefore, they can be thought

of as universal moral rights. According to this position, every individual possesses natural rights independent of society or state. This position was particularly held by one influential thinker John Locke in his work *Two Treatises of Government* (1688). The acceptance of moral rights can be taken as the genesis of human rights. According to Locke's argument, an individual possesses natural rights independent of the any political setup and prior to any legal setup as well. The immediate question that comes to our mind is what are all the moral rights the individual possesses and how does the individual possess such natural rights? While addressing the former question, one needs to enumerate with justification the natural rights one is supposed to possess; and for the latter question, one has to justify how such moral rights are possible. According to Locke, they possess natural rights because of natural law and natural law originated from God. Thus, Locke referred to the theological issues when he tried to substantiate the natural law and thereby natural rights theory.

As against Locke, in the 18th century Immanuel Kant tried to base moral rights not on any theological suppositions but on the universal rationality and autonomy of the individuals. Kant tries to give a formal understanding of the rights rather than the substantive one. That is, he was concerned with the rule for making certain rights rather than whether a particular right (for example, a right to die in case of euthanasia) can be made as inalienable right or not. According to Kant, formal principle consists in making one's maxim to see if it carries a universal applicability that respects equality and individual autonomy. Thus, Kant gives the basis of universal moral rights through his categorical imperative. I shall take up the contemporary debates with respect to this issue in the later part of the unit.

2.4 RIGHTS AND DUTIES

While we talk about human rights we should also be discussing duties as the idea of human rights is related with the concept of duty. To put in simplistic terms, one person's right is another person's duty. But, on a careful analysis of the concept of right, we can find there can be different shades of rights. **W.N. Hohfeld (1919) classified rights into four types – Liberty rights, Claim rights, Power rights and Immunity rights. Current literature (Peter Jones 1994) reduces the last two categories also within claim and liberty rights. Let us see what these liberty rights and claim rights mean.**

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q3: Who is the author of Two *Treatises of Government*?

.....

.....

Q4: What are the kinds of rights, according to W.N. Hohfeld

.....

.....

2.4.1 Claim Rights and Liberty Rights

Claim rights are those rights which we normally understand as rights, which have corresponding duty onto others. If I have a right, then it means that you (individual or state) have a duty to abide by it. Peter Jones writes that Claim right is, more important than Liberty rights. Jones classifies Claim Rights into *positive* and *negative* claim rights. Positive claim rights are those that are against some specific person or institution. For example, if I am entitled for some items in ration shop, then I have a positive right to get those items from the government public distribution system. They are bound to give me what I have a right to. Negative claim rights are not directed against any one person, but against all. For example, I have bought a pen and I have a right over it. It means that nobody can take it. Everybody is obligated not to take my pen. This can be treated as negative claim right.

Compared to Claim Rights, Liberty Rights are those rights which are not directed against one or any other person's duty to fulfill that right. It is often marked in negative terms. It comes up with the idea of liberty. I have the freedom (right) to think of having a good peaceful evening on the banks of the Brahmaputra. Is anybody obligated to fulfill your right? No. Similarly can anybody restrain you from having that freedom? No. Thus, Liberty Rights are often negative rights that need not come up with obligation on any person.

The need to make these categories of rights like Claim Rights and Liberty Rights is to see how the different enumerations of rights fit in the ambit of universal rights. When we talk of the substantive rights described in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and other conventions, we can see that it can be broadly categorized under five heads – *rights to life*, *rights to freedom*, *rights to political participation*, *rights to the protection of the rule of law*; *rights to fundamental social*, *economic*, *and cultural goods*. These rights involve Claim Rights, Liberty Rights or a combination of both.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q5: What are the classifications of Claim Right, according to Peter Jones?

.....

.....

Q6: Make a distinction between positive and negative claim rights. (Answer in about 20 words)

.....

.....

Q7: Human rights can be categorized into five heads. What are they?

.....

.....

2.4.2 Rights Priorities

When we have a list of human rights does it mean that all rights have the same importance? This will be a difficult question to tackle. Broadly speaking, when we talk of human rights as rights that are needed for every individual to lead a minimally good life, then it will not be possible to prioritize which rights are more important than the others. But, at the same time, when we think practically, depending on the resources of the state to fulfill the requirements of rights, there can be certain level of prioritizing of certain human rights over certain other human rights. For example, realizing in practice that everybody has a right to food actually depends upon the resources available to implement it.

The biggest problem associated with the current human rights discourse is its implementation part. Who owns the responsibility for exercising one's rights? Everybody has got the right to food, but we see in so many African countries and even in our own country lots of people suffer/die from hunger. Do these people not have the right to live? Who is responsible for this? Does it mean that you and I are responsible for this or is it our government? Some Philosophers like Thomas Pagge (1995) claim that moral responsibility lies upon the institutions rather than the individuals. That is why we consider our government and its policies responsible for any such violation of human rights. The government and international organizations like UN are to take the responsibility from the fulfillment of these human rights aspirations**.** Ronald Dworokin (1977), a thinker, suggests that human rights trump all other policies and social goals. That means catering to the needs of human rights is the priority of the government before it takes up other social issues. In this way, we can at least try to give a formal structure to protect human rights with the resources available to us.

2.5 CONTEMPORARY DEBATES

The current trend on human rights is considered both in terms of moral rights and legal rights. But, this issue is not philosophically resolved. The one big problem of confining human rights to legal rights is to make it contingent and socially and historically contextualized. So, some philosophers tried to defend human rights over and beyond legal rights. Contemporary thinkers like John Finnis in 'Natural Law and Natural Rights' (1997) try to defend a natural law position in rights. We have already seen how the concept of natural rights has been deliberated in the past to lay a foundation for human rights as moral rights. Apart from the natural rights theorists, there are also thinkers who try to give human rights a social-contract perspective. Thinkers like Thomas Hobbes did it. Human rights were also based on the concept of reciprocity – a golden rule – that is, 'do unto others what you want them to do to you.'

2.5.1 Interest theory

In the ongoing debate on the nature of human rights as moral rights, currently two positions can be considered quite important. They are the 'Interests theory'

and the 'Will theory'. Interests' theory approach to human rights bases its idea on some common human interests which are by nature available to human beings. For the interests theorists, the function of human rights are to serve the human interests. As humans have some natural interests, securing those interests is a part of their rights and thus, human rights can be morally justified as it is part of the human's interests. The Interests theory is concerned with listing out the social and biological interests for human beings to lead a minimally good life. Thus for the Interests theorists like John Finnis (1980), human rights act as an instrumental value in order to provide and protect the basic human interests. The human interests based approach to human rights has an appeal to commonality amongst all the human beings and thus try to make those interests as inalienable rights that transcend beyond the contingencies. It can also try to give preference for one human right over the other on the basis of the prioritizing the interests of the humans. For example, the interest to survive is more important than the interest to get education. Maybe, an interest to get education can be more important than interest to enjoy leisure. Thus, prioritizing human rights is both possible and workable in this approach.

One of the important criticisms against the Interest theory is that its bases his human rights account on the universal human nature. But a serious question in this regard is, can there be a universal human nature? The Interest theory, on the basis of universal human nature, insists on creating the necessary conditions to provide a minimal quality of good life, but, the issue is with regard to the minimal things for good life - is it common to all the people? Do the social, cultural and historical factors not play a major role in this? Amartya Sen (1999) has argued that the minimal conditions for a decent life are socially and culturally relative. Once we accept this position, then the Interests theory insists that on the basis of human's social and biological needs, the rights need to be ascertained and the need to be relooked at. And one more important issue is that once we take certain social and biological interests as the basis of human nature and subsequently those can be established as human rights, we implicitly take a deterministic position with respect to human interests and needs.

LET US KNOW

Inalienable right: A right that cannot be taken away, denied, or transferred.
Contingencies: A future event or circumstance which is possible but cannot be predicted.

2.5.2 Will Theory

Against the 'Interest theorists' are the 'will theorists', who try to rationalize human rights on the basis of one attribute, that is, the human capacity to be free. They argue that the distinctive aspect of human agency is his/her capacity for freedom and hence the human rights issue needs to be addressed through this element of freedom. WLA Hart, Henry Shue, Alan Gewirth are some thinkers who

try to argue from this line. Gewirth claims that human rights claims are based upon our capacity as rationally purposive agents. To be human is to be rationally purposive and for that freedom and well-being are the necessary, according to Gewirth, who says that capacity for freedom implies a rationally purposive agency. While such a view of human rights on the premise of rationally purposive agents with the prerequisites of human freedom and well-being is sound, it raises a serious issue against the marginalized people, who are not rational purposive agents. People who are challenged with one or other mental illness or similar illness may not fall under the category of rationally autonomous agents. Does it mean that they do not have any human rights? The implication of Will theory may imply that but it is intuitively unacceptable. However, taken together the interest and the will theory give a good ground for arguing about the possibility of human rights as something common to all people going irrespective of different cultures and social contexts. The contemporary debates and discussions do suggest that human rights issues are not merely philosophical issues but also have social, political and ethical ramification.

LET US KNOW

Marginalized people: People who are confined to a lower or outer limit or edge in case of social standing.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q8: What do you mean by Interests theory? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

.....

Q9: What is Will theory? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

.....

2.6 LET US SUM UP

- Human rights focus on fundamental prerequisites for every human being to lead a minimal good life.
- Natural rights are common to all individuals irrespective of their culture, social class, or any other such types of contingencies.
- Moral universalism holds that the moral rights are universal. This means that there is a moral right, which we can identify through our reason and which is beyond any social and historical contingencies and every human being irrespective of his/her race, culture, color, caste, religion, creed, language, gender does possess such rights.

- W.N. Hohfeld (1919) classified rights into four types – liberty rights, claim rights, power rights and immunity rights. Current literature (Peter Jones 1994) reduces the last two categories also within claim and liberty rights.
- Jones classifies Claim rights into positive and negative claim rights. Positive claim rights are those that are against some specific person or institution. For example, if I am entitled for some items in ration shop, then I have a positive right to get that from the government public distribution system. They are bound to give me what I have a right to.
- Negative claim rights are not directed against any one person, but against all. For example, I have bought a pen and I have a right over it. It means that nobody can take it. Everybody is obligated not to take my pen. This can be treated as negative claim right.
- Liberty rights are those rights which are not directed against one or any other person's duty to fulfill that right. It is often marked in negative terms. It comes up with the idea of liberty.
- Philosophers (Thomas Pagge 1995) claim that moral responsibility is upon the institutions rather than the individuals. That is why we see that our government and its policies are considered to be responsible for any such violation of human rights. The government and international organizations like UN take the responsibility to realize these human rights aspirations.
- On the nature of human rights as moral rights, two positions can be considered as quite important. They are the 'Interests' theory' and the 'Will theory'.
- Interests' theory approach to human rights bases its idea on some common human interests which are by nature available to the human beings. For the Interests theorists, the function of human rights are to serve the human interests. As humans have some natural interests, securing those interests is the part of their rights and thus, human rights can be morally justified as it is part of the human's interests. The interests theory is concerned with listing out the social and biological interests for human beings leading a minimally good life.

2.7 FURTHER READING

1) Patrick Hayden.(2001) *Philosophy of Human Rights*: *Readings in Context*. Paragaon House Publishers
2) Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy – Human Rights

2.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: According to Aristotle, 'the natural is that which has the same validity everywhere and does not depend upon acceptance.'

Ans to Q No 2: Geremy Bentham

Ans to Q No 3: John Locke

Ans to Q No 4: Liberty rights, Claim rights, Power rights, Immunity rights

Ans to Q No 5: Positive claim rights and Negative claim rights

Ans to Q No 6: Jones classifies claim rights into two. They are positive and negative claim rights. Positive claim rights are those rights which are against some specific person or institution. For example, I want some items in ration shop. It implies I have a positive right to get that from the government public distribution system. They are bound to give me what I have a right to. On the other hand Negative claim rights are that rights which are not directed against any one person, but against all. For example, I have bought a pen and I have a right over it. It means that nobody can take it. Everybody is obligated to not to take my pen. This can be treated as negative claim right.

Ans to Q No 7: Human rights can be categorized into five heads. They are: Rights to life, rights to freedom, rights to political participation, rights to the protection of the rule of law, rights to fundamental social, economic, and cultural goods.

Ans to Q No 8: It is a theory of human rights which is concerned with the social and biological interests for human beings in order to lead a good life. The advocates of this theory are WLA Hart, Henry Shue, and Alan Gewirth.

Ans to Q No 9: It is also a theory of human rights which is rationalized on the basis of one attribute i.e., human capacity to be free. It also denotes that all human rights issue needs to be addressed through the element of freedom.

2.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very Short Questions

Q 1: What do you mean by Human Rights?
Q 2: What is legal rights?
Q 3: Define natural rights.
Q 4: What do you mean by moral relativism?
Q 5: Write the name of an advocate of legal system.
Q 6: Who writes: “The natural is that which has the same validity everywhere and does not depend on acceptance”.
Q 7: What are claim rights?
Q 8: Write the definition of liberty rights.

B) Answer briefly (Answer in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Make a distinction between natural rights and legal rights.
Q 2: Write briefly on natural rights.
Q 3: Write a short note on Moral Utilitarianism.
Q 4: Distinguish between claim rights and liberty rights.
Q 5: Explain in brief the interest theory approach to human rights.
Q 6: What is will theory? Briefly explain.

C) Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Explain the concept of moral utilitarianism.

Q 2: Do you find any link between rights and duties? Explain in support of your reason.

Q 3: What is human rights? Explain the different kinds of rights.

UNIT 3: BIO-ETHICS

UNIT STRUCTURE

3.1 Learning Objectives
3.2 Introduction
3.3 The Concept of Bioethics
3.4 History of Bioethics
3.5 Meaning and Definition of Bioethics
3.6 Different Area of Bioethics
3.7 Conclusion
3.8 Let us Sum up
3.9 Further Reading
3.10: Answer to Check Your Progress
3.11 Model Questions

3.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- know the Concept of Bioethics
- explain the History of Bioethics
- explain the meaning and definition of bioethics
- know the different areas of bioethics

3.2 INTRODUCTION

This unit introduces to you the concept of bioethics. After going through this unit you will be able to know that bioethics is a part of applied ethics. Unlike other traditional ethics, bioethics tries to explore some of the important real life issues like abortion, euthanasia, animal ethics, environmental issues, stem cell research, and reproductive issues like IVF etc. from the moral perspective. Now let us study and discuss the concept of bioethics in more details.

3.3 THE CONCEPT OF BIOETHICS

Bioethics is one of the latest trends in philosophy, especially in ethics. It can be regarded that bio-ethics uses to study various ethical issues related to human and non-human like, abortion, euthanasia, stem-cell research, animal rights, environmental issues like pollution, environmental degradation etc. At present bio-ethics is studied by the students of philosophy only, as it comes under the discipline of philosophy. But bio-ethics deals with such important issues which should be known by all. Bioethical debates, particularly in animal ethics and environmental ethics, are concerned with issues of moral status and moral protection. The vital question is, for example, whether all animals have a moral status and hence are members of the moral community enjoying moral protection or

whether they do not have a moral status at all (or only to some degree for some animals, such as higher mammals such as great apes, dolphins and elephants). But, even if animals do not have a moral status and hence have no moral rights, it could be the case that they still are morally significant in the sense that human beings are not allowed to do whatever they want to do with them (for example, to torture animals for fun). The fundamental idea of granting a living being a moral status is to protect the particular being from various kinds of harm which undermine the being's flourishing. For example, one can protect the great apes by granting them a moral status which is important for their survival since one can then legally enforce their moral right not to be killed.

3.4 HISTORY OF BIO-ETHICS

For the first time the term "bio-ethics" has been referred by a biological scientist named Van Rensselaer Potter in the year 1970. For him bioethics is a subject which is a mixture of scientific knowledge and moral knowledge and which cover the evolutionary understanding of human in nature. Again in 1971, the Kennedy Institute of Ethics was founded at Georgetown. The main aim of this foundation is to do new research in the field of medical ethics, the founder of this foundation, Andre Hellegers has also regarded this kind of this ethics to be 'bio-ethics'. The Encyclopaedia of Bioethics, which was begun by Kennedy institute by 1972, has defined bio-ethics as "the study of the ethical dimensions of medicine and the biological sciences" (Reich, 1978). It is observed that some great literaures have been found in different cultures of the world like Greco-Roman, Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Confucian, Islamic etc. where people have practiced medicine by giving importance to values and Moral behaviour. It is said in those scriptures that medical practitionars in the traditional age were competent, dedicated, kept confidences, and cared for the sick poor without change.

This moral temaparament have been adopeted by the bio-ethician and extend their scope of study to other issues like euthanasia, human reproduction animal rights and environmenatl issues etc. too.

3.5 MEANING AND DEFINITION OF BIO-ETHICS

When we generally talking about ethics, most of the people cannot define it properly or not able to provide proper definition of bio-ethics. If we want to understand bio-ethics, first we have to make our mind to think the answer of the following questions:

- Should we allow the use of cloning by somatic cell nuclear transfer to help an infertile couple haave a child?
- Should genetically modified crops be grown in the UK, where it will be very difficult for organic farmers to maintain their required genetically modified free status?
- Should genetically modified pigs be used to provide organs for transplantation into human patients, with a much reduced risk of immunological rejection? (Mepham, 2005)

So far as the defintions of bioethics is concerned, it can be said that the different definitions can be presented in this respect. According to one definition, bioethics is 'the

study of the moral and social implication of techniques resulting from advances in the biological sciences. (Honderich, 1995) Another philosopher, whose name is Bernard William defines bioethics to be 'a philosophical structure, which together with some degree of emperical fact, will yield a decision procedure for moral reasoning' (William, 1993) Another important defintion is presented by Onora O'Neill. According to him,'bioethics is not a decipline It has become a meeting ground for a number of descipline, discourses, and organisations concerned with ethical, legal, and social questions raised by advances in medicine, science, and biotechnology '(O'Neill, 2002)

So if we analyse the above mentioned definitions, it can be pointed out that bioethics is something which moraly deals with some of the most important of the world. Now let us see the different topics that can be studied within the scope of bio-ethics.

3.6 DIFFERENT AREAS OF BIOETHICS

Bioethics studies within its scope different problems related to human and non-human. Some of the main areas of bioethics are presented as follows:

3.6.1 Medical Ethics

The oldest sub-discipline of bioethics is medical ethics which can be traced back to the introduction of the Hippocratic Oath (500 B.C.E.). Of course, medical ethics is not limited to the Hippocratic Oath; rather that marks the beginning of Western ethical reasoning and decision making in medicine. Other more critical elements of the Hippocratic Oath such as the strict prohibition of euthanasia and abortion seem to be rather debatable and raise the vital question of how to distinguish between valuable and less valuable principles it proposes. In contemporary bioethics, euthanasia is—in general—widely regarded as an eligible autonomous decision of the patient that must be respected. With regard to abortion, most bioethicists believe that it should be allowed, at least, under certain circumstances, but this issue is still hotly debated and causes many emotional responses. In medical ethics, one is concerned with the general ethical question of "what should one do" under the particular circumstances of medicine. In this respect, medical ethics is not different from basic ethics but it is limited to the area of medicine and deals with its particular state of affairs.

3.6.2 Animal Ethics

The idea that animals should be part of the moral community mainly evolved in the context of the ethics of utilitarianism in the nineteenth century, most notably spearheaded by Jeremy Bentham, who famously argued that it does not matter morally whether animals can reason but rather whether they can suffer. Current problems include research on animals (including vivisection), livestock farming and animal transports, xeno-transplantation, human-animal chimera, meat eating versus vegetarianism/veganism, the legitimacy of zoos and circuses, religious freedom versus animal protection, recreational hunting, and the growing conflict between the protection of the environment and animal welfare. These pose

complex moral issues that need to be addressed appropriately by responding to the question of whether animals have a moral status in general (and why), and, if they do, what their exact moral rank is.

3.6.3 Environmental Ethics

It can be said that environmental ethics deals with the moral dimension of the relationship between human beings and non-human nature"animals and plants, local populations, natural resources and ecosystems, landscapes, as well as the biosphere and the cosmos. Strictly speaking, human beings are, of course, part of nature and it seems somewhat odd to claim that there is a contrast between human beings and non-human nature. At second glance, however, it seems reasonable to make this distinction because human beings are the only beings who are able to reason about the consequences of their actions which may influence the whole of nature or parts of nature in a positive or negative way.

Bioethics use to study all these sensitive issues in the light of ethics.

3.7 CONCLUSION

From the above discussion it can be said that bio-ethics is an important dicipline. In the contemporary world, so many unethical practicecs are found to be practiced in the world. In the name of research animals are used. Stem-cell research is also going on. Again with the development of tchnology or with the invention of ultra-sound machiene, sex-selective abortion become a regular issue. The most important point here is that many educated people are parcticising these unethical things. So moral conciousness is too imporatnat for a person of every dicipline.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: Mention some of the ethical issues related to bio-ethics.

.....

.....

Q 2: Under which discipline 'bio-ethics' comes into?

.....

.....

Q 3: With what, bioethical debates like animal ethics and environmental ethics are concerned?

.....

.....

Q 4: Who has referred the term 'bioethics for the first time?

.....

.....

Q 5: in which year the Kennedy Institute of Ethics was founded at Georgetown?

.....

.....

Q 6: What is the oldest sub-discipline of bio-ethics?

.....

.....

3.8 LET US SUM UP

- Bio-ethics uses to study various ethical issues related to human and non-human like, abortion, euthanasia, stem-cell research, animal rights, environmental issues like pollution, environmental degradation etc
- Bioethical debates, particularly in animal ethics and environmental ethics, are concerned with issues of moral status and moral protection.
- For the first time the term “bio-ethics” has been referred by a biological scientist named Van Rensselaer Potter in the year 1970.
- In 1971, the Kennedy Institute of Ethics was founded at Georgetown. The main aim of this foundation is to do new research in the field of medical ethics, the founder of this foundation, Andre Hellegers has also regarded this kind of this ethics to be ‘bio-ethics’.
- It is observed that some great literaures have been found in different cultures of the world like Greco-Roman, Christian, Buddhist, Hindu, Confucian, Islamic etc. where people have practiced medicine by giving importance to values and Moral behaviour.
- According to one definition, bioethics is ‘the study of the moral and social implication of techniques resulting from advances in the biological sciences.
- The oldest sub-discipline of bioethics is medical ethics which can be traced back to the introduction of the Hippocratic Oath (500 B.C.E.). Of course, medical ethics is not limited to the Hippocratic Oath; rather that marks the beginning of Western ethical reasoning and decision making in medicine.
- The idea that animals should be part of the moral community mainly evolved in the context of the ethics of utilitarianism in the nineteenth century, most notably spearheaded by Jeremy Bentham, who famously argued that it does not matter morally whether animals can reason but rather whether they can suffer.
- It can be said that environmental ethics deals with the moral dimension of the relationship between human beings and non-human nature”animals and plants, local populations, natural resources and ecosystems, landscapes, as well as the biosphere and the cosmos.

3.9 FURTHER READING

1. Jonsen, A. (2000). *A Short History of Medical Ethics.* Oxford University Press.
2. Jonsen, A. R. (2010). A History of Bioethics as Discipline and Discourse. In N. S. Jecker, A. R. Jonsen, & R. A. Pearlman, *Bioethics: An Introduction to the History, Method, and Practice.* Jones and Bartlett.

3. Mepham, B. (2005). *Bioethics: An Introduction for the Biosciences.* Oxford University Press.
4. O'Neill, O. (2002). *Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics.* Cambridge University Press.
5. Reich, W. (1978). Introduction. In W. Reich, *The Encyclopedia of Bio-ethics* (Vol. 1, pp. xiv-xx). The Free Press.
6. William, B. (1993). *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy.* Fontana

3.10 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: Some of the human and non-human issues like abortion, euthanasia, stem-cell research, animal rights, environmental issues like pollution, environmental degradation etc.

Ans to Q No 2: Philosophy

Ans to Q No 3: Moral status and moral protection

Ans to Q No 4: In 1970, biological scientist named Van Renesselaer Potter has taken the term bioethics for the first time.

Ans to Q No 5: In 1971

Ans to Q No 6: Medical Ethics

3.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions:

Q 1: With what issues, environmental ethics actually deals?
Q 2: How has Honderich defined bioethics?
Q 3: Mention Onora O'Neill's definition of bioethics.
Q 4: What are the different areas of bioethics?

B. Short Questions:

Q 1: Write a short note on medical ethics.
Q 2: Briefly explain the concept of animal ethics.
Q 3: Briefly describe the concept of environmental ethics.
Q 4: Write a short note on meaning and definition of bio-ethics.
Q 5: Write a short note on the history of bioethics.

C. Long Questions:

Q 1: Explain the concept of bioethics.
Q 2: Describe the different areas of bioethics.

UNIT 4 : LIFE AND DEATH: EUTHANASIA

UNIT STRUCTURE

4.1 Learning Objectives
4.2 Introduction
4.3 Euthanasia: What it is
    4.3.1 Medical Definition of Euthanasia
4.4 Kinds of Euthanasia
4.5 Historical Background
    4.5.1 Early Modern Period
    4.5.2 Early Euthanasia Movement in the United States
4.6 Euthanasia Debate
4.7 Legal Status
4.8 Quality of Life Principle vs Sanctity of Life Principle
4.9 Euthanasia and Conventional Ethical Values
    4.9.1 Active Euthanasia or Passive Euthanasia?
4.10 Let us Sum up
4.11 Further Reading
4.12 Answers to Check Your Progress
4.13 Model Questions

4.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- define, what is euthanasia and its different aspects.
- understand Medical Ethics as the part of Applied Ethics.
- analyze the significance of euthanasia as the burning issue of Applied Ethics in contemporary phenomenon.
- find out the position of euthanasia amidst the conventional-value system of the society and see if euthanasia can be legalized.
- describe the relationship of euthanasia with Quality-of-Life Principle and Sanctity of Life Principle.

4.2 INTRODUCTION

'Ethics' is the key discussing point of moral philosophy under the scope of Philosophy. In connection with the discussion of ethics, we may find different types of its branches like (1) Normative Ethics, (2) Analytic Ethics (or Meta Ethics) (3) Applied Ethics etc. As it is well known, normative ethics discuss about the standard to judge an action as good or bad, analytic ethics analyses the ethical terms and applied ethics discuss the practical issues that are faced by the individual in his habitual life. In the contemporary period applied ethics has been occupying a key position of discussion all around the globe. The sub-sections of applied ethics are like Business Ethics, Environmental Ethics, Medical

Ethics and other professional ethics etc. Applied ethics mainly concern with the moral (ethical) issues related to our professions, practical life as well as the surroundings. Euthanasia is such an issue of Medical Ethics which has always been one of the key points of discussion particularly in contemporary period.

It is a tragic phenomenon of the world that many people are struck with afflictions, such as cancer or extensive burns that fill their lives with extreme suffering and that threaten to persist until they die. Other people are the victims of accidents that destroy their very personalities and deprive them even of the ability to ask others to end their lives. Moreover, all too often, infants are born with defects, such as the lack of brain, that rule out the possibility of their leading a worthwhile life. Here question is ought we to do everything possible to keep such people alive? Or should we not sometimes end their lives, or at least let them die, so as to relieve them of the burden of living an unworthwhile existence? Here the relevance of euthanasia or "mercy killing" comes to the scene.

4.3 EUTHANASIA: WHAT IT IS

The English medical word 'euthanasia' is a compound of two Greek words - *eu* and *thanatos* meaning, literally, 'a good death'. Here *eu* means "well" or "good" and *thanatos* means "death". It is the practice of intentionally ending a life in order to relieve pain and suffering. Today, 'euthanasia' is generally understood to mean the bringing about of a good death or 'mercy killing,' where one person, 'A', ends the life of another person, 'B', for the sake of 'B'. **Euthanasia is the act of deliberately ending a person's life to relieve suffering.** Euthanasia, also known as assisted suicide, physician-assisted suicide (dying), doctor-assisted dying (suicide), and more loosely termed mercy killing, means to take a deliberate action with the express intention of ending a life to relieve intractable (persistent, unstoppable) suffering of certain individual.

4.3.1 Medical Definition of Euthanasia

The history of medical literature tells us that euthanasia is an intentional termination of the life of a patient suffering from an incurable disease for the sake of the patient's good. According to MediLexicon's medical dictionary: Euthanasia is: *"A quiet, painless death."* Or *"The intentional putting to death of a person with an incurable or painful disease intended as an act of mercy."* Some interpret euthanasia as the practice of ending a life in a painless manner.

4.4 KINDS OF EUTHANASIA

Depending on the situation of the patient and intentions of his/her surroundings euthanasia may have two types of classifications. According to first type of classification euthanasia can be of three types. These are (1) Voluntary euthanasia, (2) Non-voluntary euthanasia and (3) Involuntary euthanasia.

- **Voluntary euthanasia** - This type of euthanasia is conducted with consent. Where a person makes a conscious decision to die and asks for help to do this. When the

patient brings about his or her own death with the assistance of a physician, the term assisted suicide is often used instead. Since 2009 voluntary euthanasia has been legal in Belgium, Luxembourg, Netherland, Switzerland, and the states of Oregon (USA) and Washington (USA).

- **Non-voluntary euthanasia**: Here a person is unable to give their consent (for example, because they are in a coma or are severely brain damaged) and another person takes the decision on their behalf, often because the ill person previously expressed a wish for their life to be ended in such circumstances.
- **Involuntary euthanasia** -This euthanasia is conducted without consent. The decision is made by another person because the patient is incapable to doing so himself/herself. Where a person is killed against their expressed wishes.

Depending on the circumstances, voluntary and non-voluntary euthanasia could be regarded as either voluntary manslaughter (where someone kills another person, but circumstances can partly justify their actions) or murder. Involuntary euthanasia is almost always regarded as murder.

According to second types classification (which is said as procedural classification) euthanasia is of two types. These are Active euthanasia and Passive euthanasia.

- **Active euthanasia** – Active euthanasia is the act of killing someone in order to relieve that person's suffering. It is the euthanasia where a person deliberately intervenes to end someone's life – for example, by injecting them with a large dose of sedative. Lethal substances or forces are used to end the patient's life. Active euthanasia includes life-ending actions conducted by the patient or somebody else directly.
- **Passive euthanasia** – Passive euthanasia is also aimed at relieving someone's suffering, but it is the act of refraining from doing something that would keep that person alive. It is the euthanasia where a person causes death by withholding or withdrawing treatment that is necessary to maintain life, such as withholding antibiotics from someone with pneumonia .

A case of euthanasia (whether active or passive) is voluntary if, in view of the circumstances, the person at hand wants to die. It would be involuntary if the individual wished not to die, and non-voluntary if the person were incapable of having a preference (due to several physical damage for example).

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: Fill in the blanks:

a) The term 'Euthanasia' is derived from the Greek word…..……..

Q 2: What is Euthanasia?

.....

.....

Q 3: What is Active and Passive Euthanasia?

.....

.....

4.5 HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Since the early 1800s euthanasia has been a topic of debates and activism in the USA, Canada, Western Europe and Australasia. Ezekiel Emanuel (born 1957, USA), an American National Institutes of Health bioethicist said that the modern era of euthanasia was ushered in by the availability of anesthesia. In 1935 euthanasia societies emerged in England and in 1938 in the USA. Doctor assisted suicide became legalized in Switzerland in 1937, as long as the doctor ending the patient's life had nothing to gain. After the Second World War Glanville Williams (1911-1997), a legal professor and Joseph Fletcher (1905-1991), USA an Episcopal priest, later identified himself as an atheist emerged as proponents of euthanasia. During the 1960s advocacy for a right-to-die approach to euthanasia grew.

According to the historian N. D. A. Kemp, the origin of the contemporary debate on euthanasia started in 1870. But Euthanasia is known to have been debated and practiced long before that date. Euthanasia was practiced in Ancient Greece and Rome: for example, hemlock was employed as a means of hastening death on the island of Kea, a technique also employed in Marseilles. Euthanasia, in the sense of the deliberate hastening of a person's death, was supported by Socrates, Plato and Seneca the Elder in the ancient world, although Hippocrates appears to have spoken against the practice, writing "I will not prescribe a deadly drug to please someone, nor give advice that may cause his death".

4.5.1 Early Modern Period

The term "euthanasia" in the earlier sense of supporting someone as they died was used for the first time by Francis Bacon (1561-1626). In his work, *Euthanasia Medica*, he chose this ancient Greek word and, in doing so, distinguished between *euthanasia interior*, the preparation of the soul for death, and *euthanasia exterior*, which was intended to make the end of life easier and painless, in exceptional circumstances by shortening life. That the ancient meaning of an easy death came to the forefront again in the early modern period can be seen from its definition in the 18th century *Zedlers Universallexikon*: "Euthanasia: a very gentle and quiet death, which happens without painful convulsions".

The concept of euthanasia in the sense of alleviating the process of death goes back to the medical historian, Karl Friedrich Heinrich Marx, who drew on Bacon's philosophical ideas. According to Marx, a doctor had a moral duty to ease the suffering of death through encouragement, support and mitigation using medication. Such an "alleviation of death" reflected the contemporary *Zeitgeist*, but was brought into the medical canon of responsibility for the first time by Marx. Marx also stressed the distinction between the theological care of the soul of sick people from the physical care and medical treatment by doctors.

Euthanasia in its modern sense has always been strongly opposed in the Judeo-Christian tradition. Thomas Aquinas argued that the practice of euthanasia contradicted our natural human instincts of survival. But there are many supporters of euthanasia like John Donne (1624) and it became more accepted during the Age of Enlightenment. Thomas More wrote of euthanasia in *Utopia*, although it is not clear if he was intending to endorse the practice of it. Other cultures have

taken different approaches: for example, in Japan suicide has not traditionally been viewed as a sin, as it is used in cases of honor, and accordingly, the perceptions of euthanasia are different from those in other parts of the world.

4.5.2 Early Euthanasia Movement in the United States

The rise of the euthanasia movement in the United States coincided with the so-called Gilded Age, a time of social and technological change that encompassed an "individualistic conservatism that praised laissez-faire economics, scientific method, and rationalism", along with major depressions, industrialization and conflict between corporations and labour unions. It was also the period in which the modern hospital system was developed, which has been seen as a factor in the emergence of the euthanasia debate.

Robert Ingersoll argued for euthanasia, stating in 1894 that where someone is suffering from a terminal illness, such as terminal cancer, they should have a right to end their pain through suicide. Felix Adler offered a similar approach, although, unlike Ingersoll, Adler did not reject religion. In fact, he argued from an Ethical Culture framework. In 1891, Alder argued that those suffering from overwhelming pain should have the right to commit suicide, and, furthermore, that it should be permissible for a doctor to assist – thus making Adler the first "prominent American" to argue for suicide in cases where people were suffering from chronic illness. Both Ingersoll and Adler argued for voluntary euthanasia of adults suffering from terminal ailments. Dowbiggin argues that by breaking down prior moral objections to euthanasia and suicide, Ingersoll and Adler enabled others to stretch the definition of euthanasia.

The first attempt to legalize euthanasia took place in the United States, when Henry Hunt introduced legislation into the General Assembly of Ohio in 1906. Hunt did so at the request of Anna Hall, a wealthy heiress who was a major figure in the euthanasia movement during the early 20th century in the United States. Hall had watched her mother die after an extended battle with liver cancer, and had dedicated herself to ensuring that others would not have to endure the same suffering. Towards this end she engaged in an extensive letter writing campaign, recruited Lurana Sheldon and Maud Ballington Booth, and organised a debate on euthanasia at the annual meeting of the American Humane Association in 1905 – described by Jacob Appel as the first significant public debate on the topic in the 20th century.

Along with the Ohio euthanasia proposal, in 1906 Assemblyman Ross Gregory introduced a proposal to permit euthanasia to the Iowa legislature. However, the Iowa legislation was far broader in scope than that offered in Ohio. It allowed for the death of any person of at least ten years of age who suffered from an ailment that would prove fatal and cause extreme pain, should they be of sound mind and express a desire to artificially hasten their death. In addition, it allowed for infants to be euthanized if they were sufficiently deformed and permitted guardians to request euthanasia on behalf of their wards. The proposed legislation also imposed penalties on physicians who refused to perform euthanasia when requested: a 6–12-month prison term and a fine of between $200 and $1000. The

proposal proved to be controversial. It engendered considerable debate and failed to pass, having been withdrawn from consideration after being passed to the Committee on Public Health.

4.6 EUTHANASIA DEBATE

Euthanasia has been a very controversial and emotive topic for a long time. Historically, the euthanasia debate has tended to focus on a number of key concerns. According to euthanasia opponent Ezekiel Emanuel, proponents of euthanasia have presented four main arguments: a) that people have a right to self-determination, and thus should be allowed to choose their own fate; b) assisting a subject to die might be a better choice than requiring that they continue to suffer; c) the distinction between passive euthanasia, which is often permitted, and active euthanasia, which is not substantive (or that the underlying principle–the doctrine of double effect–is unreasonable or unsound); and d) permitting euthanasia will not necessarily lead to unacceptable consequences. Pro-euthanasia activists often point to countries like the Netherlands and Belgium, and states like Oregon, where euthanasia has been legalized, to argue that it is mostly unproblematic.

Similarly, Emanuel argues that there are four major arguments presented by opponents of euthanasia: a) not all deaths are painful; b) alternatives, such as cessation of active treatment, combined with the use of effective pain relief, are available; c) the distinction between active and passive euthanasia is morally significant; and d) legalising euthanasia will place society on a slippery slope, which will lead to unacceptable consequences.

4.7 LEGAL STATUS

In the majority of countries euthanasia or assisted suicide is against the law. According to the National Health Service (NHS), UK, it is illegal to help somebody kill themselves, regardless of circumstances. Assisted suicide or voluntary euthanasia carries a maximum sentence of 14 years in prison in the UK. In the USA the law varies in some states. West's *Encyclopedia of American Law* states that "a 'mercy killing' or euthanasia is generally considered to be a criminal homicide" and is normally used as a synonym of homicide committed at a request made by the patient.

The judicial sense of the term "homicide" includes any intervention undertaken with the express intention of ending a life, even to relieve intractable suffering. Not all homicide is unlawful. Two designations of homicide that carry no criminal punishment are justifiable and excusable homicide. In most countries this is not the status of euthanasia. The term "euthanasia" is usually confined to the active variety; the University of Washington website states that "euthanasia generally means that the physician would act directly, for instance by giving a lethal injection, to end the patient's life". Physician-assisted suicide is thus not classified as euthanasia by the US State of Oregon, where it is legal under the Oregon Death with Dignity Act, and despite its name, it is not legally classified as suicide either. Unlike physician-assisted suicide, withholding or withdrawing life-sustaining

treatments with patient consent (voluntary) is almost unanimously considered, at least in the United States, to be legal. The use of pain medication in order to relieve suffering, even if it hastens death, has been held as legal in several court decisions.

Some governments around the world have legalized voluntary euthanasia but most commonly it is still considered to be criminal homicide. In the Netherlands and Belgium, where euthanasia has been legalized, it still remains homicide although it is not prosecuted and not punishable if the perpetrator (the doctor) meets certain legal conditions.

4.8 QUALITY OF LIFE PRINCIPLE VS SANCTITY OF LIFE PRINCIPLE

The supporters of euthanasia believe that value of life is extrinsic to its nature. It is gained in terms of one's physical condition. This standpoint is termed as Quality-of-Life Principle (QOL). On the other hand, non-supporters of euthanasia believe that value of life is intrinsic to its nature and hence any attempt to evaluate life's quality in terms of life-owner's physical capacity would be to show disrespect towards humanity. This standpoint is termed as Sanctity of Life Principle (SOL). Their aversion against euthanasia is chiefly an outcome of their faith in the sanctity of life. The conflict between these two standpoints i.e. the Quality-of-Life Principle and the Sanctity of Life Principle is difficult to resolve and that is why euthanasia still remains a controversial issue.

4.9 EUTHANASIA AND CONVENTIONAL ETHICAL VALUES

Medical and health-care ethics are amongst the most widely discussed areas of applied ethics and were, indeed, partly responsible for the resurgence of applied ethics in the early 1970s. The Hippocratic Oath (it is an oath historically taken by physicians and physician assistant for number of healing good, to uphold specific ethical standards in the profession) covers, amongst other things, the administration of deadly drugs, procuring abortions, patent confidentiality and the avoidances of sexual misconduct with the patents. It states, "I will neither give a deadly drug to anybody if asked for it, nor will I make a suggestion to this effect". It says, "I will maintain the utmost respect for human life from the time of conception." The problem is how exactly such principles are to be respected in regard to patients who are dying but in whom the dying process has been delayed or arrested by the intervention of medical technology. It is widely believed that these principles imply that a moral distinction can be drawn between active and passive euthanasia, between actually killing someone, which is prescribed, and allowing someone to die, which may be, in some circumstances.

4.9.1 Active Euthanasia or Passive Euthanasia?

It is a vital question at this juncture whether euthanasia is acceptable, if yes then which one is morally preferable? If it is accepted that euthanasia means procuring a 'good death' for someone, for the person's own sake, then active euthanasia must mean assisting to make this happen when it would not otherwise have happened, or at least, not happened then. And passive euthanasia must

mean not intervening to prevent it from happening when you might have been able to prevent it from happening.

Many people seem to think, if they think that euthanasia can be justified at all, that it can be more readily justified if it is passive rather than active. Many people also seem to think that, whereas, in most legal jurisdictions, active euthanasia is strictly forbidden, they do, sometimes, allow that passive euthanasia may be permissible.

Examples to be concerned:

The issues related to Active and Passive euthanasia and its justifications can be understood from the following examples.

Example no: 1

Firstly let us see a severely handicapped child, who is not otherwise going to die, is given a drug in such amounts that the drug itself will cause death. If the doctor acts intentionally then it would be upon to the jury to say: yes, he was killing, he was murdering that child. There is a difference between allowing a child to die and taking action to kill. Here question is what to do because there is a narrow difference between his life and death.

Example no: 2

The second example is on 3rd March 1993 Tony Bland died of renal failure in Airedale Hospital, Keighley, West Yorkshire. He had suffered crush injuries in disaster of April'1989 and had been in a coma ever since. The injuries he has sustained had temporally deprived his brain of oxygen and the resulting damage had left him in what is known as a "Persistent Vegetative State". Patient in PVS exhibit no awareness of or response to the world around them, though they breathe spontaneously, have a regular heartbeat and occasionally display chew movements. Destruction of the neocortex (the higher brain) in such patients means the irreversible loss of consciousness even though an intact brain system may still maintain respiration.

For three and a half years the life of Tony Bland's body was maintained by artificial hydration and nutrition delivered by naso-gastric tube. Antibiotic administered in the same way protected him from infection. Under such regime, PVS patient may well survive for anything from 10 to 30 years.

Tony Bland's parents did not wish this for their son and the Airedale Hospital NHS Trust petitioned the High Court for permission to withdraw artificial hydration and nutrition in November'1992. The case went to appeal in December'1992 and on 4th February 1993, to the House of Lords. On all three occasions the court found that it was lawful to discontinue feeding in such cases. On 22 February'1993, the medical team involved ceased antibiotics and feeding and nine days later Tony Bland died.

There were already decided cases in which it had been held permissible to discontinue treatment which was not beneficial and allow patient to die. What distinguishes the case of Tony Bland these was that he was not, in any accepted sense, dying. It had also never before been judicially determined that providing food and liquid for a patient, however done, was treatment rather than moral care. Critics were of the opinion that the court had implicitly legitimated euthanasia.

Example no: 3

On 21 September 1992 Dr. Nigel Cox was convicted for the attempted murder of Mrs Lillian Boyes, one of his patients. Mrs Boyes suffered from severe rheumatoid arthritis. Because of the progress of her condition, which was by then critical, she was in so much pain that she could not bear to be touched without screaming. It was described by a professor of rheumatology called as witness in Dr. Cox's trial as the worst such case he had ever read about. When the heroin dose fed to Mrs. Boyes by drip in order to relieve her pain, failed to do so. Dr. Cox first tried an additional heroin injection and then, when that also did not work, an injection of undiluted potassium chloride was pushed Mrs Boyes body. Almost immediately Mrs Boyes relaxed sufficiently to be able to hold her son's hand and, minutes later, she died.

A student of Medical Science knows it very well that potassium chloride has no pain-killing properties but a dose of the kind administered to Mres Boyes is certain to kill. Dr. Cox was charged with attempted murder.

Points to be considered:

From the above examples the following observation can be highlighted about euthanasia.

Point No: (1): Related to the example no (2), question is "how could be lawful to allow a patient to die slowly, though painlessly, over a period of weeks from lack of food, but unlawful to produce his immediate death by lethal injection, thereby saving his family from yet another ordeal?" In another language "how can we say Passive Euthanasia is more acceptable than Active Euthanasia especially in the case of Tony Bland's death?" It is difficult to find a moral answer to that question.

Point no: (2): Lord Browne-Wilkinson's remarks capture very well the difficulty that these two legal decisions pose, when taken together. Why is it permissible to cease to provide a patient in a PVS with that which he needs to stay alive and not permissible to provide a patient with that which she needs to die?

Point no:(3): The third important point is that the patient (Tony Bland) in PVS did not consent to the withdrawal of life-preserving care and the other (Mrs. Boyes) had repeatedly asked her doctor for the injection he (Dr. Cox) finally agreed to give her.

In this debate of euthanasia many participants were in the decision that the case of Tony Bland was justified because he was not killed, but allowed to die, whereas Dr. Cox, although from indisputably the best of motives, killed Mrs. Boyes. Though such types of decision derived still it is very difficult to accept one as the final in case of euthanasia.

The basic hypothetical idea of the argument is that if euthanasia (whether it is active or passive) were legally permitted, it would lead to a general decline in respect for human life. In the beginning, we might kill people only to put them out of extreme agony. Here our motives would be honorable, and the results might be good. But question is once we had started cold bloodedly killing people, where would it stop? Where would we draw the line? This is the point where the supporters of euthanasia will have to be cautious. The legal and moral challenge will always be in front of the execution of euthanasia; but the need of it cannot be overlooked.

4.10 LET US SUM UP

- The term 'Euthanasia' is derived from the Greek word - *eu* and *thanatos* meaning, literally, 'a good death' is the practice of intentionally ending a life in order to relieve pain and suffering. Today, 'euthanasia' is generally understood to mean the bringing about of a good death - 'mercy killing,' where one person, 'A', ends the life of another person, 'B', for the sake of 'B'. Euthanasia is the act of deliberately ending a person's life to relieve suffering.
- Euthanasia is a key issue of discussion in the province of Applied Ethics. Applied Ethics discuss the practical issues that are faced by the individual in his habitual life. Different wings of Applied Ethics are like Business Ethics, Environmental Ethics, Medical Ethics and other professional ethics etc. These are mainly concerned with the moral (ethical) issues related to our professions, practical life as well as the surroundings. Euthanasia is such an issue of Medical Ethics.
- Depending on intention and procedure there can be two types of classifications of Euthanasia. Firstly, it is of three types, these are Voluntary, Non-voluntary and Involuntary euthanasia. Secondly Active euthanasia and Passive euthanasia.
- Euthanasia conducted with the consent of the patient is termed voluntary euthanasia. Euthanasia conducted when the consent of the patient is unavailable is termed non-voluntary euthanasia. And Euthanasia conducted against the will of the patient is termed involuntary euthanasia.
- Active euthanasia is: "A mode of ending life in which the intent is to cause the patient's death in a single act (also called mercy killing)." Passive euthanasia is: "A mode of ending life in which a physician is given an option not to prescribe futile treatments for the hopelessly ill patient."
- It can be seen, if the masses think that euthanasia can be justified at all, that it can be more readily justified if it is passive rather than active. Many people also seem to think that, whereas, in most legal jurisdictions, active euthanasia is strictly forbidden, they do, sometimes, allow that passive euthanasia may be permissible.
- Since the early 1800s euthanasia has been a topic of debates and activism in the USA, Canada, Western Europe and Australasia.
- In the majority of countries euthanasia or assisted suicide is against the law. But in spite of this, may be due its practical necessity it has always been occupying a key position in discussion around the globe.
- Again if euthanasia (whether it is active or passive) were legally permitted, it might lead to a general decline in respect for human life. In the beginning, we might kill people only to put them out of extreme agony. Here our motives would be honorable, and the results might be good. But question is once we had started cold bloodedly killing people, where would it stop? Where would we draw the line? This is the point where the supporters of euthanasia will have to be very careful. Yet it can be said, though the legal and moral challenge will always be in front of the execution of euthanasia; still the need of it cannot be overlooked.

4.11 FURTHER READING

1) Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.
2) Tanzi—A Text-book of mental Diseases,
3) John H. Piet and Ayodhya Prasad (ed) An Introduction to Applied Ethics.
4) Steven Luper & Curtis Brown, The Moral Life, Second Edition, Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
5) LaFollette, Hugh (2002). Ethics in practice: an anthology. Oxford: Blackwell.
6) Perrett RW (October 1996). "Buddhism, euthanasia and the sanctity of life". J Med Ethics
7) Rachels J (January 1975). "Active and passive euthanasia". N. Engl. J. Med.

4.12 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: What is euthanasia? What are its different kinds? Briefly discuss.
Ans to Q No 2: What is Applied Ethics? What are its different wings?
Ans to Q No 3: Is euthanasia legally justified? Critically discuss.

4.13 MODEL QUESTTIONS

A. Very Short question

Q 1: What is the literal meaning of the word 'euthanasia'?
Q 2: What is "Persistent Vegetative State"?
Q 3: What is Quality of Life Principle (QOL)?
Q 4: What is Sanctity of Life Principle (SOL)?
Q 5: What is Hippocratic Oath?

B. Short question (Answer in about 150 words)

Q 1: What is Voluntary Euthanasia?
Q 2: What is Non-voluntary Euthanasia?
Q 3: What is Involuntary Euthanasia?
Q 4: What is Active Euthanasia?
Q 5: What is Passive Euthanasia?

C. Long Questions (Answer in about 300- 500 words)

Q 1: Is the issue of euthanasia relevant in our practical life? Explain with examples.
Q 2: Find out the differences between Active Euthanasia and Passive Euthanasia. Which one is more acceptable? Discuss.
Q 3: Briefly discuss on the historical background of euthanasia.

UNIT 5 : ABORTION

UNIT STRUCTURE

5.1 Learning Objectives
5.2 Introduction
5.3 Meaning and Definitions of Abortion
5.4 The Religious, Socio-Cultural and Legal Issues of Abortion
5.5 Utilitarianism, Kantian Ethics and the Problem of Abortion
5.6 Abortion and the Ethics of Virtue & Care
5.7 Moral Dimension of Abortion and Reproductive Issues and Technologies
5.8 Conclusion
5.9 Let Us Sum Up
5.10 Further Reading
5.11 Answer to Check Your Progress
5.12 Model Questions

5.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- know the meaning and definitions of abortion
- explain the religious, socio-cultural and legal issues of abortion
- know the utilitarianism, Kantian ethics and the problem of abortion
- know the abortion and the ethics and the problem of abortion
- explain the moral dimension of abortion and reproductive issues and technologies.

5.2 INTRODUCTION

The issue of abortion is a very sensible one. As from the various definitions of abortion it becomes clear that abortion is the destruction of the foetus or the killing of the foetus. As one of the most hotly debated social and moral issues, many ethical debates are found to be associated with this problem. As a living issue, abortion is very much a debatable one in the society we live, and we can see that there are many sides to this debate which touch many angles of our socio-cultural-religious or even political and legal aspects of life. From a commoner to a legal expert, a feminist or a man of religion, one has his or her way of looking at the problem. In this unit we are discussing some such diverse ways of interpreting the issues of abortion in its effort at exploring a possible moral dimension of some such issues as abortion or foetus-killing. Questions of abortion become related to the question of infanticide, of how one defines a 'human being' and a 'person' and where one draws the line. Some of the most difficult issues that we still face and the ones that create the greatest emotional anguish, to parties involved with it. In order to enter into some such problems, we have to trace the socio-historical background of the problem of abortion.

5.3 MEANING AND DEFINTIONS OF ABORTION

Let us now begin with the basic definition of the term 'abortion' as per scientific and technological understanding goes. Although the term 'miscarriage' is often been confused by the people with the term 'abortion', there is not much difference between the two. The only difference between the two is that if it is done before twenty-four weeks, then it is called miscarriage, after that it is called abortion. In both the cases, if it is not spontaneous, it should be done by licensed physician and more preferably by the experienced physician. There are two methods of abortion, viz. the medical abortion and the surgical abortion. The term medical abortion is used for ending pregnancy with the means of drugs. It can only be done if the pregnancy age is of forty-nine days or less. It does not need any surgical procedure; this can be done in doctor's clinic or at home. But medical abortion sometimes becomes dangerous for the health of the pregnant woman. Surgical abortion on the otherhand is done when pregnancy age crossed forty-nine days. It is done with three different ways, viz. Suction Aspiration, Dilation & Curettage (D&C) and Induction Abortion.

5.4 THE RELIGIOUS, SOCIO-CULTURAL AND LEGAL ISSUES OF ABORTION

If the issue of abortion is to be discussed from various socio-cultural, legal and religious aspects and to see, whether because of today's changing moral scenario, and the changing attitude of the people around us, the issue of abortion has already become a non-issue and if so, then how to make it an issue? For those who considered problematic nature of the abortion issue it needed a holistic approach to the problem that touched not only the intimate and the private personal aspects but also it needed public discussion and policy formation to be formulated and that is how public issues like abortion debates and discussions, could become matters of philosophical concern.

Not only the religious issues, but along with it, this unit will also discuss how religious impact or the religious faith of the people can control one's socio-cultural outlook of the people. As for example, it can be said that patriarchal attitudes of many religions of the world have somehow degraded the status of the women in the society. It even somehow leads to the sex-selective abortion in many countries like India, china etc. Because of which many legal steps and act have been implemented as per the various laws of those countries.

It is further observed that many religions have adopted very rigid positions regarding the act of abortion which has remained influential so far as the laws of the countries are concerned. As for example, because of the dominant of catholic religion, abortion is made unacceptable under any circumstances especially in a country like Ireland. So it can be said that different religions have played a great role so far as the socio-cultural and legal aspect of the abortion issue is concerned.

But over and above these various dimensions of new laws being introduced and implemented, various laws of different countries have also been revised because of the major influence and the role played by the ethical discussion on abortion. Even then abortion is still there in the society as one of the burning problems in the society.

It is observed that religious and cultural background of a situated moral agent often remains influential in ascertaining policy decisions and also in motivating one to a particular way of looking at sensitive moral issues. For example, if any kind religious doctrine supports the notion of ensoulment that needs a divine author, abortion will be an act that would be religiously offensive. It is observed that almost all the major religions of the world have made efforts at clarifying their positions mostly in a pro-life manner keeping exception for some extraordinary situations.

5.5 UTILITARIANISM, KANTIAN ETHICS AND THE PROBLEM OF ABORTION

From the point of view of ethical analysis of the problem of abortion, it will be trying to explore whether it is possible to study the problem of abortion with the help of traditional theories of ethics like utilitarianism and Kantian de-ontological ethics? It further questioned some of the limitations of the traditional theories of ethics in order to address the question whether with the changing structure of the society; do we need a new kind of ethics that remains more sensitive to a holistic and also to the feminist and other approaches to the value question?

By keeping in mind of this learning objective of this unit, it tries to analyse the different factors of abortion like sex-selective abortion, abortion due to the bad health condition of mother, abortion due to the defective foetus etc. from the perspectives of the traditional theories like utilitarianism and Kantian de-ontology. Utilitarianism, because of its consequentialism, has put on sole emphasis on the production of pleasure and happiness; on the other hand Kantian ethics of deontology, has emphasised on duty and reason. However, the peculiarity with the abortion issue is its distinctive nature of mother-child relationship that is neither result oriented nor entirely and exclusively reason based.

After making a brief survey of certain implications of utilitarianism's greatest happiness of the greatest number doctrine and its impact on the abortion debate, particularly with reference to Peter Singer, Michael Tooly and others, it will be trying to make a brief reference to some other related issues like animal rights, etc. While as per Michael Tooly's theory, a dolphin or a chimpanzee's right to life will get more priority in comparison to an infant, Peter Singer's point of view regarding the concept of person and foetus killing similarly centres round human-person dichotomy although mostly viewed from a point of preference utilitarian's perspective. In order to explain the problem of abortion, some feminist thinkers take the help of Kantian model.

Until the rise of virtue ethics, the dominant paradigms in 20th century normative ethics were utilitarianism and deontological ethics, both made room for reason and right based decisions in this regard. However, the two dominant ethical positions in abortion debate were developed later in terms of Pro-Life (against Abortion) and Pro-Choice (for Abortion) positions**.** Judith Jarvis Thomson, who assumes a conservative position for the sake of argument, argues in favour of pro-choice position from a feminist perspective.

Mary Anne Warren tries to defend the liberal view of abortion, i.e. it is morally permissible if reason permits to do so. The thesis makes a casual reference to some implications of Kantian de-ontological ethics on some feminist scholars some of whom are critical of the masculinity of reason that is accorded in traditional moral theories.

Kantian ethics, by using its deontological nature, has given sole emphasis on the duty and reason. Kant's one-dimensional focus on duty and respect for the moral laws, as the only morally praiseworthy motive, dehumanizes the relation between mother and her foetus. In fact Max *Scheler says in this context that moral law or the categorical imperative originates from the values rather than from human thinking as Kant explained it to be. So far as moral consciousness is concerned, emotion plays an important role. Morality is not something, which can be presented with the form of judgment derived from pure reason. Human beings should be guided by some moral values not merely by their rational quality.*

Provided ethics is seen more as a problem-solving rational skill and a pursuit that might lead to absurd conclusions when confronted with real life problems, like that of infanticide, this unit is looking for some alternate approach to be made in this direction. The unit also takes into consideration in what manner some of the existentialist philosophers, like Jean Paul Sartre, Kierkegaard and, and some others, have sought to put the affective existential man in the centre of moral decision, thereby seeking to unearth the fact that 'human reason has boundaries. In order to decide what should be the moral position in an ethical debate one is not looking for mere principles and formulae that comes from a robotic and rule governed phase of machine existence but issues like abortion, euthanasia etc. are actual moral dilemmas depicting some sort of existential crisis.

So, it can be said that the rightness or wrongness of abortion cannot be explained in terms of reason only. It is true that, it is very difficult to arrive at a definite conclusion of the problem of abortion. The rightness or wrongness of abortion varies from situation to situation.

5.6 ABORTION AND THE ETHICS OF VIRTUE & CARE

In its search for alternate ethical positions in regard to the abortion issue, there is made some explorations of the basic findings of virtue and also of care ethics and its different positions in regard to the moral status of the abortion debate. As a character-based ethics Virtue ethics looks at the virtue or moral character of the person carrying out an action, rather than at ethical duties and rules, or the consequences of particular actions. Virtue ethics not only deals with the rightness or wrongness of individual actions; it also provides guidance as to the sort of characteristics and behaviours a good person will seek to achieve. Here it has been found that although traditional virtue ethics has certain limitations, especially in adequately addressing certain abortion related problems, but the ethics of care has successfully laid down certain guidelines in order to overcome some such limitations. Despite the complicated nature of the problem, care ethics exponents have suggested various positions that have also remained successful to overcome the complicated issues of abortion. Clearly, the, the politics of reproduction, including the legislative debate over surrogate parenting, is bound up with social conflicts about gender, particularly about the role of motherhood in women's lives. The possibility that the significance of motherhood in women's identity is declining is a great source of worry for some groups, as is the seeming decoupling of motherhood from marriage. Interestingly findings confirm that a history of advocacy on behalf of women is important when it comes to legislation dealing with surrogate motherhood.

In future decades, pro-life advocates could grant that women ought to be fully sovereign over their own bodies and that they do have the right to remove an unwanted foetus. However, they could argue that while women have the right to remove a foetus, they do not have a right to kill it.

Care-based theories are away from any hard and fast rule. It tries to analyse the problem with the help of care and by taking care of the emotion of the people. Unlike Kantian de-ontology and utilitarianism, which gives importance on reason and utility respectively, care ethics, tries to analyse the problem of abortion by taking into consideration of the various emotions of the woman as it is an issue related to exclusively to both body and mind of the pregnant woman.

When the issue of abortion is being discussed one most important point which can be noticed is that it involves an assumption that the existence of unborn babies is of lesser value than an adult human's life. It is observed that there are some striking resemblances between care ethics and medical ethics.

Care ethics, especially feminist exponents of care ethics have tried to draw attention to the unequal power of women and men, of white people and people of colour, of First World and Third World people, of the rich and the poor, of the healthy and the disabled, and so forth are central to feminist ethics are decisive factors in any kind of moral evaluation. Need for re-visiting the unequal pattern of relationship that characterizes doctor patient relationship is highly significant.

Biomedical ethics, like feminine care ethics, looks for real guidance in an actual troubling situation than an abstract focus in the domain of rules and principles. Most of feminists are largely influenced by Carol Gilligan, who claims that women are more likely than men to understand morality in terms of caring for others although many feminists remain uneasy about the normative significance of this gendered description of ethics.

There are many feminist thinkers who are supporter of pro-life. These care-based feminists, including those of profile feminists, usually have found the pro-choice supporter to be with masculine nature. They said pro-choice supporter possessed the quality of aggression and destruction of maleness of reason. But in against of which, care-based feminist has chosen a alternative and peaceful path having ecologically sensitive means to resolve conflicts while respecting human potentiality.

5.7 MORAL DIMENSION OF ABORTION AND REPRODUCTIVE ISSUES AND TECHNOLOGIES

It is seen that various modern technological issues like the role of ultrasound machines in abortion, stem cell research, in-vitro fertilization etc. are also found to be associated with the foetus killing and abortion. It is found that the science and technology have played a very significant role, so far as the problem of abortion is concerned. Not only the ultrasound machines have played a very significant role in both decision-making process of those who are caught in the abortion dilemma, other advancements in science technology research like stem-cell research and IVF etc. have played crucial role, and have remained instrumental to both pro-choice and pro-life exponents in diverse ways.

5.8 CONCLUSION

This is in brief about the problem of abortion, studied from the ethical perspective. It is found that without taken into consideration of various socio-cultural and religious issues, it is not possible to study the problem. So by taking into consideration of all this issues, finally it is tried to analyse the problem of abortion with some traditional as well as contemporary ethical theories. But from the description of various issues, it becomes clear that the problem of abortion is a problem, found to be associated with the mother and the foetus she is carrying in her womb. So finally, a satisfactory answer can be expected from the care ethic.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: Write down the difference between 'abortion' and 'miscarriage'.
Q 2: For what term 'medical ethics' is used for?
Q 3: What are the three different ways of surgical abortion?
Q 4: What has degraded the status of the women in the society?
Q 5: What is found to be remained influential in ascertaining policy discussions and also in motivating one to a particular way of looking at sensitive moral issues?
Q 6: Mary Anne Waren tries to defend which kind of view of abortion?
Q 7: Mention the names of two existentialist philosophers.
Q 8: For what biomedical ethics actually looks?



5.9 LET US SUM UP

- As a living issue, abortion is very much a debatable one in the society we live, and we can see that there are many sides to this debate which touch many angles of our socio-cultural-religious or even political and legal aspects of life.
- For those who considered problematic nature of the abortion issue it needed a holistic approach to the problem that touched not only the intimate and the private personal aspects but also it needed public discussion and policy formation to be formulated and that is how public issues like abortion debates and discussions, could become matters of philosophical concern.
- From the point of view of ethical analysis of the problem of abortion, it will be trying to explore whether it is possible to study the problem of abortion with the help of traditional theories of ethics like utilitarianism and Kantian de-ontological ethics?
- In its search for alternate ethical positions in regard to the abortion issue, there is made some explorations of the basic findings of virtue and also of care ethics and its different positions in regard to the moral status of the abortion debate.
- Biomedical ethics, like feminine care ethics, looks for real guidance in an actual troubling situation than an abstract focus in the domain of rules and principles.

- It is seen that various modern technological issues like the role of ultrasound machines in abortion, stem cell research, in-vitro fertilization etc. are also found to be associated with the foetus killing and abortion.

5.10 FURTHER READING

1. Ashcroft, R. E. (2007). *Principles of Health Care Ethics.* John Wiley & Sons.
2. Ashley, B. M., & O'Rourke, K. D. (2002). *Ethics of Health Cre: An Introductory Textbook.* Georgetown University Press.
3. Ashley, B. M., DeBlois, J., & O'Rourke, K. D. (2006). *Health Care Ethics: A Catholic Theological Analysis.* Georgetown University Press.
4. Dwyer, S., & Feinberg, J. (1997). The Problem of Abortion. wdworth Publishing Company.

5.11 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: The difference between the two is that if it is done before twenty-four weeks, it is called miscarriage and after that it is called abortion.

Ans to Q No 2: The term 'medical abortion' is used for ending pregnancy with the means of drugs.

Ans to Q No 3: Suction Aspiration, Dilation & Curettage (D&C), Induction Abortion.

Ans to Q No 4: Patriarchal attitudes of many religions of the world have somehow degraded the status of the women in the society.

Ans to Q No 5: Cultural and Religious background

Ans to Q No 6: Liberal view of abortion

Ans to Q No 7: J.P. Sartre and Kierkegaard

Ans to Q No 8: Like feminist care ethics, it looks for real guidance.

5.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions

Q 1: Define Abortion

Q 2: Name some of the countries of countries, where sex-selective abortion is found?

Q 3: What is the point that is emphasises by Kantian ethics of deontology?

Q 4: Write Max Scheler's view regarding the moral law or the categorical imperative of Kant?

Q 5: What is virtue ethics?

B. Short Questions (Write in about 100-150 words)

Q 1: Write down the meaning and definition of abortion.

Q 2: Write a short note on religious, socio-cultural and legal issues of abortion.

Q 3: What is a Pro-life and Pro-choice position? Explain briefly.

C. Long Questions (Write in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Explain the problem of abortion.

Q 2: How utilitarianism and Kantian ethics has analysed the problem of abortion? Discuss.

Q 3: Discuss the problem of abortion from the angle virtue and care ethics?

Q 4: Discuss the role of technological side of the issue of abortion and reproductive issues.

UNIT 6 : SUICIDE

UNIT STRUCTURE

6.1 Learning objectives
6.2 Introduction
6.3 Characteristics of Suicide
6.4 Highlights on Historical Western Thought
  6.4.1 Ancient and Classical Views on Suicide
  6.4.2 Enlightened and Modern Developments
6.5 Morality and Rationality of Suicide
  6.5.1 Moral Permissibility
  6.5.2 Religious Arguments
  6.5.3 Libertarian views and Rights to Suicide
  6.5.4 Social and role-based Arguments
6.6 Let us Sum up
6.7 Further Reading
6.8 Answer to Check Your Progress
6.9 Model Questions

6.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- know the concept and characteristics of suicide
- know the historical Western thought of suicide
- explain whether suicide is morally and rationally justified
- know the modern developments of philosophical thoughts about suicide

6.2 INTRODUCTION

Suicide is an act of taking one's own life intentionally. It can be caused due to extreme form of mental disorders, stress or any other such causes which force themselves to take such drastic step. In this unit we shall discuss the concept of suicide, its characteristics, various Arguments in support of suicide, and various arguments that rejects suicide. We can also analyse whether taking one's own life is morally justified. Generally, it is said that suicide is morally wrong as it is a drastic form of one's own destruction and it also affects others emotionally. But inspire of it, there are certain arguments which clearly state that suicide in certain cases can be regarded morally justified

6.3 CHARACTERISTICS OF SUICIDE

Suicide is an act of putting oneself into death purposefully. It happens due to fear, anxiety, trauma, stress, problems, financial crisis, uncontrolled emotional states or any

mental disorders which is in extreme form such as personality disorders, substance abuse, bipolar disorders, etc. It is a state of self-injury to the extent of putting oneself into death. The cause of suicide varies from person to person but it has some common characteristics which can be discussed as follows: -

1. Prolonged and intolerable mental states: -
   People often commit suicide due to unbearable mental conditions which they face for a long time. In order to completely come out of such mental state, people commit suicide.
2. Unfulfilled needs: -
   Most of the people who commit suicide, take such a drastic step due to their unfulfilled psychological needs which are impossible to fulfil.
3. Overcome the painful state: -
   People try to end their own lives because they think it to be the last solution to overcome their unbearable painful state.
4. Hopeless and Helpless: -
   When there is a lack of Hope in certain difficult situation, people try to end their life. They become so helpless that they cannot find any pleasure and purpose of living their life.
5. Escape from world: -
   Most of the people try to escape from life, world and from others. They have some fear, some anxiety which they cannot overcome. So, in order to escape from such problems, people end their life.

6.4 HIGHLIGHTS OF HISTORICAL WESTERN THOUGHT

As you have come across the concept of suicide, now let us discuss the historical philosophical views about suicide in Western countries. Some of the ethical considerations regarding suicide are also found in Western thought. Confucius addresses that suicide may violate ethical duties of others. Philosophers such as Plato has also discussed about suicide by portraying Socrates was arguing that there is no contradiction in submitting freely to death and holding the belief that suicide is forbidden. Socrates believed that it is better to put oneself into death than accepting something which is wrong. The Stoic philosophers have also put forwarded some views on suicide. The reasons of committing suicide that can be found in Chrysippus book “The Stoics’ Five Reasons for Suicide”. They picturised five ways of reasonable departure from life which can be discussed as follows:-

1. According to them, people take such drastic step when a pressing matter turns up.
2. People, according to them also put themselves into death when tyrants rush in, forcing them to do or say forbidden things.
3. Another reason for such step according to them can be a serious illness that prevents the soul from using the body as an instrument for a long time.
4. Poverty is also one of the reasons according to Stoics’ philosophers, for people take their own life as they think it to be the only way in order to escape from poverty.

5. Lastly, dementedness is also one of the reasons, according to Stoics', due to which people decide to end their life.

6.4.1 Ancient and Classical Views of Suicide

Western philosophical views about suicide can be drawn from the time of Plato. Before Stoics, the concept of suicide was not discussed in a very systematic manner. Plato discussed about suicide in his two works- "Phaedo" and "Laws". In Phaedo, Plato picturized Socrates expression of guarded enthusiasm for the thesis that is linked with Pythagoras that suicide is always wrong as it leads to releasing our souls from our bodies that God has placed us in as a form of punishment.

In "Law", Plato discussed that suicide is disgraceful and it's prepetrators should be buried in unmarked graves. But he has also put forwarded some exceptions to this principle:

1) When one's mind is morally corrupted and one's character cannot therefore be salvaged.
2) When one put himself into death by judicial orders.
3) When extreme and unavoidable misfortune force oneself to put into death.
4) When self-killing takes place out of shame at participating in unjust actions.

According to Plato, suicide under these conditions can be excused. But otherwise, suicide is regarded by him as an act of cowardice and laziness.

6.4.2 Enlightement and Modern Developments

Some philosophers tried to view suicide from religious perspectives that deals with facts about individuals, their mental states and their social settings. Hume deals with this new approach on suicide. According to Thomistic view, suicide is an act against God's wish and a decision against God's order in determining when we shall die. Hume's arguments rest on the following considerations: -

1) If God is regarded as the creator of the causal laws of 'divine order' then it is wrong to go against it. But it is not wholly acceptable since God at times permits us to alter these laws during the case of disease or any other natural calamities.
2) If 'divine order' is regarded as the will of God which are rational that produce happiness then suicide should also be accepted within such law as it appears to be rational which is believed to be result into happiness by ending one's own life?
3) If 'divine order' is regarded as God's wish then all our actions can be said to be regarded as God's wish. If this is so then there can be no distinctions between God's wish in some of our actions and to those actions which is against God's wish. Then the decision of taking one's own life can also be regarded as the reflection of God's wish.

Hume holds that suicide neither violates duties towards others nor does it violate duties towards oneself. In some cases, and at certain point, we become nothing rather than a burden for others and in such cases putting oneself into death can be justified. Again, sickness, old age, and other misfortunes make our

lives miserable than death. Thus, in such cases, putting oneself to death according to Hume is acceptable.

Immanuel Kant was totally against the idea of suicide. According to him, our moral duties reflect our rational will and therefore, it is contradictory to support that the same "rational will" can destroy one's own self.

The nineteenth and early twentieth centuries philosophers Rousseau, Goethe and Flaubert and sociologist Durkheim and Laplace and some other experts brought certain developments that have shaped philosophical thoughts about suicide.

Rousseau, Goethe and Flaubert have discussed about suicide by stating it to be a response of misunderstood and anguished soul which is covered by love or shunned by society.

Secondly, psychiatry was developed during this period by many experts due to which the problems related to suicide can be diagnosed and can be treated properly.

Lastly, the sociologists such as Durkheim and Laplace regard suicide as a social I'll that creates separation of an individual from society, anomies, and other attitudes which is said to be arise out of modernity.

6.5 MODERNITY AND RATIONALITY OF SUICIDE

As we have come across the concept of suicide, its characteristics, its effects, now let us discuss whether suicide can be regarded as morally justified and rationally acceptable. In order to analyse it, we must come across certain points which are as follows: -

6.5.1 Moral Permissibility

There are certain issues that focus on suicide. Let us check what these issues are: -

a) The conditions of regarding suicide to be morally justified.
b) The decision whether other individuals should try to prevent suicide.
c) Whether suicide should be criminalized or should it be prevented.
d) Whether suicide is rational or prudent.

As it is already clear that in certain cases, as has been accepted by many philosophers, suicide us permissible and in those cases neither state nor other individuals should interfere in it. But such suicidal acts must be interfered by others to prevent them from taking their lives if such suicidal acts are done by irrational individuals.

6.5.2 Religious Arguments

There are some arguments that emerged in support of suicide being morally I'm permissible such as Thomistic arguments on suicide. But these arguments have been rejected on various grounds. As we have already discussed earlier about Hume's rejection of suicide violating natural law created by God on various

grounds, now let us see some other religious arguments against in permissibility of suicide which talks about the relationship between God and individuals. According to this argument, we are regarded as God's property and therefore suicide us regarded as wrong since it leads to destruction of God's property. But this argument has been criticised on several fronts.

Firstly, although we are God's property but we are not dominated and are free to act which sometimes might be inconsistent with God's wish?

Secondly, it points outs to that by destruction of God's property which us regarded as human life, doesn't lead to destruction of God.

Thirdly, God is regarded as all loving and if it is so then God must permit his property, that is human life to be destroyed through suicide if it is sufficiently bad.

Finally, it is argued that destruction of property is morally justified if that property causes harm to the owner. In other words, killing oneself is justified in order to avoid serious future harm to oneself.

Thus, religious thought favours suicide. It permits one to reunite with their deceased love, to attain liberty of soul from the bondage of the body.

6.5.3 Liberatarian Views and The Rights to Suicide

As we have come across the religious views on suicide, now let us discuss Libertarian views whether Libertarians permit the act of suicide. According to Libertarians, suicide is morally justified as it is the right of individuals to commit suicide. But it doesn't show that is rational but it is morally permissible.

Secondly, Libertarians assert that the right to suicide is the right of non-interference that nobody should interfere with the right of killing oneself. It is also claimed to be liberty right which states that others should not interfere of a person's suicidal behaviour and must also assist in that behaviour.

Thirdly, suicide is regarded as morally justified on the ground that we are the owner of our own bodies and thus, we have the full right to destroy our bodies whenever we wish.

Lastly, Libertarians argue that suicide is morally right if it doesn't harm others. It is our right and we are morally justified to put ourselves into death whenever we wish.

6.5.4 Social and Role Based Arguments

From religious and libertarian point of view it is quite clear that suicide is morally permissible. Now let us discuss the social and role-based arguments regarding suicide. According to Aristotle, suicide is a harm to the society. A society depends on the economic and social productivity of its members and the members must be obliged by their duties and thus in such cases suicide cannot be justified. Suicide hampers individuals' moral contribution to society. Thus, putting an end to one's own life is not morally justified. But this argument cannot be acceptable as it is difficult to show that society has a moral right to claim on its members' talents and productivity. It is not justified to say that the members of the society need to

benefit their society in terms of their capabilities regardless of the harms to themselves. However, suicide is morally wrong if the benefits to oneself are less than the benefits it produces to others. Another argument claims that there is a conditional relationship between society and its members which shows that individuals cannot end their life as they have to fulfil the conditions of the society. But this argument also cannot prove that suicide is unjustified because if the relation between an individual and a society is conditional then an individual has the full right to end his life if his conditions are not fulfilled by the society. Thus, it also indicates that suicide is morally permissible.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What is suicide?

.....

.....

Q 2: Is suicide morally justified?

.....

.....

Q 3: Name a philosopher who accepted suicide to be morally justified.

.....

.....

Q 4: Mention the name of a Stoic philosopher.

.....

.....

6.6 LET US SUM UP

- Suicide is an act of putting oneself into death purposefully.
- Philosophers such as Plato has discussed about suicide by portraying Socrates as arguing that there is no contradiction in his submitting freely to death and holding the belief that suicide is forbidden.
- Enlightenment philosophers tried to view suicide from religious perspective that deals with facts about individuals, their mental states and their social settings.
- Hume holds that suicide neither violates duties towards others nor does it violate duties towards oneself.
- Immanuel Kant was totally against the idea of suicide.
- According to Kant, our moral duty reflects our rational will and therefore it is contradictory to support that the same “rational will” can destroy one’s own self.
- Rousseau, Goethe and Flaubert have discussed about suicide by stating it to be a response of misunderstood and anguished soul which is covered by love or shunned by society.

6.7 FURTHER READING

1) Alvarez, A., 1982, The Savage God: A Study of Suicide. New York: Bentham.
2) Donnelly, J. (Ed.), 1998, Suicide: Right or Wrong? Amherst, NY: Promthens.
3) Joiner, T., 2005, Why People Die by Suicide. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
4) Shneidman, E. S., 1998, The Suicidal Mind, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

6.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

And to Q No 1: Suicide is an act of putting oneself into death purposefully.
And to Q No 2: Yes.
And to Q No 3: David Hume.
And to Q No 4: Chrysippus.

6.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short questions

Q 1: What is suicide?
Q 2: Mention the name of a philosophers who rejected the idea of suicide to be morally justified.
Q 3: Name the book written by Chrysippus.
Q 4: Mention the name of a Stoic philosopher.

B. Short questions (Answer in about 150 words)

Q 1: What are the characteristics of suicide? Discuss briefly.
Q 2: Write a note on the developments that have shaped the philosophical thought about suicide.
Q 3: “Putting an end to one’s own life is morally justified”. Discuss briefly.
Q 4: Give a brief account on the Liberatarian views of suicide.
Q 5: Give a brief account on the social arguments of suicide.

C. Long questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Is suicide morally justified? Discuss.
Q 2: Highlight the historical Western thought of suicide.
Q 3: What are the characteristics of suicide? Discuss.

UNIT 7: CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

UNIT STRUCTURE

7.1 Learning Objectives
7.2 Introduction
7.3 Background
7.4 Theories of Punishment
  7.4.1 Preventive Theory
  7.4.2 Reformative Theory
  7.4.3 Retributive Theory
7.5 What is Capital Punishment?
  7.5.1 Philosophers View on the Issue
7.6 Debate on Capital Punishment: Is Capital Punishment Justified?
  7.6.1 Reformists View
  7.6.2 Challenge to Reformists View
  7.6.3 Relevance of the Debate
7.7 Capital Punishment in India
7.8 Right to Live Argument
7.9 Let us Sum up
7.10 Further Reading
7.11 Answers to Check Your Progress
7.12 Model Questions:

7.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- know about capital punishment, the frequently discussed issue in media.
- describe how it is related to the core agenda of philosophy.
- analyze different theories of punishment.
- find out the possible justification for and against capital punishment.
- understand its relevance as well as its proper execution in the present social phenomenon.

7.2 INTRODUCTION

Philosophy is a discipline which discusses the life and the universe as a whole. It discusses the phenomenal as well as the transcendental world as our curiosity towards knowledge goes beyond. Again, it endeavors to know how to lead a worthwhile life as a human being in true sense of the term. It is the activity of that branch of philosophy which is called Axiology. Ethics, “the science of human behavior” is important subject matter of Axiology. The theory of punishment is one of the key issues of ethics. Of course, the issue of punishment may have two aspects, i.e. legal and moral. Ethics as the branch of

philosophy under Axiology try to discuss different theories of punishment in these both aspects. This is how the theory of punishment has become one of the important issues of discussion in philosophy. The capital punishment is the important issue of discussion under theory of punishment. The focal concern of this chapter is to expose what capital punishment is and what are its issues and significance in the society.

7.3 BACKGROUND

The debate over whether execution is an acceptable form of punishment involves a complicated collection of legal, empirical and moral issues. The eighth amendment to the United States Constitution prohibits “cruel and unusual punishment,” and so the legal debate has tended to center around whether capital punishment is cruel or unusual.

Crime is a disruptive act. It is the violation of the laws of society. Mackenzie says that a wrong against social law is a wrong against humanity, and it cannot be forgiven until the offended majesty of law is appeased. It is here that the justification of punishment is found. Society or State punishes the wrong doer because the latter has degraded the majesty of the social law by its violation. Punishment is inflicted on the wrong doer, because he has earned it by violating the moral law. The wrong doer has not only tried to disturb the social peace and harmony through his criminal acts, but has also degraded himself. Punishment is inflicted on a wrong doer because justice demands it. Justice demands that there should be appropriate distribution of reward and punishment in proportion to the merit and demerit of actions. Here the issue arises how the degree of crime will be counted to measure the punishment.

7.4 THEORIES OF PUNISHMENT

To think clearly about whether we ought to carry out executions at all, it is helpful to begin with an overview of different views about the justification of punishment. We can divide justifications of punishment into two broad categories: deontological and utilitarian. These two categories mainly hint three different types of theories of punishment. These are: Preventive or Deterrent theory, Reformative or Educative theory and Retributive theory. Let us have a brief overview of these three theories.

7.4.1 Preventive Theory

According to the advocates of the preventive theory, the primary end of punishment is to prevent the recurrence of crime. Here it is said a criminal ought to be punished in order to prevent others from committing similar crimes. It should be an exemplary punishment. The problem of this theory is sometimes it may recommend severe punishment for slight offences. The main theme of this theory has best been expressed through the maxim “you are not punished for stealing sheep, but in order that sheep may not be stolen,” According to this theory, the criminal is punished as a means to an end which is the prevention of crimes. But, it can be said, it is not justified to treat man as means.

7.4.2 Reformative Theory

According to the advocates of the reformative theory, the aim of punishment is to reform the criminal himself. The offender was, prior to the commission of offence, a member of the society. It should be the duty of the society to regenerate the offender. The offender should be punished for his own good. Punishment aims at reforming the offender of his anti-social tendencies so that he may regain his position in society. Punishment should educate the offender in the consciousness of the moral ideal and moral duties. It should never be tinged with retribution.

7.4.3 Retributive Theory

Retributive theory is the third important view of punishment. This theory is purely connected to the legal system. It says, punishment is an act of justice. It is (punishment) an end in itself, not a means to any end beyond itself. The primary aim of punishment is retribution. The aim of punishment is to defend the supremacy and authority of the moral law and to do justice to a criminal. According to the advocates of the retributive theory the offender against society must be punished. He has done a wrong against society. The wrong which he has done to others and to society should shrink back upon himself. It is through punishment that he should be made conscious of the wrong he has done. Punishment is the compliment paid to the criminal. The retributive theory has two wings. According to the first wing the punishing authority should take into consideration the motives and intentions of a wrong-doer while punishing the offender. Punishment should not be inflicted mechanically. Otherwise, punishment will be mere oppression. Punishment should be justice tempered with mercy. This is known as Mollified Retributive theory. On the other hand, according to the second wing of this theory, punishment should be of the nature of “tit for tat, eye for an eye, and tooth for a tooth.” Severe crimes should have severe punishment. Nature of punishment is to be determined by the nature of the offence. This is known as regoristic retributive theory. In this context the issue of capital punishment comes.

The retributive theory justifies capital punishment under exceptional circumstances. Right to live is the fundamental right. If a person takes away the life of another, justice demands that he should be deprived of his life. This is how the way of capital punishment can be understood. But generally, the execution of capital punishment is a controversial debate since its inception. Let us see what capital punishment is and what is its issue?

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What is preventive theory of punishment?

.....

.....

Q 2: What is reformative theory of punishment?

.....

.....

Q 3: What is retributive theory of punishment?

.....

.....

7.5 WHAT IS CAPITAL PUNISHMENT?

Capital punishment means "death sentence". It is also known as the death penalty, a government sanctioned practice whereby a person is put to death by the State as a punishment for a crime. The sentence that someone be punished in such a manner is referred to as a death sentence, whereas the act of carrying out the sentence is known as an execution. Crimes that can result in a death penalty are known as capital crimes or capital offences. The term *capital* is derived from the Latin *capitalis* means "of the head", referring to execution by beheading. Capital punishment is a legal penalty in India.

7.5.1 Philosophers view on the Issue

Different philosophers have given different views on punishment. The famous Greek philosopher Aristotle regards punishment as negative reward. The man who deliberately breaks a moral law is entitled to a negative reward. The society gives him what is his due. The German philosopher Emanuel Kant holds that punishment ought to be inflicted on the criminal because he has committed a crime, not as a means to his own good or that of others. He advocates the retributive theory of punishment. Kant says, "Punishment can never be administered merely as a means for promoting another good either with regard to the criminal himself or to society. The penal law is a categorical imperative". Hegel also advocates this view. He also holds that punishment is demanded by the criminal. It is his reward. It is what he deserves-what he has earned by breaking the moral law. It may be said to be his negative reward. The view of these three philosophers is very close to capital punishment as they have corollary to the retributive theory of punishment. The other thinker Rashdall advocates the reformative theory of punishment, and criticizes the retributive theory. He brands it as a vindictive theory. According to him, the amount of pain to be inflicted on the criminal in proportion to the crime cannot be ascertained.

7.6 DEBATE ON CAPITAL PUNISHMENT: IS CAPITAL PUNISHMENT JUSTIFIED?

The above mentioned three theories have their own view regarding capital punishment. The reformative theory of punishment aims at the reformation of the criminal. It is therefore, apparent that capital punishment is not justified according to this theory. If the criminal is given death sentence, the question of his reformation becomes meaningless. Secondly the preventive theory aims at preventing the recurrence of crimes. The criminal is not punished so much for his own good as for preventing others from committing similar crimes. This theory advocates exemplary punishment. Hence capital punishment is justifiable on this theory. The Mollified Retributive theory advocates punishment to the

wrong-doer after considering his motive, intention and the circumstances under which the wrong was done. But if the crime is of severe nature and if there are no extenuating circumstances, the criminal being hardened and incurable, capital punishment may be awarded. But Rigoristic Retributive theory does not consider the extenuating circumstances of the criminal. Rather it renders punishment to the criminal according to the gravity of the crime.

7.6.1 Reformists View

The reformists or the humanists as it is already hinted by reformative theory are opposed to capital punishment. They maintain that if punishment merely aims at vindication of the moral law, it smacks of revenge. According to this standpoint a wrong doer becomes temporally insane while committing a crime. Usually, no murder is committed in cold blood. But when society inflicts death sentence on a criminal, it does so in cold blood. Therefore, society or its leaders should also be punished with death. The humanists maintain that taking one's life to set an example to others is an act of barbaric cruelty. Homicidal crimes have not disappeared from the countries where capital punishment is in vogue. Capital punishment has no deterrent effect. According to the humanists, healthy and strong public opinion as well as mass awareness are the real deterrent to crime. Treating the offender as a means to an end is a crime against humanity.

The reformist theory is supported by Criminal Sociology. It regards crimes as outcomes of unfavourable social circumstances. According to them crimes are due to social inequalities, maladjustments and corruptions. For example, it presumes that theft is due to poverty. Therefore, repression of crime without improving the social and economic conditions of criminals is useless and injurious. Crimes can be prevented only if the human society is reconstructed on the basis of justice and equity.

Here it can be said, if punishment can reform the offender, it serves its purpose well. There is a possibility that with the reformation of an offender punishment may harden the criminal habit of the criminal. A kind treatment may sometimes produce a better effect than punishment. Sometimes forgiveness may bring home to the criminal his guilt and lead him to repentance and reformation. Forgiveness by the offended person sometimes melts the heart of a criminal and transforms his nature.

From the above standpoint of the reformists, it is clear that this theory cannot justify capital punishment, because the hanged man cannot be reformed.

7.6.2 Challenge to Reformists View

There are some problems in the reformists' standpoint. It is fact that all crimes cannot be attributed to social maladjustments. Crimes are deliberately committed by some persons, who are not necessarily under adverse social conditions. The common phenomenon of corruption is the right evidence of that. To ascribe all crimes to social distempers, as the reformists intended to, is to miss the distinctive character of crimes.

7.6.3 RELEVANCE OF THE DEBATE:

Capital punishment is a matter of active controversy in various countries and states, and positions can vary within a single political ideology or cultural region. In the European Union, Article 2 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights prohibits the use of capital punishment. Also, the Council of Europe, which has 47 member states, prohibits the use of the death penalty by its members. The United Nations General Assembly has adopted, in 2007, 2008, 2010, 2012 and 2014 non-binding resolutions calling for a global moratorium on executions, with a view to eventual abolition. Although most nations have abolished capital punishment, over 60% of the world's population live in countries where executions take place, such as China, India, the United States and Indonesia.

The arguments against death sentence are true to a great extent. But abolition of capital punishment cannot also be advocated. It is true that crimes have not disappeared from the countries where capital punishment is in force. But it cannot be ignored that the incidence of heinous crimes may rise sharply if capital punishment is abolished in those countries. All cases of crimes, as the reformists advocate, cannot be due to social or economic inequalities, lack of education or to some mental defects. There may be some 'born criminal'; nothing can reform these born criminals. In that case if a criminal who has committed a heinous crime goes off with a lighter punishment, it will give an indulgence to the criminal tendencies that may be in other persons. So, here the preventive attitude of punishment cannot be ignored. If the crime is of severe nature and if there are no extenuating circumstances in favour of the criminal, death sentence may be justified in that case. Where the criminal commits murder in cold blood, he will have to accept death sentence as his reward.

7.7 CAPITAL PUNISHMENT IN INDIA

Capital punishment is a legal penalty in India. Here at least 100 people in 2007, 40 in 2006, 77 in 2005, 23 in 2002, and 33 in 2001 were sentenced to death (but not executed), according to Amnesty International figures. No official statistics of those sentenced to death have been released. The president of India use to receive many mercy petitions who are convicted by Indian court and verdict death sentence. As of July 2015, President Pranab Mukherjee has rejected 24 mercy pleas including that of Yakub Memon, Ajmal Kasab, Afzal Guru. On 14 August 2004, Dhananjoy Chatterjee was hanged for the murder (following a rape) of 18-year-old Hetal Parekh at her apartment residence in Bhowanipur on 5 March 1990. Chatterjee, whose mercy plea was rejected on 4 August 2004, was kept at Alipore Central Jail for nearly 14 years.

On 3 May 2010, a Mumbai Special Court convicted Ajmal Kasab of murder, waging war on India, possessing explosives and other charges. On 6 May 2010 the same trial court sentenced him to death on four counts and to a life sentence on five other counts. Kasab was sentenced to death for attacking Mumbai and killing 166 people on 26 November 2008 along with nine other Pakistani terrorists. He was found guilty of 80 offences, including waging war against the nation, which is punishable by death. Kasab's death sentence

was upheld by the Bombay High Court on 21 February 2011 and by the Supreme Court on 29 August 2012. His mercy plea was rejected by the president on 5 November and the same was communicated to him on 12 November. On 21 November 2012, Kasab was hanged in the Yerwada Central Jail in Pune. Likewise Afzal Guru was convicted of conspiracy in connection with the 2001 Indian Parliament attack and was sentenced to death. The Supreme Court of India upheld the sentence, ruling that the attack "shocked the conscience of the society at large." Afzal was scheduled to be executed on 20 October 2006, but the sentence was stayed. He was hanged on 9 February 2013 at Delhi's Tihar Central Jail.

Yakub Memon, convicted of 1993 Bombay bombings, was executed by hanging in Nagpur Central Jail at around 6:30 am IST on 30 July 2015. On 21 March 2013 the Supreme Court confirmed Memon's conviction and death sentence for conspiracy through financing the attacks. On 30 July 2013 the Supreme Court bench headed by Chief Justice P. Sathasivam, Justice B. S. Chauhan and Justice Prafulla Chandra Pant rejected Memon's application for an oral hearing and dismissed his review petition by circulation. Indian President Pranab Mukherjee rejected Memon's petition for clemency on 11 April 2014. Memon then filed a curative petition to the Supreme Court, which was rejected on 21 July 2015.

A special mention here is to the 650-page written judgment in the 1984 Assassination of Indira Gandhi, who was killed by her bodyguards, in which the Delhi High Court panel said, "No excuse or circumstance can . . . mitigate such a treacherous and cowardly act where a defenseless woman was cruelly slaughtered by the 'guardians' of her safety." The judgment condemned "the most inhuman mode of killing" and said, "Two persons crowding in before an elderly woman and mercilessly pumping into her not one or two but as many as 30 bullets is the ghastly scene to be conjured in the mind's eye." Kehar Singh was hanged on 6 January 1989 for conspiracy in the assassination, carried out by Satwant Singh and Beant Singh.

In June 2012 it became known that Indian president Pratibha Patil, near the end of her five-year term as president, commuted the death sentence of as many as 35 convicts to life imprisonment, including four on the same day (2 June), which created a storm of protest. There have been calls for the introduction of the death penalty for rapists and molesters, especially since an infamous 2012 Delhi gang rape case and later crimes. So here it can be said in Indian context capital punishment is executed considering the gravity of the crime.

7.8 RIGHT TO LIVE ARGUMENT

Here it can be realized the importance of capital punishment cannot be ignored. But another standpoint holds that human life is valuable. It is so valuable that even the worst murderers should not be deprived of the value of their lives. They believe that the value of the offender's life cannot be destroyed by the offender's bad conduct - even if they have killed someone. Some abolitionists don't go that far. They say that life should be preserved unless there is a very good reason not to, and that those who are in favour of capital punishment are the ones who have to justify their position. Everyone has an inalienable human right to life, even those who commit murder; sentencing a person to

death and executing them violates that right. This is very similar to the 'value of life' argument, but approached from the perspective of human rights. Another problem in case of capital punishment is the execution of innocent persons. It is a problem for the retribution argument - if there is a serious risk of executing the innocent then one of the key principles of retribution - that people should get what they deserve (and therefore *only* what they deserve) should be very carefully monitored by the judiciary of a State. But unfortunately, sometimes it is violated may be due to the dishonesty of legal professionals and some instance can be seen even in USA where the capital punishment has been executed on the innocent people. Again, the death penalty doesn't seem to deter people from committing serious violent crimes. But the reverse argument in this regard is that if there is no provision for capital punishment then the level of crime may cross the limit.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 4: Fill in the blanks:
The term *capital* is derived from the Latin ……..means ……..

Q 5: What is capital punishment?
.....
.....

Q 6: What is Aristole's view about punishment?
.....
.....

Q 7: Can Immanuel Kant, the German philosopher be said as the supporter of capital punishment?
.....
.....

Q 8: What is Hegel's view on the theory of punishment?
.....
.....

Q 9: What did Rashdall said about punishment?
.....
.....

Q 10: What is reformist approach to capital punishment?
.....
.....

7.9 LET US SUM UP

- Capital punishment means death sentence. It is also known as the death penalty, is a government sanctioned practice whereby a person is put to death by the state as a punishment for a crime.
- There are different opinions of different theories of punishment regarding capital punishment. One section supports it whereas others oppose.

- According to the Deterrent theory, a person who deliberately commits murder should be given capital punishment. The criminal deprived a person of his life, so he should be hanged to prevent others from committing the same. He should be made an example for others.
- According to the retributive theory also a murderer should be given capital punishment. He has taken away the life of a person in cold blood. So justice demands that he be deprived of his life. The rigorous form of the retributive theory does not make any concession. But the mollified form of it recommends taking into consideration the criminal's age, provocation, education, and other extenuating circumstances in softening the rigour of justice.
- Capital punishment is a legal penalty in India. Here lots of instances can be found of giving capital punishment legally to different criminals.
- Capital punishment is a matter of active controversy in various countries and states, and positions can vary within a single political ideology or cultural region. In the Article 2 of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the European Union prohibits the use of capital punishment.
- As it is already seen the retributive theory justifies capital punishment under exceptional circumstances. Right to live is the fundamental right. If a person takes away the life of another, justice demands that he should be deprived of his life. This is how the way of capital punishment can be understood. But generally, the execution of capital punishment is a controversial debate since its inception.
- In the contemporary age the reformists or the humanists have been tried to enlighten public opinion against capital punishment.
- But one thing cannot be ignored that if there is no provision for capital punishment then the level of crime may cross the limit. The important thing here is that the judiciary should take special caution when executing the capital punishment so that the innocent people may not be affected.

7.10 FURTHER READING

1) Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.
2) John H. Piet and Ayodhya Prasad (ed) An Introduction to Applied Ethics.
3) Steven Luper & Curtis Brown, The Moral Life, Second Edition, Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
4) LaFollette, Hugh (2002). Ethics in practice: an anthology. Oxford: Blackwell.
5) Sinha, J.N., Manual of Ethics, New Central Book Agency (p) Ltd. London

7.11 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q. No 1: The preventive theory of punishment is that theory according to which, the primary end of punishment is to prevent the recurrence of crime. Here it is said a criminal ought to be punished in order to prevent others from committing similar crimes. It should be an exemplary punishment.

Ans to Q. No 2: According the reformative theory, the aim of punishment is to reform the criminal himself. The offender was, prior to the commission of offence, a member of the society. It should be the duty of the society to rehabilitate the offender. The offender should be punished for his own good. Punishment aims at reforming the offender.

Ans to Q. No 3: The retributive theory of punishment is purely connected to the legal system. It says, punishment is an act of justice. It is (punishment) an end in itself, not a means to any end beyond itself. The primary aim of punishment is retribution. The aim of punishment is to defend the supremacy and authority of the moral law and to do justice to a criminal. According to the advocates of the retributive theory the offender against society must be punished.

Ans to Q. No 4: The term *capital* is derived from the Latin word *capitalis* means "of the head".

The term *capital* is derived from the Latin *capitalis* means "of the head",

Ans to Q. No 5: Capital punishment means "death sentence". It is also known as the death penalty, a government sanctioned practice whereby a person is put to death by the State as a punishment for a crime.

Ans to Q. No 6: According to Aristotle, punishment is negative reward. The man who deliberately breaks a moral law is entitled to a negative reward. The society gives him what is his due.

Ans to Q. No 7: The German philosopher Emanuel Kant holds that punishment ought to be inflicted on the criminal because he has committed a crime, not as a means to his own good or that of others. He advocates the retributive theory of punishment. Kant says, "Punishment can never be administered merely as a means for promoting another good either with regard to the criminal himself or to society. The penal law is a categorical imperative". Here it can be said, Kant supports capital punishment for the sake of the law and order itself.

Ans to Q. No 8: Hegel advocates the retributivists' view of punishment. He holds that punishment is demanded by the criminal. It is his reward. It is what he deserves-what he has earned by breaking the moral law. It may be said to be his negative reward.

Ans to Q. No 9: Rashdall advocates the reformative theory of punishment, and criticizes the retributive theory. He brands it as a vindictive theory. According to him, the amount of pain to be inflicted on the criminal in proportion to the crime cannot be ascertained.

Ans to Q. No 10: The reformists or the humanists like reformative theory are opposed to capital punishment. They maintain that if punishment merely aims at vindication of the moral law, it smacks of revenge. According to this standpoint a wrong doer becomes temporally insane while committing a crime. Usually, no murder is committed in cold blood. But when society inflicts death sentence on a criminal, it does so in cold blood. Therefore, society or its leaders should also be punished with death. The humanists maintain that taking one's life to set an example to others is an act of barbaric cruelty.

7.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very Short question

Q 1: What is the literal meaning of the word 'capital punishment'?
Q 2: What is "tit for tat, eye for an eye"?
Q 3: What is Axiology?
Q 4: What is Ethics?
Q 5: What is punishment?

B. Short question (Answer in about 150 words)

Q 1: What is capital punishment?
Q 2: What is preventive or deterrent theory of punishment?
Q 3: What is reformative theory of punishment?
Q 4: What is mollified retributive theory of punishment?
Q 5: What is regoristic retributive theory of punishment?

C. Long Questions (Answer in about 300- 500 words)

Q 1: Is capital punishment justified? Explain with examples.
Q 2: What is humanist or reformist's view on capital punishment? Is it justified? Give reasons.
Q 3: Briefly discuss the scenario of capital punishment and its implementation in India.
Q 4: Give your arguments for and against capital punishment. Can capital punishment minimize the level of crime in the society?

UNIT 8 : MEDIA ETHICS

UNIT STRUCTURE

8.1 Learning Objectives
8.2 Introduction
8.3 Media and Importance of Ethics
8.4 Media Code of Ethics
  8.4.1 Common elements of Media Code of Ethics
  8.4.2 Plagiarism
  8.4.3 Compliance of Ethical Standards
8.5 Right of Reply
8.6 Let us Sum up
8.7 Further Reading
8.8 Answers to Check Your Progress
8.9 Model questions

8.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- explain the concept of 'Media Ethics'
- enumerate the common elements of media ethics and their compliance
- discuss 'Plagiarism'
- explain the 'Right of Reply'

8.2 INTRODUCTION

The media is a powerful institution that can act as a necessary instrument of communication. Freedom of Press or Media Freedom is the immunity enjoyed by communications media – including newspapers, books, periodicals, radio, television, and Internet – from government control or censorship. But one should remember that every human institution is liable to be abused, if not controlled, which may lead to disorder and anarchy. The need for controlling the Press, apart from any Emergency, arises out of this

8.3 MEDIA AND IMPORTANCE OF ETHICS

Media ethics is the subdivision of applied ethics dealing with the specific ethical principles and standards of media, including broadcast media, film, theatre, the arts, print media and the internet. The field covers many varied and highly controversial topics, ranging from war journalism to advertising.

Ethical behaviour elevates the practice of journalism. Journalism has an ethical goal – the communication of truth and facts. The problem is that the concept of truth has changed through human history. Along with this media audiences have also changed. In this context even the accepted facts and truth are subject to various interpretations among

diverse viewers and readers on the basis of geography and cultural divides. Telling the truth as one views it, then, becomes a matter of possessing good moral character and the learning to recognise truth and how to convey it without distortion. Truth has somehow come to be mixed up with vision and present circumstances. There has been much debate some years back about the means employed by the Tehelka team to record on film the extent of corruption in the Defence Ministry over the purchase of arms and ammunitions. The use of subterfuge to find the truth has been questioned at different forums of journalists. That is why the importance of ethics in the field of journalism is necessary.

Ethics is the study of standards of conduct and moral judgement that is what is good for an individual as also for society at large. The concept of ethics was formulated by the ancient Philosophers like Plato and Aristotle in Greece. The ethical culture was advocated in the Mahabharata and also in the New Testament. All those scripures prescribed that for the individual, courage, morality and correct behaviour was a benchmark for morality and ethics. They also added the qualities of wisdom, justice and temperance to the list. Ethics refers to the value system by which a person determines what is right or wrong, fair or unfair, just or unjust. It is expressed through moral behaviour in specific situations. An iindividual's conduct is measured not only against his or her conscience but also against some norm of acceptability that has been socially, professionally or organisationally determined.

In present day conditions ethics has come to mean the ability to make decisions between what is good and bad, what is morally justifiable and what is not. It also denotes the ability to discern the correct choice out of many, all of which may be morally justifiable. It is the ability to explain these choices to the people that mark ethical and rational thinking, to be converted into action. A reporter writing a story for a newspaper or for television may be called upon to take several decisions or ethical choices regarding the source of his story, his colleagues and the reading or viewing public. If his choice is correct, it cannot offend or hurt anyone of these categories involved.

Public enlightenment is the forerunner of justice and the foundation of democracy. The duty of a journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair, objective and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty and at the same time professional integrity is the cornerstone of a journalist's credibility. Media codes of ethics are designed as guides through numerous difficulties, such as conflicts of interest, to assist journalists in dealing with ethical dilemmas. The codes and canons provide journalists a framework for self-monitoring and self-correction as they pursue professional assignments. While journalists in the United States and European countries have led in formulation and adoption of these standards, such codes can be found in the news reporting organisations in most countries along with f'reedom of the press'. The written codes and practical standards vary somewhat from country to country and organisation to organisation, but there is a substantial overlapping among mainstream publications and societies.

The ethical standards for media are directed towards bringing the highest quality of news reporting to the public, thus fulfilling the mission of timely distribution of information in the service of the public interest. To a large extent, the codes and canons have evolved via observation of and response to past ethical lapses by journalists and publishers. Today, it is common for terms of employment to mandate adherence to such codes equally

applicable to both the staff and freelance journalists. Sometimes journalist may face dismissal for ethical failures. Upholding professional standards also enhances the reputation of and trust in a news organisation, which boosts the size of the audience it serves.

8.4 MEDIA CODE OF ETHICS

Ethics are norms for conduct that distinguish between acceptable and unacceptable behavior. It is concerned with what is right or wrong, good or bad, fair or unfair, responsible or irresponsible, obligatory or permissible, praiseworthy or blameworthy. Ethics and standards of journalism comprise principles of ethics and of good practice as applicable to the specific challenges faced by professional journalists. Historically and currently, these set of ethical standards are widely known to journalists as their professional "code of ethics". In recent years, it has almost become a norm that most renowned professional journalism associations and individual print, broadcast, and online news organisations have come out with their own set of basic codes on ethics to serve the society. The fundamental objectives of these ethical codes of journalism is to serve the people with news, views, comments and information on matters of public interest in a fair, accurate, unbiased, sober and decent manner. Towards this end, the Press is expected to conduct itself in keeping with certain norms of professionalism universally recognised. These universally recognised norms are expected to apply with due discernment and adaptation to the varying circumstance of each case which definitely will help the journalists to self-regulate their conduct.

The recent flurry of code writing suggests that editors and news staffs are taking issues of ethics seriously. The process of drafting and redrafting and debating and implementing the codes has good therapeutic value in and of itself. Even better, newspapers with clearly enunciated principles and stated values, combined with strong ethical decision-making skills, can better serve their readers and the public interest. Therein lies an essential connection to credibility. Codes of ethics can help newsroom staffers make sound decisions and build journalistic credibility about the many ethical problems they may encounter in their work.

There are various organisations and associations world over related to journalists and most of these associations have their own set of code of ethics. The principles of Journalistic codes of ethics of these national and international associations are designed as guides through numerous difficulties to assist journalists in dealing with ethical dilemmas. The codes and canons provide journalists a framework for self-monitoring and self-correction as they pursue professional assignments. In India we have Editor's Charter, 1953 ,adopted by All India Newspaper Editor's Conference (AINEC), AINEC Code of Ethics, 1968 to cover communal incidents, Press Council Code, 1996, Press Council Code on Communal Matters, 1968, National Integration Council (NIC) Code, 1962 and Parliamentary Code of Ethics, 1976 adopted by the Rajya Sabha for journalists and newspapers regarding their social and moral responsibilities. While various existing codes have some differences, most share common elements and these include the principles of truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, impartiality, dignity, fairness, public accountability and humanity as these apply to the acquisition of newsworthy information.

8.4.1 Common elements of Media Code of Ethics

Truthfulness:

This principle extends from honesty, good faith, and sincerity of a journalist in general, to the fact or reality in particular. However, truthfulness may conflict with many other values. Salacious details of the lives of public figures is a central content element in many media.

This type of publication is not necessarily justified simply because the information is true. Journalists need to keep in mind that Privacy is also a right. Revelation of military secrets and other sensitive government information may be contrary to the public interest, even if it is true. Photo journalists who cover war and disasters confront situations which may shock the sensitivities of their audiences. For example, human remains are rarely screened. Journalistic ethics may conflict with the law over issues such as the protection of confidential news sources. There is also the question of the extent to which it is ethically acceptable to break the law in order to obtain news. For example, undercover reporters may be engaging in deception, trespass and similar torts and crimes. The ethical issue is how far one should risk shocking the audience's sensitivities in order to correctly and fully report the truth.

Accuracy:

Accuracy is much more than simply making sure you quote someone correctly or spell their name right. It also means that journalists put their words and opinions in the proper context. It means that you report on people and events as truthfully as possible. Journalists should not tidy up what happened to fit neatly into whatever angle you or your editor might want the story to take. It means the report is not tainted by whatever personal feelings a journalist might have about the selected subject or people. The information in the report should conform to reality and it should be not in any way misleading or false. This demands not only careful and thorough research but a disciplined use of language and production techniques, including visuals. Events with a single eyewitness should be reported with attribution. Events with two or more independent eyewitnesses may be reported as fact. Controversial facts are always reported with attribution. Independent fact-checking by another employee of the publisher is desirable for accuracy of a news. Corrections should be published when errors are discovered. Defendants at trial should be treated only as having "allegedly" committed crimes, until conviction, when their crimes are generally reported as fact. Reporters are expected to be as accurate as possible given the time allotted to story preparation and the space available, and to seek reliable sources.

Objectivity:

The term 'objectivity' was not applied to journalistic work until the 20th century, but it had fully emerged as a guiding principle by the 1890s. A number of communication scholars and historians agree that the idea of "objectivity" has prevailed as a dominant discourse among journalists in the United States since

the appearance of modern newspapers. The rise of objectivity in journalistic method is also rooted in the scientific positivism of the 19th century, as professional journalism of the late 19th century borrowed parts of its worldview from various scientific disciplines of the day.

Today journalists and the public often tend to identify objectivity in its absence. Objectivity is a significant principle of journalistic professionalism, especially in the United Kingdom and United States. Journalistic objectivity can refer to fairness, disinterestedness, factuality, and nonpartisanship, but most often it encompasses all of these qualities. However, not many journalists would make a claim to total neutrality or impartiality. However, some strive toward a certain modicum of detachment from their own personal biases in their news work.

The journalistic ethics of objectivity has strong influence on the profession. But journalistic objectivity is not the pristine objectivity of philosophy. Instead, a journalist attempts to be objective by two methods: 1) fairness to those concerned with the news and 2) a professional process of information gathering that seeks fairness, completeness, and accuracy. As we all know, the ethical heights journalists set for themselves are not always reached. But, all in all, like politics, it is an honourable profession practiced, for the most part, by people trying to do the right thing.

Impartiality:

The journalistic principle of impartiality holds that decisions should be based on objective criteria, rather than on the basis of bias, prejudice, or to the benefit one person over another for improper reasons.

Fairness:

Ethical journalistic practice demands that reporters and editors be fair. Journalists should be careful about the fact that reporting about an incident is made objectively and free from political influence or personal favouritism. They should see whatever they are being fair to the people you writing about. The portrayal of thoughts and words should be fair and should not be adulterated in some way or the other. The information reports should reflect equitably the relevant facts and significant points of view and should deal fairly and ethically with persons, institutions, issues and events. The journalist should himself feel comfortable reading his own story to the people involved. One of the biggest compliments a journalist can receive is to be called tough but fair by someone he has written about in an uncomplimentary way.

In the news reporting the fairness bias manifests a contention between/ among political actors. Whenever one faction or politician does something or says something newsworthy, the press is compelled by this bias to get a reaction from an opposing camp. This creates the illusion that the game of politics is always contentious and never cooperative. This bias can also create situations in which one faction appears to be attacked by the press.

Public Accountability:

With the principle of public accountability come such principles as answerability, responsibility, blame worthiness, liability and other terms associated with the expectation of account-giving. Public accountability of journalists means the obligation of journalist to explain and report publicly, fully and fairly, before and after the fact, how they are carrying out responsibilities that affect the public in important ways. Their report about an incident should validate their fairness and completeness. In a way journalists have an obligation to explain and to justify his or her reporting.

Dignity:

The dignity of the people a journalist writes about is very important. So is the dignity of readers and newspaper. That does not mean that someone is not an aggressive journalist, but it means that he does not take cheap shots. Most hard-hitting stories are strengthened when the reporter shows respect toward the people or institutions under examination.

Humanity:

It is the principle of being humane. In the movie *Absence of Malice* there is a great scene where a wise old city editor talks about being a reporter. He says he knows how to report the news and he knows how not to hurt people, but he doesn't know how to do both at the same time. The best journalism usually hurts someone, often without meaning to. Humanity means not to hurt the innocent or those who have no idea what they are getting into when they talk to a reporter. Good journalists have a special responsibility when it comes to the common masses.

The duty of the journalist is to further those ends by seeking truth and providing a fair and comprehensive account of events and issues. Conscientious journalists from all media and specialties strive to serve the public with thoroughness and honesty. Professional integrity is the cornerstone of a journalist's credibility. Ethics form the foundation on which is built the basic social contract that has to exist between the credible journalist and the public he or she serves. The stronger that foundation, the stronger are the ties between the writer and the reader. But that strong foundation is rarely obvious to the reader, or for that matter the writer. Ethics almost always remains in the background, usually only becoming evident when there is a problem.

8.3.2 Plagiarism

'Plagiarism' is essentially the unacknowledged use of another person's work, usually by one person acting independently. It is a form of copying without acknowledgement of the work of others – published or unpublished, either verbatim or in close paraphrase, including material downloaded from computer files and the Internet. It may be the use of or close imitation of the language and thoughts of another author and the representation of them as one's own original work.

In journalism, plagiarism is considered a breach of journalistic ethics, and reporters caught plagiarising typically face disciplinary measures ranging from

suspension to termination. Some individuals caught plagiarising in academic or journalistic contexts claim that they plagiarised unintentionally, by failing to include quotations or to give the appropriate citation. While plagiarism in scholarship and journalism has a century-old history, the development of the Internet, where articles appear as electronic text, has made the physical act of copying the work of others much easier, simply by copying and pasting text from one web page to another. The practice of plagiarism is being increasingly indulged in by some newspapers by lifting news from other newspapers and publishing them subsequently as their own. In India this practice is very common. Reporters consciously or unconsciously deal with many situations that could involve plagiarism. This malpractice may not be corrected to wholesale prevention or actionable as a breach of copyright, because news once published becomes public property. To get rid of unethicality of such news proper acknowledgement of the source of the report at the beginning or at the end of the news must be given. Events in a news cannot be copyrighted, but specific account of the event can be. Journalists can rewrite the article without violating the law.

One thing may be mentioned here that Plagiarism is not copyright infringement. While both terms may apply to a particular act, they bear different meanings in law. Copyright infringement is a violation of the rights of a copyright holder, when material protected by copyright is used without consent. On the other hand, plagiarism is concerned with the unearned increment to the plagiarising author's reputation that is achieved through false claims of authorship.

Pligiarism:
The action of taking work or idea of someone else and pass it off as one's own.

LET US KNOW

Pligiarism is not same as infringement of copyright.

8.4.3 Compliance of Ethical Standards

There is a perennial concern that the standards of media ethics are being ignored. One of the most controversial issues in modern reporting is media bias, especially on political issues, but also with regard to cultural and other issues. Sensationalism is also a common complaint. Minor factual errors are also extremely common, as almost anyone who is familiar with the subject of a particular report will quickly realise. There are also some wider concerns, as the media continue to change, for example that the brevity of news reports and use of sound bites has reduced fidelity to the truth, and may contribute to a lack of needed context for public understanding. From outside the profession, the rise of news management contributes to the real possibility that news media may be deliberately manipulated. Selective reporting, double standards are commonly alleged against newspapers, and by their very nature forms of bias are not easy to establish, or guard against.

Among the leading news organizations which voluntarily adopt and attempt to uphold the common standards of media ethics there is considerable variation in respect of adherence and general quality . The professionalism, reliability and public

accountability of a news organisation are three of its most valuable assets. An organisation earns and maintains a strong reputation, in part, through a consistent implementation of ethical standards, which influence its position with the public and within the print and electronic media houses.

8.5 RIGHT OF REPLY

The 'Right of Reply' is the right of an individual to reply to misleading or inaccurate publications about him. The right of reply is the right to defend oneself against criticism. It means a person must be given the opportunity to respond to any allegations made against them in a publication. In most cases this would mean they would be contacted before publication so that their side of the story may be put across to the audience in the same article. But right to reply does not mean a person must be contacted before publication. However, it does mean that they must be given the opportunity to put their side of the story across after publication.

The newspaper should promptly publish, at the instance of the person feeling aggrieved/or concerned by the impugned publication, a contradiction/reply/rejoinder sent to the editor in the form of a letter or note. The editor has the discretion either to publish it in full or in its abridged and edited version, particularly when it is inordinately long. But the rejoinder should be an effective reply to the allegations. However, the editor is not entitled to alter, omit or refuse to publish important portions of the reply/rejoinder which effectively deals with the material allegations in the news item. If the editor doubts the truth or factual accuracy of the contradiction/reply/rejoinder, even then it is her/his duty to publish it, with liberty to add separately at the end, an editorial comment doubting its veracity, but only when this doubt is reasonably founded on unimpeachable documentary or other evidential material in her/his possession. The editor should not, in a cavalier fashion, without the application of mind, append such note, as: "We stand by our story". It must be remembered that the liberty to append an editorial comment to a rejoinder or reply is not absolute right. It is a concession which has to be availed of sparingly with due discretion and caution in appropriate cases. However, where the reply/contradiction or rejoinder is being published in compliance with the direction of the Press Council, it is permissible to append a brief editorial note to that effect.

In Europe there have been proposals to enshrine the principle in law that there is a legally enforceable right of reply that applies to all media, including newspapers, magazines, and other print media, along with radio, television, and the internet. Article 1 of the Council of Europe's draft recommendation Recital 8 *"proposes that a legally enforceable right of reply should apply to all media, including newspapers, magazines and other print media, radio, television and Internet.*" It also proposes *a right of reply "offering a possibility to react to any information in the media presenting inaccurate facts...which affect...personal rights".* In Europe in Austria, Denmark, France, Germany, Finland, The Netherlands, Norway, Spain and Sweden the right of reply is a statutory right, while in Greece it is a constitutional right.

The Sean McBride Commission, a Commission set up by the UNESCO to ensure a better flow of news suggested, "It must be recognised that communication is a personal right belonging to all individuals, not only journalists and governments, not only those who

exercise political and economic power." The right to reply is a part of the right to know in the same way as the latter is a part of the right to free expression. The media`s right to know is linked to its duty to inform. If they fail to do it, the citizen will have to have the right to do it in the form of a reply or rejoinder. In Australian politics, the Opposition party in Federal Parliament is given the formal right of reply to respond to the government's budget. Two nights after the budget is presented by the Treasurer of Australia on live television, the Leader of the Opposition delivers a reply speech in Parliament that is also broadcast on live TV.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What is 'Ethics'?

Q 2: What are the most universally accepted common principles of Code of Conduct of Journalism?

Q 3: What is Journalistic objectivity?

Q 4: Some newspapers are found of lifting news from other newspapers and publishing them subsequently as their own – what is this practice called?

Q 5: "It is your right to defend yourself against criticism about you" which is published in a newspaper. This right may be termed as?

8.6 LET US SUM UP

- Freedom of Press or Media Freedom is the immunity of the communications media – including newspapers, books, periodicals, radio, television, and Internet – from government control or censorship.
- Media Freedom is a guarantee by a government to the media or press for its citizens and their associations, extended to members of news-gathering organizations and journalists, and their published reporting.
- In many countries there are constitutional or statutory protections pertaining to media freedom or freedom of the press. Media freedom does not have the same meaning everywhere in the world.
- The principle of freedom of the press (or Media Freedom) as a constraint on government actions against the press can differ from the amount of freedom of the press actually exercises at a given time.
- The need for controlling the Press, apart from any Emergency, arises out of this danger of the freedom of the Press being abused. Freedom of the Press is not a freedom from responsibility for its exercise.
- Ethical behaviour elevates the practice of journalism. Journalism has an ethical goal – the communication of truth and facts.
- Media ethics is the subdivision of applied ethics dealing with the specific ethical principles and standards of media, including broadcast media, film, theatre, the arts, print media and the internet.
- Ethics are norms for conduct that distinguish between or acceptable and

unacceptable behavior. While the various existing codes of conduct of journalism different organisations adopt have some differences, most share some common elements which include the principles of — truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, impartiality, dignity, fairness, public accountability and humanity.

- But there is a perennial concern that the standards of media ethics are being ignored.
- 'Plagiarism' is essentially the unacknowledged use of another person's work, usually by one person acting independently. It is a form of copying without acknowledgement of the work of others – published or unpublished, either verbatim or in close paraphrase, including material downloaded from computer files and the Internet.
- In journalism, plagiarism is considered a breach of journalistic ethics, and reporters caught plagiarising typically face disciplinary measures ranging from suspension to termination. Plagiarism is not copyright infringement. While both terms may apply to a particular act, they bear different meanings in law.
- The 'Right of Reply' is right of an individual to reply to misleading or inaccurate publications about him. The right of reply is the right to defend oneself against criticism. It means a person must be given the opportunity to respond to any allegations made against them in a publication.

8.7 FURTHER READING

- P. K. Ravindran: *Preess Law and Ethics of Journalism*
- Vir Bala Aggarwal : *Essentials of Practical Journalism*
- T. Rajshekhar: *Journalism – Ethics and Objectives*
- Raymond Wacks: *Privacy and Press Freedom*

8.8 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No. 1: Ethics is the study of what is good for an individual as also for the society at large. The concept of ethics was formulated by the Greeks. Ethics refers to the value system by which a person determines what is right or wrong, fair or unfair, just or unjust. It is expressed through moral behaviour in specific situations. The Greeks prescribed that for an individual courage, morality and correct behaviour was a benchmark for morality and ethics. They also added the qualities of wisdom, justice and temperance to the list.

Ans to Q No. 2: Common elements of media ethics are truthfulness, accuracy, objectivity, impartiality, dignity, fairness, public accountability and humanity.

Ans to Q No. 3: Journalistic objectivity can refer to fairness, disinterestedness, factuality and nonpartisanship, but most often it encompasses all of these qualities. However, not many journalists would make a claim to total neutrality or impartiality.

Ans to Q No. 4: Plagiarism

Ans to Q No. 5: Right of Reply

8.9 MODEL QUESTION

Q 1: What is 'media freedom'? Why is there a need to put restraint on media freedom? Explain.

Q 2: Write a brief note on the importance of ethics for the media houses.

Q 3: What is Media Ethics? Write a note on the media code of ethics.

Q 4: What are the common principles or elements of media ethics? Write briefly on each one of them.

Q 5: Write a brief note on the compliance of the media ethics in reporting news.

Q 6: What is plagiarism? Explain plagiarism with reference to media ethics.

Q 7: What is Right of Reply? Write a note on right of reply with reference to media.

UNIT 9 : ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS: INTRINSIC WORTH OF NATURE, DEEP ECOLOGY

UNIT STRUCTURE

9.1 Learning Objectives
9.2 Introduction
9.3 Emergence of Environmental Ethics
9.4 Perspectives on Environmental Ethics
  9.4.1 Anthropocentrism
  9.4.2 Non-anthropocentrism
    9.4.2.1 Bioentrism
    9.4.2.2 Ecocentrism
  9.4.3 Criticisms
  9.4.4 Environmental Pragmatism
9.5 Let us Sum up
9.6 Further Reading
9.7 Answers to Check Your Progress
9.8 Model Questions

9.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to

- identify environmental ethics and the issues pertaining to it
- explain different perspectives related to environmental ethics
- discuss the anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric views on environmental ethics
- understand the contemporary debates on environmental ethics along with contributions from key thinkers
- Evaluate the issues in environmental ethics critically

9.2 INTRODUCTION

In this chapter, we will be discussing one of the important issues in applied ethics, namely environmental ethics. **Environmental ethics is concerned with the ethical issues pertaining to environment.** An ethical issue is that which studies whether a particular action is right or not. Here, we will be concentrating on understanding the moral rightness of the action with respect to environment.

To give an idea as to what are the concerns with respect to environment ethics– Some important questions are- Is it right to use nature as in whatever way we want to? If we are constrained to use our environment, why is it so? Does nature have a value of its own? Is it right on our part to kill and eat animals? On what basis can one justify as it differ right or wrong? These questions can be raised in order to start our discussion.

9.3 EMERGENCE OF ENVIRONMENTAL ETHICS

The etymological meaning of environment is 'surrounding'. "Environment" comes from the French term "environner", which means to encircle. The oxford English dictionary defines "environment" as "the objects or the region surrounding anything." Though there is a difference between nature and environment, within the environmental ethics discourse, the concern is oriented towards the natural environment. "Environmental ethics is the discipline in philosophy that studies the moral relationship of human beings to, and also the value and moral status of, the environment and its nonhuman contents." The concerns of environment was brought to the forefront by two important books in 1960's, one is Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring in 1962 and the other is* Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb in 1968. These two books dealt with the harmful effects of using chemical pesticides and the increasing levels of human population respectively.* Those books are not purely philosophical and had more to do with the empirical aspect of the human population and its explosion.

Lynn White in his famous article in 1967, "The historical roots of our ecological crisis", claimed that environmental problems are not purely scientific or technical and it cannot be solved purely by means of development of technology alone. He says, "what we do about ecology depends on our ideas of the man –nature relationship. More science and more technology are not going to get out us out of the present ecologic crisis until we find a new religion, or rethink our old one." White in his essay vehemently criticizes the Judeo-Christian attitude towards nature which results in the present ecological crisis. He claimed in his article, that environmental problems are more to do with our worldview and he claims that the solution to the environmental problems need to be done through a change in the worldview.

Lewis W. Moncrief, in his article "The cultural basis of our environmental crisis" (1970), argues against White's position that environmental problems are not religious in nature, rather, they are cultural. Irrespective of which religion, the environmental degradation is basically a cultural phenomenon, maybe a culture that is being charecterized by industrialism and capitalism. He says, "The force of democracy, technology, urbanization, increasing individual wealth, and an aggressive attitude towards nature seem to be directly related to the environmental crisis now being confronted in the western world."

This suggests that there cannot be a purely technological solution to environmental problems. The emergence of academic journals in the field of environmental ethics gives us a picture that ethical issues do play a part in the understanding of environmental problems and solutions. The international academic journals in environmental ethics and value study were started in the late 1970's and early 1980's. The journals *Environmental Ethics* (1979), *The Trumpeter: Journal of Ecosophy* (1983), *Environmental Values* (1992) address the concerns of environmental issues from the ethical perspective. Similarly, some academic institutions also started environmental ethics as a subject of study. J. B. Callicott started teaching *Environmental ethics* as a course in the University of Wisconsin in 1971.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What is Environmental ethics? (Answer in about 20 words)

.....

.....

Q 2: What is the etymological meaning of the word 'environment'?

.....

.....

Q 3: Who is the author of 'Silent Spring'?

.....

.....

Q 4: What do you mean by environmental degradation?

.....

.....

9.4 PERSPECTIVES ON ENVIRONMENT ETHICS

As mentioned earlier, the important issue with respect to environmental ethics is what duties we have with respect to environment and, more importantly, why do we have such duties? The discussions pertaining to answering these issues gives rise to different perspectives with respect to environment. We broadly categorize the environmental ethical discourse as either Anthropocentric or Non-anthropocentric. Biocentrism, Ecocentrism and others can be brought under one umbrella category, that is, Non-anthropocentrism.

9.4.1 Anthropocentrism

Anthropocentrism means human-centeredness. Anthropocentric approach to environmental issues takes the basis that human beings are at the centre of the environment. Anthropocentrism views that all values are related to the mankind. That is all the objects whether it is biotic or abiotic should be used for the benefit of mankind. Anthropocentrism suggests that man is the only being who can think and have rational capabilities; so all values should be related to the human being. Moral standing is confined to human beings alone and human beings are not obligated to environment as it does not have any moral standing. For example – I am not supposed to harm/kill any other human being as he or she enjoys equal rights like me, but on the other hand, a goat or a cow cannot enjoy equal rights like me and hence there is no wrong in killing a cow or goat. All objects should be used for the benefit of mankind. Anthropocentrism is a prominent philosophical position from the earlier days, at least in the prominent Western tradition. Judeo-Christian Genesis says that man is in the image of God. Man can dominate over all beings of land, water and even sky. Aristotle also says that all the biotic and non-biotic objects are for the sake of man.

LET US KNOW

Instrumental value: It is the value of objects, not as end in themselves. It is considered as extrinsic value in the sense of considering it as means of achieving something else.

For anthropocentrism, everything else in existence should be evaluated in terms of its utility for the human beings, thus taking a position of instrumental value for the nature. Invariably anthropocentrism tends to go by speciesism. The term 'Speciesism' was first coined by Richard D. Ryder in 1970 which means that humans consider themselves superior only because they are human species and others are not. Speciesism tends to favour human beings over and against other beings and nature by the virtue of merely being part of a species. Some thinkers maintain that in the realm of ethics, an undue advantage is given to human species, which cannot be justified. Except for our bias towards human species, there is no other reason to favour humans as against animals in certain situations. This position by some thinkers had led to a different perspective that can be broadly categorized as Non anthropocentrism.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 5: How can we categorize the environmental ethical discourse?

.....

.....

Q 6: Name the category under which bio-centrism, eco-centrism and others can be discussed.

.....

.....

Q 7: What is anthropocentric approach? (Answer in about 50 words)

.....

.....

9.4.2 Non Anthropocentrism

Non-anthropocentric approaches take the basis that human beings are not to be treated as the centre of environment. For the non-anthropocentric thinkers value should be given to other beings also. Our moral obligation should be extended to animals, plants, rivers and even for all living and non-living things. But, non-anthropocentrists are not a homogeneous group. Some subscribe to biocentrism while some others subscribe to ecocentrism. From the religious perspective as well, some of the ancient eastern conceptions like Jainism and Buddhism subscribe to one or the other form of non-anthropocentrism. Buddhism talks about Ahimsa; Jainism advocates a strong view of not killing any animals. Philosophically, extending moral obligation beyond the human beings is one of the most discussed issues in non- anthropocentrism. One important question is as to what is the criterion or the

basis on which it can be argued that man can extend his moral obligation beyond human beings? Is the moral obligation directed to other animal species or does it also include plant life as well or does it include the nature as such with its rivers and rocks and mountains, that is, the ecosystem? Even amongst the non-anthropocentrists there is difference of perception with respect to these issues.

So, the moot question is, if moral standing is extended beyond human beings, then which are all the beings or what are all the things that should also be considered for moral standing? In that case, I (human being) am not supposed to harm/kill them.

9.4.2.1 Bio centrism

Some thinkers articulated that animals have rights and our moral obligation is and should be extended to animals as well. Philosophers like Peter Singer (1946–), Tom Regan (1938–), and Gary Francione (1954–) have argued from different moral theories for the protection of animal welfare. Singer, for example, from utilitarian standpoint and Regan from rights perspective have argued for the animal liberation.

Sentient: able to see or feel the things through senses.

Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), the utilitarian philosopher puts the question regarding animals in these words "the question is not whether they can speak or think, the question is, can they suffer?" Following the utilitarian point of view Peter Singer in his book, *Animal Liberation* assigns an equal consideration of interest to animals. Singer says that animals are *sentient* beings. They can feel pleasure and pain. On the basis of *sentience*, we have to extend our moral obligation to animals. On the other hand, Tom Regan says that not merely sentience but anything which is the subject of life has to get moral support. Regan's view is important in the sense that some animals and even some human beings such as mentally retarded person, persons under coma etc. have their life but no capacity for sentience. In such cases, they deserve moral support from fellow human beings. Following Kant's deontological ethics, Regan also argues that every being should be considered as an end not as a means.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 8: What is non-anthropocentrism? (Answer in about 50 words)

.....

.....

Q 9: Who says- "All the biotic and non-biotic objects are for the same man"

.....

.....

Q10: Who for the first time involves the term 'ecosophy?'

.....

.....

9.4.2.2 Eco centrism

While some non anthropocentrists argue for animal liberation, some other thinkers like Aldo Leopald (1887-1948), Arne Naess (1912-2009) argue against the *unnecessary* intervention with respect to nature. They extend the moral obligation beyond the human beings and animals to the entire eco-system that may include the living and the non-living. Leopold comes up with the notion of 'land ethics'. In order to keep a balance in ecology such type of land ethics is essential. Land should not be merely considered as commodity, but, according to him, it is also a community. Leopold acknowledges the evolutionary changes that have happened in nature and tries to argue that man-made changes are of different order from the evolutionary changes as man-made changes are prone to be more violent because of population density.

Arne Naess (1912-2009), the Norwegian philosopher advocates a holistic approach to the nature. He termed his philosophy as Ecosophy. Everything has its own value of it. **Naess makes a distinction between 'shallow' and 'deep' ecology. He makes the distinction on the criteria that valuing the object without self-realization is shallow ecology. In this sort of value, the value that is assigned is only an instrumental value. As against the shallow ecology, is the 'deep ecology', where the nature is valued with self-realization.** Here, the value of nature is not because of its instrumental value, but it has its intrinsic worth. According to Naess, it is the deep ecology with self –realization that actually helps us to preserve our different ecological aspects of nature. Naess, along with another person George Session, formulated eight principles for ecological development that include the admission that the human and the non-human life on earth have intrinsic values, they are values-in-themselves, and the humans have no right to reduce the richness and diversity except to satisfy their own vital needs, etc.

LET US KNOW

Ecology: It is the scientific analysis and study of interactions among organisms and environment.

9.4.3 Criticisms

While there are different perspectives such as anthropocentrism, biocentrism and ecocentrism with respect to environment and other beings each one of them is criticized either for their shortcomings or for their impractical positions. If we see anthropocentrism, it is too human centered without any obligation to any other beings except humans. This may tend to be too narrow without any moral extension, therefore, thinkers like Ryder, Singer and others have pointed out that this can be a biased perspective in favour of human species and is being denounced as speciesism. Even if the anthropocentrists are bothered about human beings alone, are they bothered only about the present generation or also bothered

about the future human generations? If they are bothered about the future human generations, then they are extending their moral worthiness that goes beyond the present generation. If we take the biocentrists, though they talk of moral worthiness beyond human species, yet they restrict the moral obligation only to those animal species that have the capability of experiencing pain, according to Singer. Those beings that have sentience, the capacity to experience pain, are worthy of moral considerations. This suggests that we should not harm/kill animals like goat or cow or hen. In a sense, these theories subscribe for vegetarianism. Suppose, you have lots of problems with rats in your home, then, are you not supposed to kill them by setting a trap? If they have moral standing, then, can we do that? The biocentrists may come up with an answer maintaining that for necessity we can kill them, but not for other reasons, say, for example, using leather products. But, what is necessity is also contentious. If we face problems with the biocentrists with respect to practicality, we also face similar and more serious problems with ecocentrists as well. How can we think of giving moral worthiness to plants and other existing entities like mountains and rivers? What does it mean to say that they have rights?

This raises a serious issue with respect to environmental ethics as to what course of action should we adopt regarding our environment. The different viewpoints with respect to the human's treatment of animals and their inter relationship with nature has given rise to numerous ethical problems. What is the best course of human action with respect to animals? Whether the humans are right in interfering with nature? Whether nature does really possess a value? If there is a value to the nature, what type of value it is? Is it intrinsic or instrumental? How all these issues translate to policies and development issues? Are the anthropocentric and non-anthropocentric viewpoints are contrasting? Is it possible to reconcile between these two viewpoints in order to make good decisions?

9.4.4 Environmental Pragmatism

In order to address these types of issues, environmental pragmatism as a school of thought emerged in the 1990's. Environmental pragmatism tries to address these environmental issues from the pragmatist view point. Environmental pragmatism, thus, is a new strategy to environmental thought. It argues that theoretical debates are hindering the ability of the environmental movement to forge agreement on basic policy imperatives. Bryan Norton, within the fold of anthropocentrism, makes a distinction of strong and weak anthropocentrism. While strong anthropocentric argues that humans are at the centre and only the humans possess the intrinsic value and all other things, if they possess any value, then they do have it as an instrumental value. The weak anthropocentrism might acknowledge that significantly a greater amount of intrinsic value is given to humans as compared to other beings and hence the protection of humans as against the other nonhuman beings is always justified.

The environmental pragmatists believe that the environmentalist's dilemma is primarily a dilemma in values, conceptualizations, and world views more than a dilemma regarding action and policies, and only

occasionally and tangentially does it affect those policies themselves. In this regard, Norton comes out with a theory called as 'Convergence hypotheses'. Norton views that though in the worldview, the weak-anthropocentrists and the non-anthropocentrists differ, but, in terms of choosing the policies, they come up with the same set of policies and procedures. The convergence thesis is a hypothetical conditional. It predicts that if person A is a consistent weak anthropocentric and person B is a non-anthropocentric with a consistent notion of the intrinsic value of the environment, for Norton, both A and B will end up supporting the same environmental policy position. This is only a hypothesis and there are criticisms for this hypothesis and environmental pragmatism as well. This suggests as to environmental issues are bothering and at the same time shows why they are difficult to resolve? But, still we need to make an attempt to understand the ethical issues involved in environment to try to make as much just decisions as possible.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 11: How does Naess make a distinction between 'shallow and deep ecology' (Answer in about 60 words)

.....

.....

Q 12: What is strong anthropocentrism, according to Bryan Norton? (Answer in about 30 words)

.....

.....

Q 13: What is weak anthropocentrism, according to Bryan Norton? (Answer in about 40 words)

.....

.....

ACTIVITY

What do you mean by environmental pragmatism?

.....

.....

9.5 LET US SUM UP

- Environmental ethics is concerned with the ethical issues pertaining to environment.
- The environmental ethical discourse can be explained from two perspectives: One is Anthropocentric and the other is non-anthropocentric. Biocentrism, Ecocentrism and others can be brought under one umbrella category, that is, Non-anthropocentrism.

- The etymological meaning of environment is 'surrounding'. "Environment" comes from French term "environner", which means to encircle. The oxford English dictionary defines "environment" as "the objects or the region surrounding anything." Though there is a difference between nature and environment, within the environmental ethics discourse, the concern is oriented towards the natural environment.
- Environmental ethics is the discipline in philosophy that studies the moral relationship of human beings to, and also the value and moral status of, the environment and its nonhuman contents.
- Anthropocentrism means human-centeredness. Anthropocentric approach to environmental issues takes the basis that human beings are at the centre of the environment. Anthropocentrism views that all values are related to mankind. That is all the objects whether they are biotic or abiotic should be used for the benefit of the mankind.
- Bryan Norton makes a distinction between strong and weak anthropocentrism. Strong anthropocentrism argues that humans are at the centre and only the humans possess the intrinsic value and all other things. If they possess any value, then they do have it as an instrumental value.
- Weak anthropocentrism might acknowledge that significantly a greater amount of intrinsic value is given to humans as compared to other beings and hence the protection of humans as against the other nonhuman beings is always justified.
- The environmental pragmatists believe that the environmentalist's dilemma is primarily a dilemma in values, conceptualizations, and world views more than a dilemma regarding action and policies, and only occasionally and tangentially does it affect those policies themselves. In this regard, Norton comes out with a theory called as 'Convergence hypotheses'.

9.6 FURTHER READING

1) Jamieson, Dale. *Ethics and Environment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
2) Rolston Holmes III. *Environmental Ethics*. Temple University Press, 1989

9.7 ANSWERS TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No 1: As a discipline of philosophy it is concerned with the moral relationship of human beings to the environment.

Ans to Q No 2: The etymological meaning of environment is 'surrounding'. "Environment" comes from French term "environner", which means to encircle.

Ans to Q No 3: Rachel Carson's

Ans to Q No 4: Environmental degradation implies environmental pollution caused by industrialism and capitalism.

Ans to Q No 5: We can categorize the environmental ethical discourse under two heads:
i) Anthropocentrism ii) Non-anthropocentrism

Ans to Q No 6: Non-anthropocentrism

Ans to Q No 7: Anthropocentrism means human-centeredness. Anthropocentric approach to environmental issues takes the basis that human beings are at the centre of the environment. Anthropocentrism views that all values are related to the mankind. That is, all the objects, whether biotic or abiotic, should be used for the benefit of the mankind.

Ans to Q No 8: Non-anthropocentric approaches take the basis that human beings are not to be treated as the centre of environment. For the non-anthropocentric thinkers value should be given to other beings also. Our moral obligation should be extended to animals, plants, rivers and even for all whole living and non-living things.

Ans to Q No 9: Aristotle

Ans to Q No 10: Naess

Ans to Q No 11: Naess distinguishes between 'shallow' and 'deep' ecology. He makes the distinction on the criteria that valuing the object without self-realization is shallow ecology. In this sort of value, the value that is assigned is only an instrumental value. As against the shallow ecology, is the 'deep ecology', where the nature is valued with self-realization.

Ans to Q No 12: According to Bryan Norton, strong anthropocentrism argues that humans are at the centre and possess the intrinsic value. It is considered the instrumental value.

Ans to Q No 13: Weak anthropocentrism holds that a greater amount of intrinsic value is given to humans as compared to other beings and hence the protection of humans as against the other nonhuman beings is always justified**.**

9.8 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Objective Questions

Q 1: What is environmental ethics?
Q 2: State the etymological meaning of 'environment'.
Q 3: Who is the author of *The Population Bomb?*
Q 4: What is weak anthropocentrism?
Q 5: What is strong anthropocentrism?

B) Short Questions (Answer in about 150 words)

Q 1: Write a brief note on Anthropocentrism.
Q 2: What is non-anthropocentrism? Explain briefly.
Q 3: Write briefly on the concept of biocentrism.
Q 4: Do you find any distinction between 'Shallow' and 'Deep ecology'? Briefly explain
Q 5: Distinguish between weak and strong anthropocentrism.

C) Long Questions (Answer in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: Explain the concept of Environmental pragmatism.

Q 2: Describe the concept of Eco-centrism.

Q 3: Explain critically the different perspectives with respect to environment.

Q 4: Discuss the concept of Anthropocentrism.

Q 5: What do you mean by Non-anthropocentrism? Explain.

UNIT 10: MORAL AGENCY AND NATURE

UNIT STRUCTURE

10.1 Learning Objectives
10.2 Introduction
10.3 The Meaning and Characteristics of Moral Agency
  10.3.1 Rationality and the Capacity for Moral Judgment
  10.3.2 Freedom and Volition
  10.3.3 Moral Personhood and the Self
10.4 The Scope of Moral Agency: Who or What Can Be an Agent
  10.4.1 Non-Human Animals
  10.4.2 Collective Moral Agency
  10.4.3 Artificial Moral Agents
10.5 Nature as A Realm Beyond and Within Moral Agency
  10.5.1 Nature as the “Other”: The Non-Agent
  10.5.2 Nature as a Moral Source: Should We “Follow Nature”?
  10.5.3 The Agency of Nature: An Expanding Moral Community?
10.6 Conclusion
10.7 Let us Sum Up
10.8 Further Reading
10.9 Answer to Check Your Progress
10.10 Model Questions

10.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- to know the moral agency and articulate its core components, distinguishing a moral agent from other types of agents or entities.
- to analyse the essential characteristics of moral agency, including rationality, freedom, and moral personhood.
- to explain the complex and multifaceted scope of moral agency, particularly its application to non-human animals, collectives, and artificial entities.
- to explain the philosophical relationship between moral agency and the concept of nature, including the debate over nature as a moral source and the idea of nature’s own agency.
- to explain the contributions of key philosophers such as Jonathan Edwards and Immanuel Kant to our understanding of moral agency.

10.2 INTRODUCTION

What does it mean to be a moral being? At the heart of ethical philosophy lies the concept of the “moral agent”. This is not merely a being that acts, but one whose actions are eligible for moral evaluation and they can be judged as right or wrong, virtuous or

vicious, praiseworthy or blameworthy. The study of moral agency is the study of the necessary conditions for morality itself to exist. As the 18th-century theologian and philosopher Jonathan Edwards provided one of the classic definitions, a moral agent is "a being that is capable of those actions that have a moral quality, and which can properly be denominated good or evil in a moral sense". This capacity, Edwards argued, requires a "moral faculty, or sense of moral good and evil," and the ability to be influenced by moral inducements presented to the understanding.

This unit explores the meaning, scope, and characteristics of moral agency, culminating in an examination of its complex relationship with "nature." We will investigate not only what it means to be a human moral agent but also whether this status can be extended to other entitiesfrom animals and ecosystems to artificial intelligences. This inquiry forces us to confront profound questions about rationality, freedom, responsibility, and our place within the natural world. Is nature a stage upon which moral agents act, a source of moral guidance, or perhaps even an agent itself?

10.3 THE MEANING AND CHARACTERISTICS OF MORAL AGENCY

To understand moral agency, we must first distinguish it from simple agency. A stone is not an agent at all; it reacts to physical forces but does not act. A sunflower is a biological agent; it grows and turns toward the light, but it does so by instinct and mechanical process, not by choice. A moral agent, however, acts from a more complex internal structure. While different philosophical traditions emphasize different aspects, several core characteristics are widely recognized as constitutive of moral agency.

10.3.1 Rationality and the Capacity for Moral Judgment

The most fundamental characteristic of a moral agent is rationality. This does not simply mean the ability to perform logical deductions, but the capacity to grasp and be motivated by moral reasons. The moral agent can understand concepts like "ought," "duty," "right," and "good." They can reflect on their own desires and impulses and choose whether or not to act on them based on moral principles. Edwards emphasized that a moral agent must be capable of being influenced by "moral inducements or motives, exhibited to the view of understanding and reason". A fire that destroys a city is harmful, but it is not a moral agent because its "action" is devoid of reason or intent. Similarly, brute creatures, acting from instinct, do not qualify as moral agents in the full sense, as they lack a "capacity of reasoning and reflecting". The "Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy" reinforces this, noting that a moral agent must be "capable of conforming to at least some of the demands of morality," a capacity that inherently requires a level of cognitive sophistication.

10.3.2 Freedom and Volition

For an action to be morally evaluable, it must be freely chosen. If an agent's behaviour is completely determined by external forces or internal compulsions

they cannot control, it seems unjust to hold them morally responsible for it. This is the classic philosophical problem of free will versus determinism. Moral agency presupposes a degree of autonomy—the ability to be the source of one's own actions.

"Immanuel Kant" provided one of the most influential accounts of this freedom. He argued that as beings in the world of experience (the phenomenal world), our actions are part of a causal chain. However, as moral agents, we must view ourselves as belonging to an intelligible world (the noumenal world) where we are free to act according to laws, we give ourselvesthe laws of reason. For Kant, this freedom is not something we can prove empirically, but it is a necessary presupposition of morality itself. We must act "under the idea" of freedom. This is why, for Kant, the moral law is not a description of how we 'do' behave (like a law of nature) but a prescription for how we 'ought' to behave, a command of reason that we are free to obey or disobey.

10.3.3 Moral Personhood and the Self

Moral agency is closely tied to the concept of personhood. A moral agent is typically understood to be a "person"an entity with a coherent self, a sense of identity over time, and a conception of its own good. This is what distinguishes the moral responsibility of a human adult from that of, say, a very young child or an animal, who may be agents in a limited sense but are not yet (or not at all) full moral persons. They are often considered "moral patients" entities who are due moral consideration from agents, even if they are not agents themselves. The agent has an inner life, capable of experiencing emotions like remorse, empathy, and concern for others, which are crucial for full participation in a moral community. This sense of self allows for what the philosopher Harry Frankfurt called "second-order desires"the ability to reflect on and evaluate our own desires. For instance, a person might have a first-order desire to smoke but a second-order desire to 'not' want that desire. This capacity for self-reflection and self-modification is central to moral agency.

10.4 THE SCOPE OF MORAL AGENCY: WHO OR WHAT CAN BE AN AGENT?

While the paradigmatic moral agent is a rational, adult human being, the boundaries of this category are deeply contested. The question of scope asks us to consider which entities qualify for membership in the moral community as agents, rather than merely as patients.

10.4.1 Non-Human Animals

Whether non-human animals can be moral agents is a hotly debated topic. Those who argue in favour point to strong evidence of complex social structures, empathy, cooperation, and even the punishment of norm-breakers in species like primates, dolphins, and canines. They suggest that moral agency might be a matter of degree, with different species exhibiting different "levels" of agency based

on their social and emotional capacities. If morality is rooted in empathy and social relations, then these animals may indeed be rudimentary moral agents.

Opponents, however, argue that these behaviours, while complex, are still fundamentally different from human morality. They contend that true moral agency requires abstract reasoning, the ability to employ complex language, and the capacity to act on universalizable principles, not just ingrained social instincts. A chimpanzee may console a loser in a fight, but does it do so because it grasps the concept of "compassion as a duty," or because of a more immediate empathetic impulse? For Kantians, this distinction is crucial. The animal may act in accordance with duty, but not *for the sake of* duty, which is the hallmark of a moral agent.

10.4.2 Collective Moral Agency

Can a corporation, a government, or a mob be considered a moral agent? This question has immense practical importance for assigning responsibility. **Collective moral agency** suggests that some groups have decision-making structures, goals, and the capacity to act that are not simply reducible to the individuals within them. A corporation can pollute a river, and the action is the result of a corporate policy, not just a rogue employee's decision. In such cases, it seems appropriate to hold the corporation itself morally and legally accountable.

Critics, however, adhering to a more stringent, Kantian sense of agency, argue that collectives lack a unified conscience, the capacity for remorse, or an inner life. They are, in this view, fictions that serve to obscure the responsibility of the flesh-and-blood individuals who make decisions within them. The debate often hinges on whether the group's internal structure is robust enough to produce a genuine "corporate intention" that is distinct from the sum of individual intentions.

10.4.3 Artificial Moral Agents

As technology advances, the question of **artificial moral agency** moves from science fiction to engineering reality. If we create an autonomous system, like a self-driving car or an AI-powered medical diagnostic tool, that can make decisions with significant moral consequences, should it be considered a moral agent? The discussion has several layers:

1. Possibility: Is it even theoretically possible for an artificial system to possess the necessary qualities for moral agency, such as consciousness, understanding, and free will?
2. Construction: Regardless of possibility, should we 'try' to build machines that are genuine moral agents, capable of being held responsible for their actions, or is that an abdication of human responsibility?
3. Perception: Research shows that humans do tend to perceive robots as having a degree of moral agency, often judging their actions similarly to human actions, though they are less likely to give robots "credit" for good deeds and require them to be more consistent to earn trust.

10.5 NATURE AS A REALM BEYOND AND WITHIN MORAL AGENCY

The relationship between "moral agency" and "nature" is multifaceted, encompassing at least three distinct philosophical inquiries.

10.5.1 Nature as the "Other": The Non-Agent

In the traditional view exemplified by Edwards, nature is the very definition of what is 'not' a moral agent. The sun, a river, a mountainthese are powerful and sometimes beneficial or destructive, but they lack reason, will, and moral sense. They are not subjects of moral evaluation for their own actions. You cannot blame the river for flooding, though you might hold a moral agent responsible for building a city in its floodplain. In this sense, "nature" represents the realm of causal necessity against which moral freedom is defined. This echoes Kant's distinction: nature operates according to laws of physical necessity ("laws according to which everything 'does' happen"), while morality operates according to laws of freedom ("laws according to which everything 'ought' to happen").

10.5.2 Nature as a Moral Source: Should We "Follow Nature"?

A second major inquiry asks whether nature can serve as a guide for human moral agents. The idea that we should "follow nature" is ancient and persistent. This raises a fundamental paradox, however, often explored in environmental sociology:

i. To be able to follow nature, humans must be in some way separate from it. The command only makes sense if we have a choice to do otherwise.

ii. But for nature to be a relevant source of values for us, we must also be 'a part' of it. If we are wholly separate, why should its ways matter to us?

If we are completely part of nature, the command to follow it becomes superfluousas natural beings, everything we do is, by definition, natural. Philosophers and cultures have grappled with this contradiction for millennia. Some, like the Stoics or Taoists, see the rational order of nature as a model for human conduct. Others argue that "nature" is a 'social construction', and our appeals to it often unconsciously reflect our own social interests and biases. For instance, the 19th-century theory of social Darwinism used a selective reading of natural selection (the "survival of the fittest") to justify laissez-faire capitalism and social inequality. In this view, when we say "follow nature," we are often just projecting our own values onto the natural world and then using its perceived authority to validate them.

10.5.3 The Agency of Nature: An Expanding Moral Community?

The most radical inquiry challenges the foundational assumption that agency is a purely human (or human-like) property. Emerging fields like environmental ethics and actor-network theory ask whether nature itself might possess a form of agency.

One approach reframes humans not as "masters" of nature but as its stewards. In this view, human moral agents have a profound responsibility toward the natural world. As one analysis of environmental ethicist Holmes Rolston III's work suggests, the human as moral agent is not a representative for nature, but an actor with a direct duty to it . Our agency is fulfilled in recognizing and protecting the intrinsic value of ecosystems and their inhabitants.

A more radical step is to attribute agency directly to nature itself. This idea is present in many indigenous worldviews, which often see natural entities like rivers, mountains, or the Earth as living beings with intentions and personhood. Fascinatingly, this concept is being explored in contemporary psychology. Recent research suggests that when people are prompted to view the Earth as an agent—either as a living organism or as a thoughtful person, they exhibit significantly greater moral concern for the environment and adopt more biocentric attitudes (valuing nature for its own sake). This implies that the way we perceive agency in nature has a causal impact on our moral behaviour toward it. While science may not confirm that the Earth is an agent in the same way a human is, the study suggests that "vitalist" attributions of life to the Earth can be a powerful tool for mobilizing conservationist attitudes. This opens up a new dimension in the scope of moral agency: not just what is an agent, but what we perceive as an agent, and how that perception shapes our own moral lives as agents embedded within the natural world.

10.6 CONCLUSION

The exploration of moral agency undertaken in this unit reveals a concept that is at once foundational to ethics and profoundly dynamic in its implications. Beginning with Jonathan Edwards' classic definition, we established that a moral agent is not merely any being that act, but one whose actions are eligible for moral evaluation, a being capable of understanding and being motivated by moral reasons. The core characteristics of rationality, freedom, and moral personhood emerged as the essential pillars upon which the entire edifice of moral responsibility rests. Rationality provides the capacity to grasp moral principles; freedom ensures that actions are authentically one's own and therefore eligible for praise or blame; and personhood supplies the coherent self-capable of reflection, commitment, and participation in a moral community. Yet, as we have seen, the boundaries of this moral community are far from settled. The scope of moral agency is a vibrant and contested frontier, continually reshaped by new knowledge and emerging technologies. The question of non-human animals challenges us to reconsider whether sophisticated social behaviours and evident empathy might constitute a form of rudimentary moral agency, or whether true agency requires the abstract reasoning and principled deliberation that, for now, remains uniquely human. Similarly, the reality of collective action forces us to grapple with whether corporations and governments can be genuine moral agents, bearing responsibility for systemic harms that transcend individual intentions. And the rapid advancement of artificial intelligence presents perhaps the most urgent frontier: if we create machines capable of autonomous decision-making with moral consequences,

must we also create mechanisms for their moral accountability, or does this very aspiration represent a fundamental misunderstanding of what agency requires?

The relationship between moral agency and nature adds yet another layer of complexity to this inquiry. Here we encounter three distinct but interconnected perspectives. First, nature has traditionally served as the definitive "other", the realm of causal necessity against which moral freedom is defined. The river that floods is destructive but not blameworthy, precisely because it lacks the rational will that constitutes agency. Second, nature has been invoked as a moral source, with the ancient injunction to "follow nature" carrying persistent appeal despite its inherent paradox: we must be both separate enough to choose whether to follow and connected enough for nature's ways to matter to us. The exposure of "nature" as a social construction, frequently deployed to legitimise particular human values, cautions against naive appeals to natural law while acknowledging the profound human need to locate our moral lives within a larger cosmic order.

Most radically, emerging perspectives in environmental ethics, indigenous thought, and even contemporary psychology challenge us to consider whether agency might be attributed to nature itself. The finding that perceiving the Earth as a living agent increases moral concern for the environment suggests that our frameworks for understanding agency are not merely descriptive but deeply performativeand they shape how we act in and toward the world. Whether we ultimately affirm that ecosystems possess agency in any literal sense, the recognition that our perception of natural agency influences our moral behaviour toward the environment carries profound implications for how we conceptualize our responsibilities.

Ultimately, this unit demonstrates that moral agency is not a fixed category but an evolving concept that reflects our deepest understandings of what it means to be human, how we relate to other beings, and where we locate ourselves within the natural order. The study of moral agency is thus inseparable from the study of ourselves, our capacities, our limitations, and our ongoing negotiation of the boundaries between freedom and necessity, reason and instinct, the human and the natural. As we continue to encounter new beings, animal, collective, artificial, and natural, that challenge our established frameworks, the question of who or what counts as a moral agent will remain central to ethical philosophy, forcing us to continually refine our understanding of responsibility, community, and the moral dimensions of existence itself.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: According to Jonathan Edwards, what are the two essential requirements for a being to be considered a moral agent?

.....

.....

Q 2: What is the key difference between a simple biological agent, like a sunflower, and a moral agent?

.....

.....

Q 3: Beyond logical deduction, what specific capacity does rationality entail for a moral agent?

.....

.....

Q 4: Explain Immanuel Kant's distinction between the "phenomenal world" and the "noumenal world" in the context of moral freedom.

.....

.....

Q 5: What are "second-order desires," as conceptualized by philosopher Harry Frankfurt, and why are they central to moral agency?

.....

.....

Q 6: What is the crucial difference between a "moral agent" and a "moral patient"?

.....

.....

Q 7: In the debate over non-human animal agency, what is the main argument Kantians use to deny animals the status of full moral agents?

.....

.....

Q 8: What is the central point of contention in the debate over collective moral agency regarding "corporate intention"?

.....

.....

Q 9: List the three main layers of discussion surrounding the creation of Artificial Moral Agents.

.....

.....

Q 10: Explain the fundamental paradox inherent in the ancient injunction to "follow nature."

.....

.....

Q 11: How did 19th-century social Darwinism serve as an example of "nature" being used as a social construction?

.....

.....

Q 12: According to the unit, how does perceiving the Earth as an agent (e.g., as a living organism) impact human moral behaviour toward the environment?

.....

.....

10.7 LET US SUM UP

- A moral agent is a being whose actions are eligible for moral evaluation, requiring the capacity to understand and be motivated by moral reasons rather than mere instinct.

- The three essential pillars of moral agency are rationality (grasping concepts like "ought"), freedom (autonomous choice), and moral personhood (a coherent sense of self).
- True moral agency requires the ability to reflect on one's own desires and choose whether to act on them based on moral principles.
- While adult humans are the paradigmatic moral agents, the boundaries of this category are deeply contested regarding animals, collectives, and artificial intelligences.
- The debate over non-human animals asks whether sophisticated social behaviours and empathy constitute rudimentary agency, or whether true agency requires abstract reasoning and principled deliberation.
- Collective moral agency suggests that groups like corporations can have decision-making structures that generate intentions distinct from the individuals within them.
- The development of autonomous AI forces us to question whether machines could ever possess the consciousness and understanding necessary for genuine moral responsibility.
- Traditionally, nature has been viewed as the definitive "non-agent", a realm of causal necessity against which moral freedom is defined.
- The ancient injunction to "follow nature" contains a fundamental paradox: humans must be both separate enough to choose whether to follow, and connected enough for nature's ways to matter.
- Appeals to "nature" as a moral guide often involve social construction, projecting human values onto the natural world and using its perceived authority to validate them.
- Emerging perspectives in environmental ethics and indigenous worldviews challenge human-exclusive agency, suggesting natural entities like rivers or the Earth may possess a form of personhood.
- Research indicates that when humans perceive the Earth as a living agent, they exhibit significantly greater moral concern for the environment.
- Our frameworks for understanding agency are not merely descriptive but performative and they shape how we actually behave toward the world.
- Moral agency is ultimately not a fixed category but an evolving concept that reflects our deepest understandings of responsibility, community, and humanity's place within the natural order.

10.8 FURTHER READING

1. Edwards, J. (1754/2004). *The freedom of the will*. Yale University Press.
2. Kant, I. (1997). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)
3. Frankfurt, H. G. (1971). Freedom of the will and the concept of a person. *The Journal of Philosophy, 68*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.2307/2024717
4. Rolston, H., III. (1988). *Environmental ethics: Duties to and values in the natural world*. Temple University Press.

5. Craig, E. (1998). Moral agency. In E. Craig (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of philosophy*. Routledge.

10.9 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q 1: According to Jonathan Edwards, a moral agent requires a "moral faculty, or sense of moral good and evil," and the ability to be influenced by moral inducements presented to the understanding.

Ans to Q 2: A sunflower, as a biological agent, acts by instinct and mechanical process without choice. A moral agent, in contrast, acts from a more complex internal structure involving rationality, freedom, and the capacity for moral judgment.

Ans to Q 3: Beyond logical deduction, rationality for a moral agent entails the capacity to grasp and be motivated by moral reasons. This includes the ability to understand concepts like "ought," "duty," "right," and "good," and to reflect on desires and impulses based on moral principles.

Ans to Q 4: Kant argued that as beings in the world of experience (the phenomenal world), our actions are part of a causal chain and determined by natural laws. However, as moral agents, we must view ourselves as belonging to an intelligible world (the **noumenal world**) where we are free to act according to the laws of reason, we give ourselves. This freedom is a necessary presupposition of morality.

Ans to Q 5: "Second-order desires" are the ability to reflect on and evaluate our own first-order desires. For example, having a desire to smoke (first-order) and simultaneously desiring not to want that desire (second-order). This capacity for self-reflection and self-modification is central to moral agency.

Ans to Q 6: A moral agent is an entity whose actions are eligible for moral evaluation (praiseworthy or blameworthy). A moral patient is an entity that is due moral consideration from agents, even if they are not agents themselves (e.g., a very young child or an animal).

Ans to Q 7: Kantians argue that while an animal may act in accordance with duty (e.g., showing empathy), it does not act *for the sake of* duty. True moral agency requires acting on universalizable principles and abstract reasoning, not just ingrained social instincts.

Ans to Q 8: The central point of contention is whether a group's internal structure is robust enough to produce a genuine "corporate intention" that is distinct from the sum of individual intentions, or if "collective agency" is a fiction that obscures the responsibility of the individuals within the group.

Ans to Q 9: The three main layers of discussion are:

1. Possibility: Is it theoretically possible for an artificial system to possess consciousness, understanding, and free will?
2. Construction: Should we try to build machines that are genuine moral agents, or is that an abdication of human responsibility?

3. Perception: How do humans perceive and judge the actions of robots, and to what extent do we grant them moral agency?

Ans to Q 10: The paradox is that to be able to "follow nature," humans must be in some way separate from it (to have a choice). However, for nature to be a relevant source of values for us, we must also be a part of it. If we are completely part of nature, the command becomes superfluous, as everything we do would be natural by definition.

Ans to Q 11: Social Darwinism used a selective reading of natural selection ("survival of the fittest") to justify laissez-faire capitalism and social inequality. This is an example of projecting human social values onto nature and then using nature's perceived authority to validate those values.

Ans to Q 12: The unit states that when people are prompted to view the Earth as an agent, either as a living organism or as a thoughtful person and they exhibit significantly greater moral concern for the environment and adopt more biocentric attitudes (valuing nature for its own sake).

10.10 MODEL QESTIONS

A. Very Short Questions

Q 1: Who provided the classic 18th-century definition of a moral agent mentioned in the text?

Q 2: According to the text, what are the three core characteristics constitutive of moral agency?

Q 3: What term does the text use for entities that are due moral consideration from agents but are not agents themselves?

Q 4: Which philosopher is credited with the concept of "second-order desires"?

Q 5: What are the three entities discussed in the text as potential candidates for extending moral agency beyond humans?

Q 5: According to the text, what is the fundamental paradox inherent in the command to "follow nature"?

B. Short Questions (150-200 words)

Q 1: Differentiate between simple agency and moral agency as outlined in the text.

Q 2: Explain Immanuel Kant's contribution to the concept of freedom in moral agency.

Q 3: What are "moral patients" and how do they differ from moral agents?

Q 4: Summarize the debate regarding non-human animals as moral agents.

Q 5: What is collective moral agency and what are the main arguments against it?

Q 6: Explain the three layers of discussion surrounding Artificial Moral Agents.

Q 7: How does the text characterize the relationship between nature and moral agency in three distinct ways?

C. Long Questions (300-400 words)

Q 1: Analyse the three core characteristics of moral agency and rationality, freedom, and personhood and as presented in the text. Explain how they are interconnected and why each is considered necessary for an entity to be a full moral agent.

Q 2: Critically examine the debate surrounding the extension of moral agency to non-human animals. What are the strongest arguments for and against this proposition, and what is at stake in this debate?

Q 3: Discuss the concept of "nature" in relation to moral agency as presented in the text. Address its role as the non-agent, as a source of moral guidance, and as a potential agent itself.

Q 4: Analyse the concept of "second-order desires" as introduced by Harry Frankfurt. Why is this capacity for self-reflection considered central to moral agency and personhood?

UNIT 11 : NATURE AS THE EXPRESSION OF THE SUBLIMITY

UNIT STRUCTURE

11.1 Learning Objectives
11.2 Introduction
11.3 Ancient Philosophy: The Rhetorical Origins of the Sublime
11.4 The Eighteenth Century: Theorizing the Natural Sublime
  11.4.1 Edmund Burke: The Terrible Sublime
  11.4.2 Immanuel Kant: The Cognitive and Moral Sublime
  11.4.3 The Natural Sublime in Practice
11.5 The Romantic Period: The Sublime as Transcendental Experience
  11.5.1 Wordsworth: The Sublime and the Self
  11.5.2 Turner and Constable: The Sublime in Paint
11.6 Victor Hugo: The Synthesis of the Sublime and the Grotesque
11.7 Post-Romantic and Twentieth-Century Perspectives: The Fragmented Sublime
  11.7.1 The Technological Sublime
  11.7.2 The Environmental Sublime and Ecological Melancholy
  11.7.3 The Recovery of Wonder
11.8 Conclusion
11.9 Let Us Sum Up
11.10 Further Reading
11.11 Answer to Check Your Progress
11,12 Model Questions

11.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- know the origins of the concept of the sublime in nature from its roots in ancient philosophy, particularly the treatise ‘On the Sublime’ by Longinus.
- explain how eighteenth-century philosophers redefined the sublime as an emotional experience of awe and terror evoked by nature’s vast and powerful forces.
- analyse the central role of nature and the sublime in Romantic literature and art, as a means of exploring individual emotion, imagination, and the transcendental.
- evaluate Victor Hugo’s unique contribution to the aesthetic of the sublime, particularly his theory of the “grotesque” and its integration with the sublime to create a “total” aesthetic.
- to know how to assess how post-Romantic and twentieth-century perspectives reconfigured, questioned, and, in some cases, sought to recover the experience of the natural sublime in a modern context.

11.2 INTRODUCTION

The relationship between humanity and the natural world has been a central theme in cultural history, but perhaps nowhere is it more dramatically explored than in the aesthetic

concept of the "sublime." Unlike the merely beautiful, which pleases the eye with harmony and proportion, the sublime is an experience of overwhelming power, vastness, and obscurity that defies easy comprehension. It is an encounter with nature that can evoke terror, awe, and a profound sense of human limitation, yet simultaneously lead to a thrilling elevation of the mind and spirit. This unit traces the evolution of this powerful idea, following its journey from its classical origins through its flourishing in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, and into its complex legacy in the modern era.

The concept of the sublime involves the inherent conflict which comes from an appreciation of beauty with a feeling of awe, astonishment, and incomprehension of the eternal. Philosophers discussed this conflict and suggested that our aim should be the harmonious blending of reason with emotion. As we shall see, the sublime became an element of the great shift during the Enlightenment which saw reason come to replace religion as the dominant driving intellectual force, even as it preserved a space for profound emotional and intuitive response. By tracing the trajectory of the sublime from ancient rhetoric through Enlightenment philosophy, Romantic art, and into its postmodern fragmentation, this unit will illuminate how this concept has served as a barometer for humanity's ever-shifting understanding of itself and its place within the cosmos.

11.3 ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY: THE RHETORICAL ORIGINS OF THE SUBLIME

Our exploration of the sublime begins not with rugged mountains or stormy seas, but with the power of language. The foundational text for all subsequent theories of the sublime is 'Peri Hypsous' (On the Sublime), a Greek treatise from the first century CE, long attributed to the rhetorician Longinus. Rediscovered and translated into French by Nicolas Boileau in 1674, this work ignited a fascination with the sublime that would sweep through European intellectual circles.

For Longinus, the sublime (hypsos) was a quality of discourseof great writing and oratory. It is "that quality which gives a distinctive power to works of art and literature; it rests primarily on grandeur of ideas and the capacity for strong emotion, supplemented by certain features of rhetoric; sublimity is the echo of a noble mind and a passionate heart". The goal of the sublime in literature was to transport the audience, to overwhelm them not with logic but with passionate intensity.

A crucial concept introduced by Longinus is that of energeia, vividness or visual immediacy in description. However, scholarly analysis reveals that Longinus developed a distinct form of this concept, which we might term 'enargeia II'. The conventional sense of 'enargeia' involves presenting a vivid picture for the audience to apprehend as spectators at a distance. Longinus's version, however, "collapses distance between subject and object, in effect subjectifying the experience, since we obviously are being called upon to identify ourselves with the poet in participating similarly (or rather identically) in the described experience". This shift from a cool, distanced aesthetic to a "heated aesthetic based on fusion, or empathy" marks a revolutionary moment. Longinus praises passages where "the soul of the writer enters the chariot at the same moment as Phaeton and shares in his dangers". This emotionalist approach, which prioritises the intensity of feeling over

mimetic accuracy, laid the groundwork for later theories that would locate the sublime not in the object itself, but in the mind's response to it.

Although Longinus focused on rhetoric and poetry, he did not ignore nature entirely. He noted how impressive natural features and phenomena, wide plains, rugged mountains, powerful rivers, can bring out in most people a pleasure at beholding them and a clearer sense of and proximity to the divine. In the "fabulous" poetic power he encourages, we see the seeds of a tradition that would free artists from the mere reproduction of images and allow them to pursue the "marvellous" over the merely "credible". This ancient emphasis on emotional transport and the power of language to evoke the transcendent would prove essential to the eighteenth-century philosophers who began to apply these ideas directly to the natural world.

11.4 THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY: THEORISING THE NATURAL SUBLIME

The eighteenth century represents a pivotal moment when the sublime was systematically theorized in relation to the natural world. This period, conventionally thought of as the epoch of Enlightenment reason, paradoxically saw a profound interest in darkness, obscurity, and terror. The eighteenth-century desire to delve into aesthetic classification re-illuminated Longinus's ancient text, sparking a new wave of philosophical inquiry.

11.4.1 Edmund Burke: The Terrible Sublime

The most influential early theorist of the natural sublime was the Irish-born philosopher and statesman Edmund Burke. In his 1757 treatise, 'A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful', Burke sought to provide an empirical explanation for the sublime, separating it definitively from the beautiful. He explored "the nature of 'negative' pleasures, that is, irrational and mixed feelings of pleasure and pain, of attraction and terror".

Burke located the sources of the sublime in qualities that evoke ideas of pain and danger without actually causing physical harm. These include "obscurity, power, vacuity, darkness, solitude, silence and vastness". For Burke, whatever is "terrible, or is conversant about terrible objects, or operates in a manner analogous to terror, is a source of the sublime; that is, it is productive of the strongest emotions which the mind is capable of feeling". The sublime, therefore, is not about the pleasant appreciation of harmony (which defines beauty) but about a complex, thrilling experience of awe mixed with terror. He provides the example of a starry sky: "The apparent disorder augments the grandeur... the stars lie in such apparent confusion, as makes it impossible on ordinary occasions to reckon them. This gives them the advantage of a sort of infinity".

Significantly, Burke's work marked a romantic turn away from the eighteenth-century aesthetic of clarity and order, favouring instead "the imaginative power of the unbounded and infinite, and the unstated and unknown". He insisted that emotion and intuition had a place alongside reason in the human experience of the world.

11.4.2 Immanuel Kant: The Cognitive and Moral Sublime

The German philosopher Immanuel Kant further developed the concept, shifting the focus from the qualities of the object to the cognitive processes of the subject. In his 'Observations on the Feeling of the Beautiful and Sublime' (1764) and more fully in the 'Critique of Judgment' (1790), Kant presented the sublime as a matter of intuition and subjective experience. He distinguished between the "mathematical sublime" (related to vastness and magnitude that overwhelms the imagination) and the "dynamical sublime" (related to nature's immense power, like storms or volcanoes).

Kant argued that by using our minds to comprehend the immensity of nature's power, we discover a faculty within ourselves that is superior to nature itself. The sublime "raises the soul above the height of vulgar commonplace". Because the mind is superior to all physical things, the sublime must really be found in the non-physical realm of human reason and morality. It is the human reaction to the physically impressive, the exercise and mastery of ourselves as moral beings. This Kantian orientation towards the dynamics of cognitive process would profoundly influence the Romantic generation.

11.4.3 The Natural Sublime in Practice

This theoretical interest in the sublime manifested in the arts and letters of the period. In poetry, James Thomson's 'The Seasons' evoked terror before the sizable and destructive forces of nature. The Graveyard Poets, such as Robert Blair and Edward Young, explored the sublime through the themes of death and mortality, finding in the grave a threatening yet awe-inspiring subject. Travel writers like Mary Wollstonecraft, in her 'Letters Written During a Short Residence in Sweden, Norway, and Denmark' (1796), provided first-hand accounts of sublime encounters. Describing a waterfall, she wrote:

"The impetuous dashing of the rebounding torrent from the dark cavities which mocked the exploring eye, produced an equal activity in my mind: my thoughts darted from earth to heaven... Still the tumultuous emotions this sublime object excited, were pleasurable; and, viewing it, my soul rose, with renewed dignity, above its cares."

This passage perfectly captures the Burkean mixture of terror and pleasure, as well as the Kantian elevation of the soul through the exercise of the mind in response to nature's power.

11.5 THE ROMANTIC PERIOD: THE SUBLIME AS TRANSCENDENTAL EXPERIENCE

The Romantic period (roughly 1770-1850) represents the high-water mark of the natural sublime in art and literature. Building on eighteenth-century philosophy, Romantic artists and poets made the encounter with sublime nature the central arena for exploring individual emotion, imagination, and the search for the transcendental.

11.5.1 Wordsworth: The Sublime and the Self

For the English poet William Wordsworth, the sublime was not merely an occasional thrill but a foundational element of human consciousness. In his masterpiece, “Lines Composed a Few Miles Above Tintern Abbey” (1798), Wordsworth reflects on how memories of the Wye Valley landscape have sustained him in times of stress and enabled him to achieve a “blessed mood” in which “we see into the life of things”. Unlike the immediate terror of Burke’s sublime, Wordsworth’s version often involves a meditative recollection that transforms ordinary experience into a glimpse of something beyond the self.

Scholars note that “Wordsworth, however, unlike his predecessors, attempts to translate the sublime moment into the ways in which the spectator can catch a glimpse of something beyond himself”. The sublime moments in Romantic landscapes “are really not about mountains, rivers and forests. Here what the sublime spectator perceives is the enormous communion between the individual microcosm and the planetary macrocosm of Being”. This is a reciprocal phenomenon where “the physicality and in particular the body of the spectator are intermixed with what the mind forges”. The poem’s emphasis on memory and the link with nature presents nature as a source of reflection and grounding, inviting the reader to reflect on the relationship between humans and the natural world.

11.5.2 Turner and Constable: The Sublime in Paint

In the visual arts, the sublime found its greatest exponents in the English landscape painters J.M.W. Turner and John Constable. Both artists, in their different ways, portrayed “the terrible beauty of the natural world from an intimate, close-up perspective”.

Turner’s paintings often depict nature at its most violent and overwhelming, shipwrecks, avalanches, storms at sea. His use of light, colour, and swirling composition creates a sense of dynamism and dissolution of form that directly evokes the Burkean sublime of terror. The human figures in his paintings are often tiny and vulnerable, dwarfed by the immense power of the elements.

John Constable, by contrast, found the sublime in the ordinary. His masterpiece ‘The Hay Wain’ (1821) depicts a tranquil rural scene, yet it achieves a kind of sublime through its “truth to nature”. Constable’s “observation of nature reflects his dedication to the truth of representation as the feelings evoked from the painting give importance to the seemingly ordinary situation”. His vibrant greens and reds, his experienced brushstrokes creating a sense of movement, and the play of light and shadow all “inspire the sensory experience of being within the landscape”. For Constable, the intimate and the ordinary could open a doorway to the sublime, suggesting a harmony between nature and humanity that indicates awe without overstating the scene’s grandeur. This approach aligns with what some scholars have termed the “intimate sublime”.

11.6 VICTOR HUGO: THE SYNTHESIS OF THE SUBLIME AND THE GROTESQUE

The French writer Victor Hugo, a giant of nineteenth-century Romanticism, made a distinctive and influential contribution to the aesthetic of the sublime. Hugo expanded the Romantic aesthetic by developing the concept of the "grotesque" as the necessary counterpart to the sublime.

For Hugo, true artistic totality came from mingling the lofty and the grotesque, the beautiful and the terrifying, mirroring the complex and often contradictory nature of creation itself. This combination of subjects is characteristic of Hugo, who strongly wished to start a new Romantic style that would be completely different from the ideal forms slavishly imitated from the models inherited from Antiquity.

In his monumental novel 'Les Misérables', Hugo draws a parallel between "a series of sublime actions which his hero, Jean Valjean, has accomplished and grotesque, comic, ludicrous actions carried out by other antagonists". The novelist is never satisfied with simply making his heroism conspicuous; he also endeavours to present "a whole variety and a whole panel of contradictions such as the ones the human race actually shows in everyday life".

The narrative of Jean Valjean's transformation embodies this Hugolian aesthetic. As a converted hero facing the infinite, Valjean agrees to carry out the most difficult tasks entrusted to his own conscience. "His inflexible conviction and the incredible strength of his will allow Valjean to fulfil his own sublimity as he moves away from his own monstrosity". In this process, he discovers "the 'infinite' being within himself and understands the divine will that saved him from the abyss of evil".

Hugo's innovation lies in his insistence that the sublime cannot exist in isolation. It must be defined and intensified by its opposite, the grotesque. This dialectical relationship creates a more complete representation of reality, one that acknowledges both the elevated and the debased aspects of human existence. This synthesis became a hallmark of French Romanticism and influenced generations of writers and artists who sought to capture the full complexity of the human condition.

11.7 POST-ROMANTIC AND TWENTIETH-CENTURY PERSPECTIVES: THE FRAGMENTED SUBLIME

As the confident certainties of the Romantic era gave way to the anxieties of the modern and postmodern periods, the experience of the natural sublime became increasingly complex, fractured, and contested.

11.7.1 The Technological Sublime

One significant development was the displacement of the natural sublime by the "technological sublime." As industrialisation transformed landscapes and societies, the awesome power once found in mountains and oceans began to be located in machines, factories, and urban sprawls. The railway, the steamship, and later the skyscraper and the aeroplane became new sources of awe and

terror, evoking similar mixtures of fear and admiration previously reserved for nature. This shift reflects a broader cultural movement away from the natural world and towards human-made environments as the primary arena for transcendent experience.

11.7.2 The Environmental Sublime and Ecological Melancholy

In the twentieth century, particularly after the rise of environmentalism, the natural sublime took on new dimensions. Some scholars have identified an "environmental sublime" tinged with "ecological melancholy". This version of the sublime arises not just from nature's power, but from an awareness of its fragility and the human role in its destruction. The awe inspired by a pristine wilderness is now shadowed by the knowledge of its vulnerability to climate change, pollution, and extinction. The experience becomes bittersweet, a lament for what is being lost even as it is being appreciated.

11.7.3 The Recovery of Wonder

Recent scholarship has also sought to distinguish more clearly between the sublime and a related but distinct aesthetic category: wonder. Critics argue that "most ecocritical scholarship tends to overshadow discussions of wonder with the sublime, failing to treat these two aesthetic categories as distinct". As a result, the nuances that these two concepts conjure have been lost.

Wonder, in this view, offers an alternative to the sublime's ethos of domination and self-aggrandizement. While the sublime often involves the mind's triumph over nature's overwhelming power (as in Kant), wonder is an "open-ended, non-violent framework" that allows for a more receptive and humble engagement with the natural world. This distinction has important implications for ecological consciousness and environmental politics, suggesting that cultivating wonder might be more conducive to sustainable relationships with nature than the more self-centred experience of the sublime.

11.8 CONCLUSION

This unit has traced the long and complex history of the sublime as an expression of humanity's encounter with nature. We began with its origins in ancient philosophy, where Longinus first identified the power of language to transport audiences through emotional intensity and vivid imagery. We then explored how the eighteenth century, particularly through the works of Edmund Burke and Immanuel Kant, systematically theorised the sublime as a response to the terrifying and vast aspects of the natural world. The Romantic period represented the fullest artistic flowering of this concept, as poets like Wordsworth and painters like Turner and Constable made the sublime encounter central to their explorations of self, imagination, and transcendence. Victor Hugo's distinctive contribution was to integrate the sublime with its opposite, the grotesque, creating a more comprehensive aesthetic that reflected the full complexity of creation. Finally, we considered how post-Romantic and twentieth-century perspectives have

fragmented, reconfigured, and sometimes sought alternatives to the sublime, whether through the technological sublime, ecological melancholy, or the recovery of wonder.

Throughout this journey, one constant remains: the sublime continues to name that profound and unsettling experience when we confront something greater than ourselves, whether in nature, art, or the human spirit, and are momentarily transported beyond the limits of ordinary perception.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: According to the text, how does the aesthetic concept of the "sublime" fundamentally differ from the merely "beautiful"?

.....

.....

Q 2: Who wrote the foundational ancient text on the sublime, and what was its original focus?

.....

.....

Q 3: What is the significance of Longinus's concept of 'enargeia' in the development of sublime theory?

.....

.....

Q 4: According to Edmund Burke's 1757 treatise, what kind of qualities in nature provoke the experience of the sublime?

.....

.....

Q 5: How did Immanuel Kant's theory of the sublime differ from Burke's, particularly regarding the location of the sublime experience?

.....

.....

Q 6: Name the two distinct categories of the sublime that Kant identified and briefly define them.

.....

.....

Q 7: How did the Romantic poet William Wordsworth's depiction of the sublime differ from the immediate terror described by Burke?

.....

.....

Q 8: In what ways did the painters J.M.W. Turner and John Constable each represent the sublime, according to the text?

.....

.....

Q 9: What was Victor Hugo's distinctive contribution to the aesthetic of the sublime?

.....

.....

Q 10: What is the "technological sublime," and what broader cultural shift does it represent?

.....

.....

Q 11: How does the more recent concept of the "environmental sublime" differ from earlier formulations of the idea?

.....

.....

Q 12: According to recent scholarship, what is the key difference between the experience of "wonder" and the experience of the "sublime"?

.....

.....

11. 9 LET US SUM UP

- The concept originated in the 1st-century CE treatise 'On the Sublime' by Longinus, who defined it as a quality of great writing and oratory that uses passionate intensity and vivid language ("enargeia") to transport the audience.
- Edmund Burke (1757) theorised the sublime as a response to nature's terrifying qualities like obscurity, power, and vastness, which produce a complex "negative pleasure" of awe mixed with terror, separate from the harmony of beauty.
- Immanuel Kant (1790) shifted the focus to the human mind, arguing the sublime is not in nature but in our cognitive process of comprehending nature's immensity (mathematical sublime) or power (dynamical sublime), which reveals the superiority of human reason.
- The Romantic period (1770-1850) made the encounter with sublime nature the central arena for exploring individual emotion, imagination, and the search for the transcendental or spiritual.
- William Wordsworth's sublime, as in "Tintern Abbey," involves meditative recollection where the mind communes with nature, transforming personal experience into a glimpse of a universal "Being" and connecting the individual to the cosmos.
- In painting, J.M.W. Turner depicted nature's violent power (shipwrecks, storms) where tiny, vulnerable human figures are overwhelmed by dynamic forces of light and colour, directly visualising Burke's terrifying sublime.
- John Constable found a different sublime in ordinary rural scenes, where a truthful and sensory-rich depiction of nature, as in *The Hay Wain*, inspires an immersive experience and awe without overt grandeur.
- Victor Hugo argued that true art requires mingling the sublime with its opposite, the grotesque, to reflect the full, contradictory complexity of reality, as seen in the contrast between Jean Valjean's heroism and his antagonists' ludicrous actions.
- In the modern era, the awe once reserved for nature was displaced onto human-made creations like railways, skyscrapers, and factories, which became new sources of terror and admiration.

- A recent development tinges the sublime with "ecological melancholy," where awe for nature's beauty is shadowed by an awareness of its fragility and the human role in its destruction.
- Contemporary scholarship distinguishes "wonder" from the sublime, proposing it as a more humble, open-ended, and non-dominating framework for engaging with nature, which may be more conducive to ecological consciousness.
- The text traces a major philosophical shift from Longinus's focus on the qualities of an object (or text) to Kant's focus on the subjective cognitive processes and moral framework of the human mind experiencing the sublime.
- The rise of the sublime in the 18th century represents a paradox within the "Age of Reason," as it demonstrated a profound intellectual interest in darkness, terror, and emotion, preserving a space for intuition alongside logic.
- Throughout its history, the concept of the sublime has served as a barometer for humanity's shifting understanding of itself and its place in the cosmos, from a rhetorical tool to a transcendental experience to a fragmented modern concept.

11.10 FURTHER READING

1. Burke, Edmund. 'A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful'. 1757.
2. Economides, Louise. 'The Ecology of Wonder in Romantic and Postmodern Literature'. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
3. Kant, Immanuel. 'Critique of Judgment'. 1790.
4. Lee, Choong Hoon. 'A Romantic Theodicy: Sublime and Grotesque in Les Misérables by Victor Hugo." 'Literature and Film', vol. 14, no. 3, 2013, pp. 585-614.
5. Longinus. 'On the Sublime'. 1st century CE.
6. Monk, Samuel Holt. *The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England*. 1935.
7. Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. 'Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory: The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite'. 1959.
8. Plumly, Stanley. 'Elegy Landscapes: Constable and Turner and the Intimate Sublime'. W. W. Norton, 2018.
9. Vincent, Patrick. "The Romantic Sublime." 'The Cambridge History of European Romantic Literatur', Cambridge University Press, 2023.
10. Weiskel, Thomas. 'The Romantic Sublime: Studies in the Structure and Psychology of Transcendence'. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
11. World History Encyclopaedia. "The Idea of the Sublime in the Enlightenment."

11.11 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q1. The beautiful pleases the eye with harmony and proportion, while the sublime is an experience of overwhelming power, vastness, and obscurity that evokes terror and awe, leading to a thrilling elevation of the mind.

Ans to Q2. The foundational text is *On the Sublime* (or *Peri Hypsous*) by the Greek writer Longinus. Its original focus was on the power of language and rhetoric in great writing and oratory.

Ans to Q 3. Longinus's version of 'enargeia' was significant because it moved beyond vivid description to create a "heated aesthetic" that collapses the distance between the subject and object, allowing the audience to identify and fuse with the experience being described.

Ans to Q 4. According to Burke, the sublime is provoked by qualities that evoke ideas of pain and danger, such as obscurity, power, vastness, darkness, solitude, silence, and terror.

Ans to Q 5. While Burke located the sources of the sublime in the terrifying qualities of external objects, Kant shifted the focus to the internal cognitive processes of the human subject, arguing the sublime is found in the mind's reaction to nature.

Ans to Q 6. Kant identified the "mathematical sublime," related to vastness and magnitude that overwhelms the imagination, and the "dynamical sublime," related to nature's immense power (like storms or volcanoes) that inspires awe.

Ans to Q 7. Wordsworth's sublime often involved a meditative recollection that transforms an ordinary experience, emphasizing a communion between the individual mind and the larger cosmos, rather than an immediate feeling of terror.

Ans to Q 8. Turner depicted nature's violent and overwhelming power (e.g., shipwrecks, storms), while Constable found a form of sublime in ordinary, tranquil rural scenes by creating an immersive sensory experience of being within the landscape.

Ans to Q9. Victor Hugo's contribution was to synthesize the sublime with its opposite, the "grotesque." He argued that true artistic totality comes from mingling the lofty and the terrifying to reflect the full complexity of human existence.

Ans to Q 10. The "technological sublime" refers to the experience of awe and terror previously reserved for nature being displaced onto human-made creations like railways, skyscrapers, and factories. It represents a cultural shift towards human-made environments as the primary arena for transcendent experience.

Ans to Q11. The "environmental sublime" is tinged with "ecological melancholy," where awe for nature's power and beauty is mixed with an awareness of its fragility and the human role in its destruction.

Ans to Q12. The key difference is that the sublime often involves the mind's triumph over nature's overwhelming power (a form of domination), whereas wonder is an "open-ended, non-violent framework" that allows for a more receptive and humble engagement with the natural world.

11.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. VERY SHORT QUESTIONS

Q 1: Who wrote the foundational ancient Greek treatise on the sublime, and what was its original subject?

Q 2: According to Edmund Burke, what primary emotion is the source of the sublime experience?

Q 3: What are the two categories of the sublime that Immanuel Kant identified?

Q 4: Which French writer synthesized the sublime with its opposite, the grotesque?

Q 5: What is the "technological sublime"?

B. SHORT QUESTIONS (150-200 words each)

Q 1: Briefly explain Edmund Burke's distinction between the beautiful and the sublime, providing an example of a sublime quality he identified.

Q 2: How did Immanuel Kant's interpretation of the sublime differ from earlier thinkers by focusing on the human mind rather than external nature?

Q 3: Describe the different approaches to representing the sublime in the paintings of J.M.W. Turner and John Constable.

Q 4: What was Victor Hugo's theory of the grotesque, and how did it relate to his understanding of the sublime?

Q 5: According to recent scholarship, how does the aesthetic category of "wonder" offer an alternative to the traditional concept of the sublime?

C. LONG QUESTIONS (300-400 words each)

Q 1: Trace the evolution of the sublime from its origins in classical rhetoric through its development in eighteenth-century philosophy. How did thinkers like Longinus, Burke, and Kant each reshape the concept?

Q 2: Analyse how the Romantic period represented the high point of the natural sublime in art and literature. Use the examples of William Wordsworth and J.M.W. Turner to illustrate the key characteristics of the Romantic sublime.

Q 3: Discuss Victor Hugo's contribution to sublime theory through his synthesis of the sublime and the grotesque. How does this combination, as seen in *Les Misérables*, create a more complete representation of reality?

Q 4: Explain how the concept of the sublime has been transformed in post-Romantic and twentieth-century thought. Consider the technological sublime, the environmental sublime with its ecological melancholy, and the recovery of wonder as alternative frameworks.

Q 5: Trace the shifting relationship between the human subject and nature throughout the history of the sublime, from Longinus through Kant to contemporary environmental perspectives. How has this relationship changed, and what does it reveal about humanity's understanding of itself?

UNIT 12: NATURE AS AN ARTEFACT

UNIT STRUCTURE

12.1 Learning Objectives
12.2 Introduction
12.3 Defining the Artefact: The Core Conditions
  12.3.1 The Modification Condition
  12.3.2 The Intention Condition
12.4 The Ontology of Artifacts: Kinds, Instances, And Character
  12.4.1 The Dependence on Intention
  12.4.2 Intended Character vs. Actual Character
  12.4.3 Type, Instance, and Kinds
12.5 Making Objects: Productive Action and Intention
  12.5.1 The Nature of Productive Action
  12.5.2 Degrees of Authorship
12.6 The Characterisation and Evaluation of Artifacts
  12.6.1 Function and Significant Properties
  12.6.2 The Basis of Evaluation
12.7 The Artwork: A Special Kind of Artefact
  12.7.1 Artworks as Artefacts
  12.7.2 The Primary Purpose: Aesthetic Appreciation
12.8 Conclusion
12.9 Let Us Sum Up
12.10 Further Reeding
12.11 Answer to Check Your Progress
12.12 Model Questions

12.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to

- define “artefact” and distinguish it from natural objects using the criteria of modification and intention.
- analyse the ontology of artefacts, including the distinctions between an object’s intended and actual character, and between type and instance.
- explain the process of “making” as a form of productive action guided by a productive intention.
- differentiate between the characterisation of an artefact by its function and its evaluation based on how well it fulfils that function.
- evaluate the unique ontological position of the artwork, considering it as a special class of artefact primarily for aesthetic appreciation.

12.2 INTRODUCTION

When we look at a towering skyscraper, we immediately recognise it as a product of human design and labouran artefact. When we look at a mountain range, we instinctively classify it as a natural object. This distinction, seemingly self-evident, has been a cornerstone of Western philosophical thought since Aristotle. However, the boundaries between the natural and the artificial are not as clear as they might seem. A meticulously manicured garden, a genetically modified crop, or a river redirected by a dam blur the lines. Furthermore, if we consider artworks, we encounter objects that are clearly made by humans but seem to transcend the simple definition of a mere tool. This unit delves into the complex philosophy of artefacts. We will explore what it means for something to be “made,” the role of intention in creation, and how we characterize and evaluate the objects that populate our world. Ultimately, we will grapple with the special status of the artwork, asking whether it is just another artefact or something else entirely.

12.3 DEFINING THE ARTEFACT: THE CORE CONDITIONS

What transforms a piece of found wood into a walking stick? What separates a rock used to prop open a door from a professionally crafted doorstop? The answer lies in two fundamental conditions that philosophers have identified as necessary for something to be considered an artefact: the modification condition and the intention condition.

12.3.1 The Modification Condition

For an object to be an artefact, it must have undergone some form of physical change or modification. A tree in a forest, existing purely through natural processes, is not an artefact. However, if a person breaks a branch from that tree, strips it of its leaves, and carves one end to a smooth point, the resulting object is materially different from its original state. The philosopher Risto Hilpinen suggests that even the simplest act of ‘separation’, detaching an object from its natural environment ad can constitute a sufficient modification to initiate the creation of an artefact.

This condition highlights that artifactuality is a property acquired through intervention in the natural world. The degree of modification can range from the minimal (polishing a stone) to the extensive (assembling a smartphone from hundreds of manufactured components). The key is that the object’s current physical state is not solely the result of natural forces but is a consequence of human (or, in some debated cases, animal) action. A branch that falls naturally and is then picked up and used does not meet the modification condition; it is a “nature fact”, a natural object used for a purpose, but not made for it.

12.3.2 The Intention Condition

Modification alone is insufficient. Imagine a storm that snaps branches from trees, creating sticks with pointed ends identical to the carved walking stick. These branches have been modified by the wind, yet we would not call them

artefacts. What is missing is 'productive intention'. An artefact is not just any modified object; it is an object that has been intentionally modified (or brought into being) by an agent with the purpose of creating an object of a certain kind.

This leads to a core principle: an object is an artefact if and only if it has an author. The author's intention "ties" a set of desired predicates to the object. The carpenter intends for this piece of wood to become a 'chair', a sortal description that gives the object its identity. This intention guides the productive actions (the sawing, sanding, and joining) that result in the final object. The existence and the properties of the artefact are therefore dependent on the creator's intention. As we will see, this relationship between intention and outcome is central to understanding both successful and failed artefacts.

12.4 THE ONTOLOGY OF ARTIFACTS: KINDS, INSTANCES, AND CHARACTER

Having established the basic criteria, we must now examine the philosophical questions surrounding the 'being' of artefacts. What kind of objects are they? How do they relate to their creators and to other artefacts?

12.4.1 The Dependence on Intention

The 'Dependence Condition' formalizes the relationship between an artefact and its creator. It states that the existence and some of the properties of an artefact depend on an author's intention to make an object of a certain kind. This means artefacts are not mind-independent entities in the same way that stars or mountains are. A mountain exists regardless of whether any conscious being perceives it or intended it to be. A hammer, however, only exists 'as a hammer' because someone intended it to be a tool for driving nails. If all conscious beings disappeared, the physical matter of the hammer would remain, but its "hammer-ness", its status as an artefact, would arguably vanish with the intentional framework that gave it meaning.

12.4.2 Intended Character vs. Actual Character

A crucial distinction must be made between what the creator intended and what was actually produced. The 'intended character' is the set of descriptions the creator had in mind (e.g., "a sturdy, wooden table that is one meter high"). The 'actual character' is the totality of the finished object's properties.

The actual character is always much richer than the intended character. The table will have a specific grain pattern, a precise weight, and millions of microscopic imperfections that were never part of the maker's plan. The success of the artefact is measured by the "fit" between its intended and actual character. A table is a good table if its actual character *includes* the intended character (it is sturdy, it is one meter high). If the table wobbles, its actual character fails to align with the intention, and we judge it a failure or a defective artefact.

12.4.3 Type, Instance, and Kinds

Artefacts have a complex ontological structure. Consider the concept of a "paper clip." This is an 'artefact kind', often referred to as a 'type'. The type is a general idea or design, often abstract. When a factory produces millions of paper clips, each individual, physical object is an 'instance' of that type. The inventor of the paper clip is the author of the 'type', while the factory workers are the authors of the 'instances.

Furthermore, artefact kinds can be identified by sortal descriptions. Some, like 'hammer' or 'motor controller', are essentially artefactual and their very definition implies a purpose and a maker. Others can be accidental. A 'path' through a forest can be a natural formation or an intentional creation, and a 'language' can evolve organically or be deliberately constructed, like the creation of New Norwegian (Nynorsk) by Ivar Aasen.

12.5 MAKING OBJECTS: PRODUCTIVE ACTION AND INTENTION

The act of making is a bridge between the internal mental state of intention and the external physical reality of the object. This process is what we call 'work'.

12.5.1 The Nature of Productive Action

Productive action is the intentional manipulation of the world. It is the application of skill and labour to pre-existing material, which may itself be natural or another artefact and to bring about a new object that conforms to a plan. This action is teleological, meaning it is directed toward an end or purpose. The philosopher Herbert Simon described the sciences related to this as the "sciences of the artificial," which are concerned with the interface between an inner environment (the object's physical structure) and an outer environment (the context in which it functions).

12.5.2 Degrees of Authorship

Not all makers are equal. The concept of "authorship" in relation to artefacts admits of degrees. The 13th-century philosopher St. Bonaventure famously distinguished different levels of "making" a book, a framework that can be applied to artefacts in general:

i. **The Scribe (minimal authorship):** Produces a new instance of an existing artefact by copying. While they are the author of the 'copy', their intentions are wholly subordinate to the original author's design.
ii. **The Compiler:** Combines existing artefacts or texts to create a new whole. The parts are not their own, but the 'arrangement' is.
iii. **The Commentator:** Adds their own material to an existing work, but the original remains primary.

iv. **The Author (strict sense):** Creates a new artefact whose principal design originates with them, even if they use existing elements for confirmation or support.

This framework helps us see that creation is rarely *ex nihilo*. Most artefact-making involves varying degrees of reliance on and transformation of prior works and intentions.

12.6 THE CHARACTERISATION AND EVALUATION OF ARTIFACTS

How do we talk about artefacts? What makes one good and another bad? The answers lie in understanding the relationship between an object's function and its properties.

12.6.1 Function and Significant Properties

Artefacts are typically characterised by their intended function. We call something a 'hammer' not because of its specific shape or colour, but because of what it is for. This function allows us to distinguish between the 'significant properties' of the object and its incidental ones.

The 'significant properties' are those that are relevant to the object's proper functioning. For a hammer, these include the weight of the head, the strength of the handle, and the shape of the striking face. It'scolour or the decorative pattern on the handle, however, are incidental properties and they do not affect its ability to perform its function as a hammer. This distinction is key to both design and evaluation.

12.6.2. The Basis of Evaluation

The evaluation of an artefact flows directly from its function. An artefact is judged to be a 'good' one to the extent that its significant properties are well-suited to fulfilling its intended purpose.

This kind of evaluation is both normative and practical. It is normative because it sets a standard (a good hammer 'ought' to drive nails effectively). It is practical because it guides our choices and use. A well-designed artefact makes our lives easier and our actions more effective, while a poorly designed one can led to frustration and failure. This is the basis of design theory, which seeks to create artefacts whose significant properties are optimally aligned with their intended use and the context of that use.

12.7 THE ARTWORK: A SPECIAL KIND OF ARTEFACT

We now arrive at the most nuanced category: the artwork. Is a painting just another artefact, like a hammer? In one sense, yes. It is an object intentionally made by an author, thus satisfying the definition of an artefact. However, its *purpose* sets it apart in a way that profoundly affects its ontology and evaluation.

12.7.1 Artworks as Artefacts

Formal ontologies, such as the Suggested Upper Merged Ontology (SUMO), classify an 'ArtWork' as a subclass of 'Artifact'. This classification captures the basic truth that artworks are human creations. They are not natural kinds. A sunset, no matter how beautiful, is not an artwork because it lacks an author. Similarly, a piece of driftwood, even if aesthetically pleasing, is not an artwork until it is (at minimum) selected and presented as such by an artist, an act which itself constitutes a form of modification and intention.

12.7.2 The Primary Purpose: Aesthetic Appreciation

The defining feature that distinguishes an artwork from a purely technical artefact is its primary purpose. While a hammer is made for the practical function of driving nails, an artwork is created primarily for 'aesthetic appreciation'.

This purpose has significant implications:

i. **Significant Properties:** For a hammer, colour is usually incidental. For a painting, colour is often a 'significant property', it is directly relevant to the work's purpose of being aesthetically appreciated.
ii. **Evaluation:** A hammer is evaluated on its utility. A good hammer is an effective one. An artwork, however, is evaluated on its aesthetic, expressive, or conceptual power. A technically perfect but emotionally vapid painting might be judged a failure, while a powerful painting that is physically deteriorating (e.g., a crumbling fresco) might still be considered a great work of art. Its function is not to be physically durable, but to provide an aesthetic experience.
iii. **Intentions:** The artist's intention is not merely to create an object with a certain physical character, but to create an object capable of sustaining a certain kind of attention and interpretation. The artwork is meant to be a vehicle for perception, thought, and emotion.

12.7.3 A Unique Ontological Status

The distinction between an artefact's intended and actual character is also more complex for artworks. The actual character of a painting might include a crack in the paint. For a hammer, this is simply a flaw. For a painting, however, this flaw might become part of its aesthetic character, a sign of its age and history that contributes to its overall "meaning." The viewer's experience is not limited to checking off the artist's intended properties; it involves an open-ended engagement with the work's total actual character. In this way, while the artwork is undeniably an artefact, its mode of being and the way we interact with it elevate it to a special status within that category.

12.8 CONCLUSION

This unit has traversed the conceptual landscape from the simplest tool to the most complex artwork. We have seen that an artefact is defined by a dual nature: it must

be physically modified and brought into being with a specific intention. Its existence is ontologically dependent on a mind, and it is characterized by the fit between what was intended and what was made. The act of making is a form of purposeful work, and the degree of a maker's authorship can vary significantly. We evaluate artefacts based on how well their significant properties enable them to fulfil their function. Finally, we considered the artwork, which, while fitting the basic definition of an artefact, is set apart by its primary purpose of aesthetic appreciation, a difference that fundamentally alters how we understand, characterize, and evaluate it. The distinction between nature and artefact, therefore, is not a simple line but a complex and productive philosophical terrain.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What are the two fundamental conditions that philosophers have identified as necessary for something to be considered an artefact?

.....

.....

Q 2: What is a "nature fact" and how does it differ from an artefact?

.....

.....

Q 3: Explain the difference between the intended character and the actual character of an artefact.

.....

.....

Q 4: According to the Dependence Condition, how do artefacts differ from natural objects like mountains or stars?

.....

.....

Q 5: What is the distinction between a "type" and an "instance" in the ontology of artefacts?

.....

.....

Q 6: Describe the four degrees of authorship as distinguished by St. Bonaventure, from minimal to strict authorship.

.....

.....

Q 7: What are significant properties of an artefact and how do they differ from incidental properties? Provide an example.

.....

.....

Q 8: How is the evaluation of an artefact connected to its function?

.....

.....

Q 9: In what way is an artwork considered a special kind of artefact, despite satisfying the basic definition of an artefact?

.....

.....

Q 10: How does the treatment of unintended features (like a crack in paint) differ between a functional artefact like a hammer and an artwork like a painting?

.....

.....

12.9 LET US SUM UP

- While skyscrapers are immediately recognized as human-made artefacts and mountains as natural objects, this distinction becomes blurred when considering hybrid entities like manicured gardens, genetically modified crops, or artworks, which challenge simple categorisation.
- For something to be considered an artefact, it must satisfy both the modification condition (physical change from its original state) and the intention condition (deliberate creation by an agent with a purpose).
- An object acquires artifactuality through human intervention that alters its physical state, ranging from minimal acts like separating an object from its environment to extensive manufacturing, distinguishing it from objects shaped solely by natural forces.
- A branch that falls naturally and is simply picked up for use remains a “nature fact”, a natural object used for a purpose but not made for it, because it lacks the essential element of intentional modification.
- An artefact must have an author whose productive intention guides the creation process, “tying” desired properties to the object and making the object’s existence dependent on the creator’s purpose.
- Artefacts are not mind-independent entities like mountains; a hammer existsas a hammer only because someone intended it to be a tool for driving nails, and its “hammer-ness” would vanish without the intentional framework that gave it meaning.
- The intended character is the creator’s mental plan, while the actual character is the finished object’s total properties, which is always richer and includes unintended features. An artefact’s success is measured by how well its actual character includes its intended character.
- Artefacts have a dual ontological structure where the “type” is the abstract design or kind (e.g., the concept of a paper clip), while each physical object produced is an “instance” of that type, with different authors potentially responsible for each level.
- Some artefact kinds are essentially artefactual (like ‘hammer’), implying purpose and maker by definition, while others like ‘path’ or ‘language’ can be either natural/ organic or intentionally created.

- The act of making is a teleological process applying skill and labour to pre-existing material to bring about an object conforming to a plan, bridging internal intention with external physical reality.
- Drawing from St. Bonaventure's framework, authorship ranges from minimal (the scribe copying an existing work) through compiler and commentator to the strict author whose principal design originates with them, showing creation is rarely 'ex nihilo'.
- Significant properties are those relevant to an artefact's proper functioning (e.g., hammer head weight), while incidental properties (like colour) do not affect function. This distinction is fundamental to both design and evaluation.
- An artefact is judged "good" to the extent its significant properties are well-suited to fulfilling its intended purpose, making evaluation both normative (setting standards) and practical (guiding choices).
- While artworks satisfy basic artefact definitions and are classified as such in formal ontologies like SUMO, they are distinguished by their primary purpose of aesthetic appreciation rather than practical utility.
- For artworks, properties considered incidental in tools (like colour or even cracks/ damage) become significant properties relevant to aesthetic experience, and evaluation focuses on expressive/conceptual power rather than utility, with unintended features potentially enhancing rather than diminishing the work.

12.10 FURTHER READING

1. Baker, Lynne Rudder. (2007). 'The Metaphysics of Everyday Life'. Cambridge University Press.
2. Hilpinen, Risto. (2004). "Artifact." 'Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy'.
3. Simon, Herbert A. (1996). 'The Sciences of the Artificial' (3rd ed.). MIT Press.

12.11 ASWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q1: The Two Core Conditions for Artefacts

The two fundamental conditions necessary for something to be considered an artefact are,

a. **The Modification Condition:** An object must have undergone some form of physical change or modification from its original state. This can range from minimal acts like separating an object from its natural environment to extensive manufacturing processes.

b. **The Intention Condition:** An object must have been intentionally modified or brought into being by an agent with the purpose of creating an object of a certain kind. The creator must have a productive intention that guides their actions.An object qualifies as an artefact only when both conditions are satisfied—physical modification alone, without intention, is insufficient.

Answer to Q 2: Nature fact is a natural object that is used for a purpose but was not made for that purpose. For example, a branch that falls naturally from a tree and is then picked up and used as a walking stick.The key difference from an artefact lies in the presence of intentional modification. While a nature fact may be utilised by humans, it does not meet the modification condition because its current physical state is solely the result of natural forces, not human intervention. An artefact, by contrast, has been intentionally modified by an agent with the purpose of creating an object of a certain kind.

Answer to Q3: Intended Character is the set of descriptions and properties the creator had in mind during the planning and making of the artefact. For example, "a sturdy, wooden table that is one meter high." On the other hand the actual Characteris the totality of the finished object's properties, including all its physical characteristics, both planned and unplanned. The actual character is always much richer than the intended character, encompassing specific grain patterns, precise weight, microscopic imperfections, and other features never part of the maker's plan.The success of an artefact is measured by the "fit" between these two characters, a good artefact is one whose actual character *includes* the intended character.

Answer to Q 4: According to the Dependence Condition, artefacts differ from natural objects in that their existence and some of their properties depend on an author's intention to make an object of a certain kind. Natural objects like mountains or stars are 'mind-independent entities', they exist regardless of whether any conscious being perceives them or intended them to be. A mountain would continue to exist even if all conscious beings disappeared.Artefacts, however, have a different ontological status. A hammer exists 'as a hammer' only because someone intended it to be a tool for driving nails. If all conscious beings disappeared, the physical matter of the hammer would remain, but its "hammer-ness", its status as an artefact, would vanish with the intentional framework that gave it meaning.

Answer to Q 5: Type refers to the artefact kind or abstract design, the general concept or idea of an artefact. For example, the concept of a "paper clip" is a type. The inventor of the paper clip is the author of the type.Instance refers to each individual, physical object produced that embodies the type. When a factory produces millions of paper clips, each specific paper clip is an instance of the paper clip type. The factory workers are the authors of the instances. Thisdistinction reveals that artefacts have a complex ontological structure where different authors may be responsible for different levels of the artefact's existence.

Answer to Q 6: The Four Degrees of Authorship (St. Bonaventure) are i. The Scribe (Minimal Authorship), that Produces a new instance of an existing artefact by copying. Their intentions are wholly subordinate to the original author's design. They are the author of the 'copy' only.ii. The Compiler: Combines existing artefacts or texts to create a new whole. The parts are not their own creation, but the 'arrangement' and organization are their contribution.iii. The Commentator:Adds their own material to an existing work, but the original remains primary. Their contribution supplements rather than replaces the original.iv. The Author (Strict Sense): Creates a new artefact whose principal design originates with them, even if they use existing elements for

confirmation or support. This represents the highest degree of authorship.This framework demonstrates that creation is rarely ex nihilo (from nothing), but involves varying degrees of reliance on and transformation of prior works.

Answer to Q7: Significant Properties are the properties of an artefact that are relevant to its proper functioning. They directly affect the object's ability to fulfil its intended purpose.Incidental Propertiesare properties that do not affect the object's ability to perform its function. They are irrelevant to the artefact's core purpose. As for example, for a hammer, Significant properties include the weight of the head, the strength of the handle, and the shape of the striking faceall directly relevant to driving nails effectively.Incidental properties include the hammer's colour or any decorative pattern on the handle; these do not affect its function as a hammer.This distinction is fundamental to both design (focusing on optimizing significant properties) and evaluation (judging based on significant rather than incidental properties).

Answer to Q8: The evaluation of an artefact flows directly from its function. An artefact is judged to be a 'good' one to the extent that its significant properties are well-suited to fulfilling its intended purpose.This evaluation is 'normative' because it sets a standard, a good hammer 'ought' to drive nails effectively. It establishes what the artefact should do based on its function.This evaluation is also 'practical' because it guides our choices and use. A well-designed artefact makes our lives easier and our actions more effective, while a poorly designed one leads to frustration and failure.This forms the basis of design theory, which seeks to create artefacts whose significant properties are optimally aligned with their intended use and context.

Answer to Q9: An artwork is considered a special kind of artefact because, while it satisfies the basic definition of an artefact (intentionally made by an author), its 'primary purpose' sets it apart in ways that affect its ontology and evaluation.The defining feature is that an artwork is created primarily for 'aesthetic appreciation' rather than practical utility. This difference has several implications:

Answer to Q10: The treatment of unintended features (like a crack) differs fundamentally between functional artefacts and artworks:For a Functional Artefact (e.g., a hammer) an unintended feature like a crack is simply a flaw or defect. It indicates that the artefact's actual character fails to align with its intended character, and the object is judged as failed or defective. The crack negatively impacts the hammer's ability to perform its function.For an Artwork (e.g., a painting):An unintended feature like a crack in the paint might become part of the work's 'aesthetic character'. Rather than being merely a flaw, it can be appreciated as a sign of age and history that contributes to the work's overall meaning and experience. The viewer's engagement with the artwork involves an open-ended response to its total actual character, not merely checking off the artist's intended properties. The crack might enhance rather than diminish the work's aesthetic value.This difference stems from the artwork's primary purpose of aesthetic appreciation, which allows unintended features to be reinterpreted as meaningful rather than merely defective.

12.12 MODEL QUESTIONS

A: VERY SHORT QUESTIONS

Q 1: What are the two fundamental conditions necessary for something to be considered an artefact?

Q 2: What is a “nature fact”?

Q 3: Define “intended character” and “actual character” of an artefact.

Q 4: What is the difference between a “type” and an “instance” in the ontology of artefacts?

Q 5: According to the Dependence Condition, how do artefacts differ from natural objects?

B: SHORT QUESTIONS (Answer within 150-200 words each)

Q 1: Explain the Modification Condition with suitable examples. Why is modification alone insufficient for something to qualify as an artefact?

Q 2: Discuss the relationship between productive intention and authorship in the creation of artefacts.

Q 3: Distinguish between significant properties and incidental properties of an artefact, using a hammer as an example.

Q 4: How does the evaluation of an artwork differ from the evaluation of a functional artefact like

C: LONG QUESTIONS(Answer within 300-400 words each)

Q 1: Critically examine the two core conditions (modification and intention) that define an artefact. Why is it necessary for both conditions to be satisfied? Illustrate your answer with examples of objects that meet only one condition but not the other.

Q 2: Analyse the distinction between intended character and actual character in artefacts. How does this distinction help us understand both successful artefacts and failed or defective ones? Provide examples to support your analysis.

Q 3: Discuss St. Bonaventure’s four degrees of authorship and their application to understanding artefact creation. How does this framework demonstrate that creation is rarely *ex nihilo* (from nothing)?

Q 4: Explain why artworks are considered a special class of artefacts despite satisfying the basic definition of an artefact. How do the criteria for evaluation, significant properties, and treatment of unintended features differ between artworks and functional artefacts?

Q 5: Critically evaluate the Dependence Condition, which states that artefacts depend on an author’s intention for their existence and properties. What would be the ontological status of an artefact if all conscious beings disappeared? Justify your answer with philosophical reasoning.

UNIT 13 : ANIMAL RIGHTS

UNIT STRUCTURE

13.1 Learning Objectives
13.2 Introduction
13.3 Meaning and Definition of Animal Rights
13.4 Consequences of Animal Rights
13.5 The Case for Animal Rights
13.6 The Case against Animal Rights
13.7 Moral Community
13.8 Problems of Marginal People
13.9 Let Us Sum Up
13.10 Answer to Check Your Progress
13.11 Model Questions

13.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to

- know the meaning of rights and its relation to animals
- know the arguments for and against animal rights
- know which things are wrong to do animals
- know the values of the lives of the member of moral community
- know whether animals posses moral status or not

13.2 INTRODUCTION

The foundation for rigorous thinking about animal use was laid in 1975, with the publication of Peter Singer's book animal liberation. While today Singer is commonly regarded as father of the animal rights movements, ironically animal liberation did not make a concerted attempt to argue that animals in fact have rights. Peter Singer extended Bentham's utilitarian approach to evaluate how animals might ethically be used by humans. Utilitarianism opens the door to a thoughtful dialogue about how humans can ethically make use of animals. But utilitarian thinking is also hindered by some obvious limitations. Especially intrinsic value of the animal's life a second concept called speciesism that opened the door to considering animal rights.

13.3 MEANING AND DEFINITION OF ANIMAL RIGHTS

The origin of the idea of animal rights is not easy to trace. One view is that this notion is a natural spin-off or even a logical extension of the civil rights and women rights movements. Another view is that it represents nothing more than another system of the tendency, particularly prevalent in the United States to couch all demands for

change in the language of rights. But to develop a sensible alternative position on the moral status of animals, it is necessary to examine the foundation of our system of moral beliefs.

The fundamental principle of equality, on which the equality of all human beings rest is the principle of equal considerations of interests. Only a basic moral principle of this kind can defend a form of equality that embraces all human beings with all the differences that exists between them. Having accepted the principle of equality as a sound moral basis for relations with others of our own species, we are also committed to accepting it as a sound moral basis for relations with those outside our own species, i.e the non human animals. Animals deserves certain kinds of considerations, like what is in their best interests, regardless of whether they are useful to humans or any human cares about them at all. It means recognizing that animals are not to be use as our property for food, clothing, entertainment, or experimentation.

Among the most important moral and political issues facing the world today, issues like moral status of animals should be treated alike. Do not human animas have substantial or full moral status? If so, why? If not, why not? Morality requires equally unless there is some general and relevant differences between them that morally justifies a difference in treatment. Animals are more like humans in almost all sorts of important ways. For eg- like human beings, they are alive, most of them are capable of suffering, some can arguably think and even emotions. So it would be more precise to ask how those non-human animals should be treated that we standardly use for food, for product and biomedical testing and for their skin. Virtually most of the philosophers, scientists agree that it would be wrong to torture or kill a mammal or bird just for fun. The question here is not about whether these animals have moral status, but rather how much status they have, and why?

Every conscious being has interests that should be respected. No being who is conscious of being alive should be devalued to thinghood, dominated, used as resource or a commodity.

The main part of the idea known as animal rights is a movement to extent moral consideration to all conscious beings. When we stop eating and drinking products derived from other animals, when we stop going to circuses, decline to bread or buy dogs and cats, we are carrying out the idea of animal right. By doing so and giving respect to the animals regardless of how they happen to be classified or name, the purpose of giving rights to animals will be served.

According to the view that an animal's moral claim is equivalent to a moral right, any action that fails to treat the animal as a being with inherent worth would violate that animal's right and will be morally objectionable. According to the animal rights position, to treat an animal as a means to some human end, as many humans do when they eat animals or experiment on them, is to violate animal's right. The animal rights position is an absolutist position. Any being that is a subject of life has inherent worth and the rights that protect such worth and all subjects of a life have these rights equally. Thus any practice that fails to respect the rights of those animals who have them eg- eating animals, hunting animals, experimenting on animals, using animals for entertainment, is wrong, irrespective of human need, context or culture.

In the past, the idea of "the rights of animals has been used to parody the case

for women's rights. When Mary Wollstonecraft, a fore runner of later feminists, published her vindication of the rights of women in 1792, her ideas were widely regarded as abused, and they were satirized.

In any anonymous publication entitled. A vindication of the rights of bruits the author of this satire tride to refute W ollstonecraft's reasonings by shouring that they could be carried one stage further. If sound when applied to women, why should be arguments not be applied to dogs, cats, and horses? They seem to hold equally will for these "brutes", yet to hold that brutes had rights was manifestly abused, therefore the reasoning by which this conclusion had been reached must be unsound when applied to brute, it must also be lensound when applied to women, since the very same arguments had been used in each case.

13.4 CONSEQUNCES OF ANIMAL RIGHTS

Animal rights teach us that certain things are wrong as a matter of principle. There are certain things that are morally wrong to do to animals, even if they do them in a humane way. Accepting the doctrine of animal rights may mean the following points.

1) **No experiments on animals:**
   The area in which speciesism can most clearly be observed is the use of animals in experiments. Animals are used in laboratories for three main purposes- education, product safety testing and experimentation- medical research in particulars. The issue here stands in an unpleasant manner because experiments often seek to justify experimenting an animal by claiming that the experiments lead us to discover about humans and if this is so the experiments must agree that human and non human animals are similar in crucial respects. Again sometimes people think that all animal experiments serve vital medical purposes, and can be justified on the grounds that they relieve more suffering than they cause. But this comfortable belief is mistaken. Pressure from the animal liberation movement has led several cosmetic companies to abandon this practice. Thus one who belives in absolute rights might hold that it is always wrong to sacrifice one being, whether human or animal, for the benefit of another. In that case the experiment should not be carried out whatever be the consequence.
2) **No breeding and killing animals for food or cloths:**
   The use of animals for food is probably the oldest and the most widespread from of animal use. There is also a sense in which it is the most basic form of animal use. The foundation stone on which rests the belief that animal exists for our pleasure and convenience. The case against using animals for food is at its strongest when animals are made to lead miserable lives so that their flesh can be made available to humans at the lowest possible cost. Modern forms of intensive farming apply science and technology to the attitude that animals are objects for us to use. In order to have meat on the table at a price that people can afford our society tolerates methods of meat production that confine

sentient animals in cramped unsuitable conditions for the entire duration of their lives. Animals are treated as machines that convert fodder into flesh, and any innovations that results in higher conversion ratio is liable to be adopted. To avoid speciesism we must stop these practices. Our custom is all the support that factory farmers need. We should not eat chicken, pork or veal, unless we know that the meat we are eating was not produced by factory farm method. The lives of free ranging animals are undoubtedly better than those of animals reared in factory farm. So human beings have no rights to take the live of animals for their comfort i.e. for their food and clothing.

3) No use of animals for hard labour :

Another use of animal is in exploiting them by forcing them to do physical labour. Most of the animals are used as a means of transport, to pull plows, carry goods etc. some are also used as police dogs or guide dogs. Again in many places the use of horses for transportation is tourists attraction, which is a similar form of exploitation to that of other domesticated animals used for work. Jobs for which non human animals are used are often tiresome and may cause physical pain. They are stressed and unhappy by the tedium of their activities. Our labour values tell us that we have a moral duty to treat the animals we share our planet with in a humane and compassionate way. The last labour government achieved much to end the cruel and unnecessary suffering of animals. The banning of hunting with dogs, and others by introducing the animal welfare act 2006.

4) No hunting:

Hunting has contributed to the extinction of several animals over the world. Many animals endure prolonged painful deaths when they are injured. Animals are being hunted for thrill but people do not understand that a balance in the environment should be maintained for their own benefit. Under the terms of the new hunting act, which covers England and wales, a person commits an offense if he hunts a wild mammal with a dog, unless his hunting is exempt. Exempt hunting is defined as stalking or flushing out an animal, using no more than two dogs, with a view to shooting the mammal as soon as it breaks cover. Under animal rights it is a punishable offense to kill or maim any animal including stray animals.

5) No use of animals in entertainment:

Under animal rights it is morally wrong to keep animals in zoo and use them for entertainment. It treats the animals as a means to achieve some human end. Also it falls to treat animals with the respect they deserve. Moreover it violets the animal's right to live in freedom.

13.5 THE CASE FOR ANIMAL RIGHTS

The case for animal rights is usually derived from the case for human rights. The case for animal rights shows that the animal rights movement is a part of the

human rights movement and not antagonistic to it. The theory that rationally grounds the rights of animals also grounds the rights of humans. Thus those involve in the animal rights movement are partners in the struggle to secure respect for human rights – the rights of women, for example, or minorities or workers. The animal rights movement is cut from the same moral cloth as these. The case for animal rights put forwarded the following points

- Human beings and animals have similar levels of biological complexity. Pain is pain wherever it occurs. If someone causing a human being is wrong because of the pain that is caused , moral relevance of the pain that an animal feels cannot rationally be ignored or dismissed.
- Like human beings animals are also conscious and aware of their existence. Consequently the weight of evidence indicates that humans are not unique in possessing the neurological substrates that generate consciousness. Non human animals including all mammals and birds and many other creatures also possess these neurological substrates.
- Like human beings animals also has preferences of likes and dislikes and make conscious choices.
- Human beings live in such a way to give themselves the best quality of life. So as animals also try the best shelter place. They also find the best food for themselves.

All beings with inherent value are equally valuable and entitled to the same right. Their inherent value does not depend on how useful they are to the world, and it does not diminish if they are a burden to others. Thus, animals have their rights just in the same way, for the reasons , and to the same extent that human beings have rights.

In all essential respects these animals are physiologically like human beings and human beings are like them. Charles Darwin compares “the mental power of man and the lower animals.” For example – injuries to our brain or spinal cord can diminish aru sense of sight or touch. By analogy Darwin thinks it is reasonable to infer that the same is true of animals that are most physiologically similar to human beings. Because our central nervous system provides the physical basis for our subjective awareness of the world, and because the central nervous system of other mammals resemble human beings in all the relevant respects, it is reasonable to believe that their central nervous system provide the physical basis for their subjective awareness.

Every person of commonsense agrees with Darwin. Dogs and pigs enjoy something and find others painful. In addition both humans and other mammals share a family of cognitive abilities as well as variety of emotions. (Darwin lists fear, jealousy and sadness). Not surprisingly again, these mental capacities affect their behavior. For e.g. other mammal will behave one way rather than another because they remember which ways of acting had pleasant outcomes in the past or because they are afraid or sad.

The psychological complexity of mammals (hence forth “animals”, unless otherwise indicated) plays an important role in arguing for their rights. As in the case of human so in the case of animals. They are the subjects – of – a- life, their life, a life that is experientially better or worse for the one whose life it is. Each is unique somebody not a replaceable something. In this respect, as the subjects –of –a- life

other mammals are our equals. And in this case our someness, our equality is important morally, logically, we cannot maintain that harms alone to us matter morally, but that harms done to these animals do not. Relevantly similar cases must be judged similarly. So humans have rights to do these animals.

In the case of the use of animals in science, the rights view is categorically abolitionist. Lab animals are not our testers, we are not their kings. Because these animals are treated routinely, systematically as if their value were reducible to their usefulness to others, they are routinely, systematically treated with a lack of respect, and thus are their rights routinely, systematically violated. This is just as true when they are used in trivial, duplicative, unnecessary or unique research as it is when they are used in studies that hold out real promise of human benefits. Harming or killing a human being can't be justified just these sort of reason neither it can be done even in the case of so lowly creatures as a laboratory rat. It is not just refinement or reduction that is called for not just larger, cleaner cages, not just more generous use of anesthesia or the elimination of multiple surgeries, not just tidying up the system. It is complete replacement the best that can be done when it comes to using animals in science is-not to use them. That is where one's duty lies according to rights view.

As for commercial animal's agriculture, the rights view takes a similar abolitionist position. The fundamental moral wrong here is not that animals are kept in stressful close confinement or in isolation, or that their pain and suffering their needs and preferences are ignored or discounted. All these are wrong, of course, but they are not the fundamental wrong. They are symptoms and effects of the deeper. Systematic wrong that allows these animals to be viewed and treated as lacking independent value, as resources for people—as needed, a renewable resource. Giving farm animals more space, more natural environment more companions does not right the fundamental wrong. Anesthesia or bigger cleaner cages would right the fundamental wrong in their case. Nothing less than the total dissolution of the commercial animal agriculture will do this. Morality requires nothing less than the total elimination of hunting and trapping for commercial and sporting ends. In this way the rights view's implications are stated clearly and uncompromisingly by Tom Regan.

13.6 THE CASE AGAINST ANIMAL RIGHTS

The argument for animal rights sketched above implies that humans and other animals are equal in morally relevant respects. Some philosophers repudiate any form of species egalitarianism. According to Cohen (Cohen and Regan, 2001), whereas humans are equal in morally relevant respects regardless of our race, gender, or ethnicity humans and other animals are not morally equal in any respect not even when it comes to suffering. Here are a few examples that will clarify Cohen's position.

At first, let us imagine that a boy and a girl suffer equally. If someone assigns greater moral weight to the boy's suffering because he is white made from Ireland and less moral weight to the girl's suffering because she is black female from Kenya Cohen would protest and rightly so. Human racial, gender and ethnic differences are not morally relevant difference. The situation differs however when it comes to differences in species. When we imagine a cat and a dog both suffer as much as the boy and girl.

For Cohen there is nothing morally prejudicial, nothing morally arbitrary in assigning greater importance to the suffering of the children, because they are human, than to the equal suffering of the animals, because they are not.

Proponents of animal rights deny this. It is believed that views like Cohen's reflect a moral prejudice against animals that is fully analogous to moral prejudices like sexism and racism that humans often have against one another. This type of prejudice is called speciesism he denies its prejudicial status because according to him, while there are no morally relevant differences between men and women or between white and blacks the morally relevant differences between humans and other animals are enormous. In particular human beings are morally autonomous and can make moral choices for which they are morally responsible. But animals are not morally autonomous and thus are not morally responsible.

But this defense of speciesism is no defense at all. It not only over look the fact that a very large percentage of the human populations are not morally autonomous, but moral autonomy is notrelevent to the issue at hand.

It is seen that a number of arguments are put forward against the idea that animals have rights which are as follows:

1) Animals don't think as men do. They are not really conscious. The French philosopher Rene Descartes and many others taught that animals were no more than complicated biological robots. These meant that animals were not the sort of thing that was entitled to have rights or any moral consideration.
2) Animals were put on earth to serve human beings. St Thomas Aquinas taught that the universe was constructed as a hierarchy in which beings at a lower level were there to serve those above them. As human beings were above animals in this hierarchy they were entitled to use animals in any way they wanted.
3) Moreover animals are not 'moral'. Rights only have meaning within a moral community and only human beings live in a moral community. Animal's don't understand or practice living according to a moral code. The differences in the way human beings and animals experience the world are morally relevant. There for rights are only for human and is applicable only to human being.
4) Moreover some argue that since animals don't behave in a moral way they don't deserve moral treatments from other beings. Animals usually behave selfishly and look after their own interests, while human beings will often help other people, even if doing so is it to their own disadvantage.
5) It is also objected by some that if animals have rights, they should be allowed to vote, marry, file for divorce and immigrate, which is absurd. Therefore animals have no rights
6) Another objection raised is that animals are not members of the moral community. A moral community is- A) a group of beings who live in relationship with each other and use and understand moral concepts and rules. B) The members of this community can respect each other moral persons. C) The members of this community respect each other's autonomy.

   These characters of moral community are displayed in human beings and are therefore members of the moral community. But animals do not display

these characteristics and are therefore not members of moral community. Thus only members of moral community can have rights. Therefore animals don't have rights..

7) Again it is objected that animals have some rights to bodily integrity and life, but the rights they have are not equal to human rights. therefore human vivisection is wrong, but animal vivisection is not.

The objections raised above have been considered because they are among the most important, not because they are the least convincing. Their failure, individually and collectively goes some way towards suggesting logical inadequacy of the anti animal rights position. Morality is certainly not mathematics. In morality there are no proofs like those we find in geometry. What we can find and what we must live with, are principles and values that have the best reasons, the best arguments on their side. The principles and values that pass this test, whether most people accept them or not, are the ones that should guide our lives. Given this reasonable standard, the principles and values of animal rights should guide our lives.

13.7 MORAL COMMUNITY

Generally moral community is regarded as a group of beings that shares certain characteristics and whose members are bound to observe certain rules of conduct in relation to one another because of their mutual likeness. All the members of the moral community do not have lives of equal value. It is deeply disagreeable to many to think that some lives are less valuable than others, they would dearly love it to be true that atleast all human lives are equally valuable. But when it is said of all lives not being equally valuable, it does not only refer to the differences between animal and normal adult human lives, it also refer to human lives themselves. It is viewed that all human lives are of not equal quality.

If we think that not all human lives have the same value , and if we think about the depths to which human life can tragically plummet , then it may well turn out that some animal lives have a higher quality than some human lives. R.G Frey in his chapter titled 'Animals and their medical use' stated that the comparative value of the human and animal life must be subject to scrutiny. The value of human and animal life, Frey thinks, coheres nicely with recent discussions of the value of life in medical ethics and allied areas. The value of a life is a function of its quality,its quality of its richness and its richness of its capacities and scope for enrichment: it matters, then, what a creature's capacities for a rich life are.

As Frey indicated, since not all human lives have the same richness and potentialities for enrichment, not all human lives are equally valuable. In fact, some human lives can be so shatter with no or so little prospect for enrichment that the quality of such lives can fall well below that of ordinary ,healthy animals. It might be claimed that we can know nothing of the richness of animal lives, but ethnologists and animal behaviorist, including some sympathetic to the 'animal rights' cause, certainly think otherwise. How else, for example, could the claim that certain rearing practices blight animal lives be sustained? That we cannot know everything about the inner lives of animals, of course, in no implies that we cannot know a good deal.

Quality of life views turn upon richness and if we are to answer the question of the comparative value of human and animal life we must inquire after the richness of their respective lives. Inter-species comparisons of richness and quality of life are likely to be even more difficult, though not possible.

Again, it must not be thought that criteria assessing the richness of human lives apply straightforwardly to animals. Rather we must use all that we know about animals, especially those closest to us, to try to guage the quality of their lives in terms appropriate to their species.

However, one cannot be sure that human life will always and in every case be of higher quality than animal life. And if we are to use the life of lower quality in preference to the life of higher quality, assuming that some life or other has to be used then we seem committed to using the human life of lower quality in this case.

Finally, R.G Frey draws a distinction between two different senses of the moral community. He stated that the patient in the final throes of Alzheimer disease or the severely mentally enfeebled are members of the moral community in the sense of having moral standing, since they remain experiential subjects with a welfare and a quality of life that can be diminished by what we do to them. All kinds of human being presently live lives of massively reduced quality – reduced from the quality of life we find in healthy, normal, adult humans. Yet they remain members of the moral community.

On the other hand, patients in a permanently vegetative state are more problematic candidates for membership in the moral community in this first sense. For all accounts of moral community in this first sense are accompanied by disclaimers that animals are moral agents – are capable, in the sense of agency that matters for the assessment of moral responsibility, of acting for and weighing reasons. They are not morally responsible for what they do, because fall outside the moral community in this first sense, but because they do not weigh reasons for action.

Membership in the moral community in the second sense has nothing to do with whether a being is morally considerable. On a quality of life view of the value of a life, being a member of the moral community in the second sense can enrich one's life and therefore, enhance its quality. It does this by informing the relations in which we stand to others and thus affecting how we live and judge our lives.(Frey unpublished)

It should be noted that the very way we live our lives as, for instance, fathers and sons – in order to fulfill what we see as our obligations within these moral relations – forms part of the texture and richness of our lives. We often cannot explain who we are and what we take some of our prized ends in life to be except in terms of these relationship in a moral community, and we often find it difficult to explain why we did something that obviously was at great cost to ourselves except through citing how we see ourselves linked to certain others. Thus, the fact that most humans are the members of the moral community in the second sense is a powerful and important feature of their lives, they can live lives out of their own choosing, moulded, and shaped in the ways they want, in order to reflect and capture the ends and projects they want to pursue.

When we seek to compare human and animal life, then, in order to make judgements about the comparative richness of life, account must be taken of this fashioning of a life for ourselves in a community of shared moral relations. R.G Frey

claims that agency can enable normal adult human to enhance the quality and value of their lives in ways that no account of the activities that we share with animals comprehends, and in seeking to give some account of the comparative value of human and animal lives , this kind of difference is obviously both relevant and important. When we examine critically each of the characteristics differentiating humans from animals which are morally relevant we find that none of them succeeds in establishing the moral superiority of humans.

13.8 PROBLEMS OF MARGINAL PEOPLE

The argument from marginal cases is an argument that attempts to demonstrate that if animals do not have direct moral status, than neither do such human beings as infants, the senile, the severely cognitively disabled, and other such 'marginal cases' of humanity.

Peter Singer has been very influential in the debate concerning animals and ethics. The publication of his animal liberation marked the beginning of a growing and increasingly powerful movement in both the United States and Europe. Singer attacks the views of those who wish to give the interests of animals less weight than the interests of human beings. He argues that if we attempt to extend such unequal consideration to the interests of animals, we will be forced to give unequal consideration to the interests of different human beings. Singer concludes that we must instead extend a principle of equal consideration of interests to animals as well. To defend his point Singer gave two arguments. First is a version of the argument from marginal cases. Singer's version of argument from marginal cases runs as follows——

1) In order to conclude that all and only human beings deserve a full and equal moral status (and therefore that the animals deserve a full and equal moral status), there must be some property P that all and only human beings have that can ground such a claim.
2) Any P that only human beings have is a property that (some) human beings lack(e.g. the marginal cases)
3) Any P that all human beings have is a property that (most) animals have as well.
4) Therefore, there is no way to defend the claim that all and only human beings deserve a full equal moral status.

Singer does not defend his first premise, but does not need to. The proponents of the view that all and only humans deserves a full and equal moral status rely on it themselves. In support of the second premise, Singer ask us to consider exactly what properties only humans have that can ground such a strong moral status, for e.g. being rational, autonomous or able to act morally have all been used to justify giving a stronger status to human beings than we do to animals. The problem with such a suggestion is that not all human beings have these properties. So if this is what grounds a full and equal moral status, it follows that not all human beings are equal after all. The attempt to grant all and only human beings a full and equal moral status does not work accordingly to singer. We must either conclude that not all human beings are equal, or we must conclude that not only human beings are equal; Singer suggests that

the first option is too counter—intuitive to be acceptable, so we are forced to conclude that all animals are equal, human or otherwise.

Tom Regan is of the view that a being with inherent value has rights and these rights act as trumps against the promotion of the overall good. Regan concludes that we must radically alter the ways in which we treat animals, when we rise animals for food, regardless of how they are treated and how they are killed, we are using them as a means to our ends and not treating them as ends in themselves.

Some philosophers are prepared to argue that in fact the marginal human beings don't have rights, most people find that conclusion repellent.

The argument can be rescued by rewriting it like this.

- If an individual is a member of a species that lacks the capacity for free moral judgment than he or she does not have moral rights.
- All non—human animal species lack the capacity for free moral judgment.

Therefore, non –human animals do not have moral rights.

But this is not an argument, it's a statement that human beings have rights and non—human animals don't, which is pure speciesism and hardly persuasive.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: What is the meaning of animal rights?

.....

.....

Q 2: Does animal have moral status?

.....

.....

Q 3: What do you understand by the problem of marginal people?

.....

.....

Q 4: What are the consequences of animal rights?

.....

.....

Q 5: The idea of THE RIGHTS OF ANIMAL has been used to parody the case for whose right?

.....

.....

Q 6: Name two advocates of animal rights.

.....

.....

Q 7: Write the cases for animal rights.

.....

.....

Q 8: Write the cases against animal rights.

.....

.....

Q 9: What do you understand by moral community?

.....

.....

Q 10: Who drew the distinction between two stages of moral community?

.....

.....

13.9 LET US SUM UP

- Along with the issues of moral and politics the issue , issues like moral status of animals should be treated alike.
- Animal rights teaches us that certain things are morally wrong to do to animals like experiments on them, breeding and killing of animals for food, etc.
- Every conscious being has interest that should be respected. No being should be disvalued or used as a resource or commodity.
- Animals should be not use for hard labour.
- The case for animal rights shows that the animal rights movement is a part of the human rights movement and not antagonistic to it.
- The psychological complexity of mammals plays an important role in arguing for their rights.
- Logically we cannot maintain that harm harm alone to us matter morally, but that harm done to this animals do not. Relevantly similar cases must be judged similarly. So if human have rights, so too do these animals.

13.10 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q No. 1 : Animal rights means recognizing that animals are not to be used as our property for food , clothing, entertainment or experiment.

Ans to Q No. 2 : Animals are more like humans in almost all sorts of important ways. So they have moral status.

Ans to Q No. 3 : It is an argument that attempts to demonstrate that if animals do not have direct moral status , then neither do such human beings as infants, the senile, and other such marginal cases of humanity.

Ans to Q No. 4 : The consequences of animal rights are –

- No experiments on animals.
- No breeding and killing animals for food or clothes.
- No use of animals for hard labour.
- No hunting of animals.
- No use of animals in entertainment.

Ans to Q No. 5 : In the past the case of the idea of the rights of animals has been used to parody the case for women's rights.

Ans to Q No. 6 : Peter Singer and Tom Regan.

Ans to Q No. 7 : The cases for animal rights are as follows –

- human beings and animals have similar similar levels of biological complexities.
- like human beings animals also has preferences of likes and dislikes and make conscious choices.
- Like human beings animals also finds the best food and the best shelter for themselves.
- Animals have rights just the same way , for the same reasons and to the same extent that human beings have rights.

Ans to Q No. 8 : The cases against animal rights are as follows ;

- Animals do not think as man do.
- Animals were put on earth to serve human beings.
- Only human beings live in a moral community and not animals.
- Since animals do not behave in a moral way they do not deserve moral rights.
- If animals have rights they should be allowed to vote, marry, file for divorce. Therefore animals have no rights.

Ans to Q No. 9 : Generally moral community is regarded as a group of beings that shares certain characteristics and whose members are bound to observe certain rules of conduct in relation to one another because of their mutual likeness.

Ans to Q No. 10 : R.G FREY drew the distinction between two different senses of moral community.

13.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very Short Question:

Q 1: What do you understand by the concept of animal rights?
Q 2: What is a moral community?
Q 3: State two consequences of animal rights.
Q 4: What are two views regarding of the concept of animal rights?
Q 5: What are two different senses of moral community according to R.G. frey?

B) Short answers (About 100-150 Words)

Q 1: Briefly in details the cases for animal rights.
Q 2: Briefly in details the cases against animal rights.
Q 3: Briefly in details the consequences of animal rights.

C) Long Questions (About 300-500 Words)

Q 1: State Singer's version of the argument from moral cases.
Q 2: Discuss how the idea of ' the rights of animals' has been used to parody the case for women's right.

UNIT 14 : JOHN RAWLS: JUSTICE AS FAIRNESS

UNIT STRUCTURE

14.1 Learning Objectives
14.2 Introduction
14.3 What is Justice?
14.4 Just Distribution
14.5 John Rawl's Theory of Justice
14.6 Criticism
14.7 Conclusion
14.8 Let Us Sum Up
14.9 Further Reading
14.10 Answer to Check Your Progress
14.11 Model Questions

14.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit, you will be able to:

- what is the meaning of justice
- why justice is necessary for the society
- what is Just Distribution
- how Rawl explained about justice in his "Theory of Justice"
- what are the criticism has made against Rawl's "Theory of Justice"

14.2 INTRODUCTION

A Theory of Justice is a work of political philosophy and an ethics by John Rawl's, in which the author attempts to solve the problem of distributive justice by utilizing a variant of the familiar device of social contract. This theory is also known as "Justice of Fairness". It was originally published in 1971 and revised in both 1975 and 1999.

14.3 WHAT IS JUSTICE?

Justice is the legal of philosophical theory by which fairness is administered. It is a central moral standard in social life, is generally held to have a prominent role in social theory and social action.

It is conventional to distinguish 'formal justice'(the law) and material justice(morality and politics), although some theorists of justice treat the two concepts as parallel or overlapping and argue that since legal or criminal justice concerns the distribution of penalties to the guilty. It has much in common with social justice, which deals with the allocation of scarce goods to a population: both are premised on the ideas of due process, impartiality and distribution according to appropriate criteria.

Most academic debate about the concept of justice starts with John Rawl's famous 'difference principle', which asserts that inequalities in the distribution of scarce goods (power, money, access to healthcare, or whatever) are justified only if they serve to increase the advantage of the least favored groups in society.

14.4 JUST DISTRIBUTION

Just distribution or distributive justice concerns the nature of a society just allocation of goods in a society. The concept includes the available quantities of goods, the process by which goods are to be distributed, and the resulting allocation of the goods to the members of the society.

John Rawl himself was particularly concerned with distributive justice, which is about the distribution of what he calls ''the social surplus'—that is, all the things we get only through co-operating in a society.

Rawl believes that justice can be created through just institutions. If what he calls the 'basic structure' of a society is just, then that society will be just. Rawl says that in order to determine which social institutions would be just, we need to discover what kind of social structure would be chosen by rational agents free from prejudice and partiality, that is ,what principles of justice do they think ought to govern the basic institutions of society.

14.5 JOHN RAWL'S THEORY OF JUSTICE

Rawls theory of justice revolves around the adaption of two fundamental principles of justice which would, in turn, guarantee a just and morally acceptable society. The first principle guarantees that right of each person to have the most extensive basic liberty compatible with the liberty of others .The second principle states that social and economic positions are to be

a) to everyone's advantage and

b) Open to all.

A key problem to Rawls is to show how such principles would be universally adopted and here the work borders on general ethical issues. He introduces a theoretical "veil of ignorance" in which all the "players" in the social game would be played in a situation which is called the "original position". Having only a general knowledge of the facts of "life and society", each player is to abide based on their moral obligation, by denying the players any specific information about themselves it forces them to adopt a generalized point of view that bears a strong resemblance to the moral point of view.

Rawl proposes that the most reasonable principles of justice for a society are those that individuals would themselves agree to behind the "veil of ignorance", in circumstances in which each is represented as moral powers. What this position supports is that while each position has different ends and goals, different backgrounds and talents, each ought to have a fair chance to develop his/her talents and pursue those goals fair equality for opportunity. This should be complete cooperation among all so that there may be reasonable life for all.

Why should we accept Rawls principles of justice?

Primarily Rawls principles promote equality among all. Each individual has the same basic liberties and opportunities. Each individual has a moral obligation to accept the existence of every other human being. In doing so, all people become equal in their position and desires. Competition in that what is desired by much perhaps? A benefit of competitive circumstances is the betterment of all parties involved as they must evolve in order to surpass one another.

Also, in fair equality for opportunity we may eliminate all forms of discrimination and discretion of races, ethnic origin, social standards and religious intolerance and beliefs. All of these characteristics are a component of the individual person thus making him/her "individual". Justice is only succumbed when the liberties of an individual are affected because of an external opinion of these characteristics, and in the oppression of these characteristics upon another. They are nothing more than components of a people.

14.6 CRITICISM

In 1974, Rawls' colleague at Harvard, Robert Nozick, published a defense of libertarian justice, *Anarchy, State, and Utopia*.[Another Harvard colleague, Michael Walzer, wrote a defense of communitarian political philosophy, *Spheres of Justice*, as a result of a seminar he co-taught with Nozick. In a related line of criticism, Michael Sandel, also a Harvard colleague, wrote *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*,[6] in which he criticized Rawls for asking us to think about justice while divorced from the values and aspirations that define who we are as persons and that allow us to determine what justice is.

Feminist critics of Rawls, such as Susan Moller Okin, largely focused on weakness of Rawls in accounting for the injustices and hierarchies embedded in familial relations. Rawls argued that justice ought only to apply to the "basic structure of society." Feminists, rallying around the theme of "the personal is political," took Rawls to task for failing to account for injustices found in patriarchal social relations and the gendered division of labor, especially in the household.

14.7 CONCLUSSION

From the above discussion we would have to understand that justice has different understanding for different people. Justice is not only about materiality. It is about a balance among economic inequality, cultural disrespect, sexual disrespect, gender differences and many other issues. Rawl has theorized his understanding of justice by creating a divine between personal and political, but as we understand from the different critique of Rawls, in contemporary time we need a new theory of justice which would try to encapsulate these critiques.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: When Rawls theory of justice published?

.....

.....

Q 2: Rawls Theory of Justice is also known as _____. (Fill in the gap)

Q 3: What is the meaning of justice?

.....

.....

Q 4: What do you mean by Formal Justice and material Justice?

.....

.....

Q 5: What is Just Distribution?

.....

.....

Q 6: Write what are the two principles of Rawls Theory of Justice?

.....

.....

Q 7: Mention the name of some critics of Rawls theory of Justice?

.....

.....

Q 8: At what point did Feminists criticize Rawl?

.....

.....

Q 9: State whether the following statements are true or false.

a) Rawls theory of justice is also known as “Justice of fairness”.
b) Distributive Justice includes the limited quantities of goods.
c) Primarily Rawls principles promote equality among all.
d) Justice is only succumbed when the liberties of an individual are affected.
e) Justice is not about materiality.

14.8 LET US SUM UP

- Justice is the legal of philosophical theory by which fairness is administered.
- Most academic debate about the concept of justice starts with John Rawl’s famous ‘difference principle’, which asserts that inequalities in the distribution of scarce goods (power, money, access to healthcare, or whatever) are justified only if they serve to increase the advantage of the least favored groups in society
- Just distribution or distributive justice concerns the nature of a society just allocation of goods in a society.
- The concept includes the available quantities of goods, the process by which goods are to be distributed, and the resulting allocation of the goods to the members of the society.
- Rawl believes that justice can be created through just institutions.
- Rawls theory of justice revolves around the adaption of two fundamental principles of justice which would, in turn, guarantee a just and morally acceptable society.
- A key problem to Rawls is to show how such principles would be universally adopted and here the work borders on general ethical issues.

- Rawl proposes that the most reasonable principles of justice for a society are those that individuals would themselves agree to behind the "veil of ignorance", in circumstances in which each is represented as moral powers.
- In fair equality for opportunity we may eliminate all forms of discrimination and discretion of races, ethnic origin, social standards and religious intolerance and beliefs.
- Feminist critics of Rawls, such as Susan Moller Okin, largely focused on weakness of Rawls in accounting for the injustices and hierarchies embedded in familial relations.
- Rawls argued that justice ought only to apply to the "basic structure of society."

14.9 FURTHER READING

1. John Scott and Gordon Marshal (2009, 3rd edition): Oxford Dictionary of Sociology
2. Helen McCabe, "John Rawls and Justice", Philosophy now: A Magazine Idea
3. John Rawls theory of Justice: Summery and Analysis, School work Helper
4. "Justice ", Political Theory: Concept and Debates, Virtual Learning Environment, ILL

14.10 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Ans to Q.1: Rawls theory of Justice was originally published in 1971 and revised in both 1975 and 1999.

Ans to Q.2: "Justice of fairness".

Ans to Q.3: Justice is the legal of philosophical theory by which fairness is administered. It is a central moral standard in social life, is generally held to have a prominent role in social theory and social action.

Ans to Q.4: Formal justice is based on the Law and Material justice is based on morality and politics.

Ans to Q.5: Just distribution or distributive justice concerns the nature of a society just allocation of goods in a society. The concept includes the available quantities of goods, the process by which goods are to be distributed, and the resulting allocation of the goods to the members of the society.

Ans to Q.6: The two principles of Rawls theory of justice are,

i) The first principle guarantees that right of each person to have the most extensive basic liberty compatible with the liberty of others.

ii) The second principle states that social and economic positions are to be to everyone's advantage and Open to all.

Ans to Q.7: Robert Nozick,, Michael Sandel, Michael Walzer, and so many.

Ans to Q.8: Feminist critics of Rawls, such as Susan Moller Okin, largely focused on

weakness of Rawls in accounting for the injustices and hierarchies embedded in familial relations. Rawls argued that justice ought only to apply to the "basic structure of society."

Ans to Q.10: **a)** True **b)** false **c)** True **d)** True **e)** False

14.11 MODEL QUESTIONS

A. Very shorts questions

Q 1: In the theory Rawls attempt to solve what?
Q 2: What is the main topic for the most academic debate about the concept justice?
Q 3: What is original position?
Q 4: What issue does a political conception of justice address?

B. Short questions (Answer each question about 150 words)

Q 1: What is the "social surplus" for Rawls?
Q 2: What is "veil of ignorance"? Discuss.
Q 3: When is our social situation is just?
Q 4: What should be the basic structure of society for Rawls?
Q 5: For Rawls what were the most reasonable principles of justice?

C: Write short notes on (answer each in about 250 words)

Q 1: What does Rawls mean by Justice as Fairness?
Q 2: Why should we accept Rawls principles of justice?
Q 3: Why Rawl believes that justice can be created through just institutions?
Q 4: Why a new theory on justice is needed in the contemporary time?

D. Long Questions) Answer each question in about 300-500 words)

Q 1: What is Rawls Theory of Justice? Explain.
Q 2: Explain how the different theorists had criticized Rawls?

UNIT 15 : JUSTICE AND EQUALITY

UNIT STRUCTURE

15.1 Learning Objectives
15.2 Introduction
15.3 Meaning of Justice and Equality
15.4 Relation Between Justice and Equality
15.5 Different Thinkers' Views on Justice and Equality
15.6 Let us Sum up
15.7 Further Reading
15.8 Answer to Check Your Progress
15.9 Model Questions

15.1 LEARNING OBJECTIVES

After going through this unit you will be able to:

- know that knowledge about the concept of Justice and equality
- know the meaning of the concept of Justice and equality
- know the relation between the concept of Justice and equality
- know about different thinkers' views on the concept of Justice and equality

15.2 INTRODUCTION

In philosophy, justice is the concept of a proper proportion between a person's desires and the good and bad things that befall or are allotted to him or her. Justice, in its broadest context, includes both the attainment of that which is just and the philosophical discussion of that which is just. The concept of justice is based on numerous fields, and many differing viewpoints and perspectives including the concepts of moral correctness based on ethics, rationality, law, religion, equity and fairness. Often, the general discussion of justice is divided into the realm of social justice as found in philosophy, theology and religion, and, procedural justice as found in the study and application of the law.

Justice is the most important and most discussed objective of the State, and Society. It is the basis of orderly human living. Justice demands the regulation of selfish actions of people for securing a fair distribution, equal treatment of equals, and proportionate and just rewards for all. It stands for harmony between individual interests and the interests of society.

Justice is of central importance to political theory. In defending or opposing laws, policies, decisions and actions of government, appeals are made in the name of justice. Justice is a complex concept and touches almost every aspect of human life. The word 'Justice' has been derived from the Latin word 'Jungere' meaning 'to bind or to tie together'. The word 'Jus' also means 'Tie' or 'Bond'. In this way, justice can be defined as a system in which men are tied or joined in a close relationship. Justice seeks to harmonise different .values and to organise upon it all human relations. As such, justice means bonding,

joining, or organising people together into a right or fair order of relationships.

Equality is about ensuring that every individual has an equal opportunity to make the most of their lives and talents. It is also the belief that no one should have poorer life chances because of the way they were born, where they come from, what they believe, or whether they have a disability. Equality recognises that historically certain groups of people with protected characteristics such as race, disability, sex and sexual orientation have experienced discrimination.

Equality is when things are the same (equal) in some particular way. Equality means "the state of being equal." It's one of the ideals a democratic society, and so the fight to attain different kinds of equality, like racial equality, gender equality, or equality of opportunity between rich and poor, is often associated with progress toward that ideal of everyone being truly equal. Equality does not have to be used only for social ideals, though. There can be equality in weight between two barrels of apples, or between two molecules.

15.3 MEANING OF JUSTICE AND EQUALITY

According to Salmond "Justice means to distribute the due share to everybody". Justice protects the rights of the individual as well as the order of society. Justice consists in a system of understandings and a procedure through which each is accorded what is agreed upon as fair. In other words, justice means securing and protecting of rights of all in a fair way. It stands for harmony among all the people, orderly living and securing of rights of all in a just and fair way. Justice is related to mutual relationships of persons living in society. Justice is based on values and traditions of society. Justice is related to all aspects of aspects of human behaviour in society. Laws are made and courts are set up with this aim in view. Aim of justice is to provide equal rights, opportunities and facilities to all in a fair way. The function of justice is to harmonise individual interests with the interests of society. Justices is a primary value and it is inseparably related to other values like liberty, equality, and property. Justice is the principle of balancing or reconciling human relations in society in such a way as enables each one to get his due rights and punishment. Justice has several dimensions: social justice, economic justice, political justice and legal justice.

According to John Rawls of Harvard University, *"Justice is the first virtue of social institutions."* He made this statement in his book, A Theory of justice, which was published in 1971. Justice is of central importance in political practice and theory. In defending or opposing laws, public policies and administrative decisions of governments, appeals are made to notices of justice.

In common, usage equality is taken to mean full equality of treatment and reward for all. It is demanded as natural equality. It is said that all men are born natural and free. However, despite a strong emotional appeal to our hearts, the notion of natural and absolute equality of all cannot be fully accepted and realized. Men are neither equal in respect of their physical features nor in respect of their mental abilities. Some are stronger others weaker and some are more intelligent and capable than others. Their capacities and abilities are different. As such equality of treatment and rewards cannot be ensured. Rewards must depend upon the actual abilities and work of various people. Hence, equality does not mean absolute and total equality. Equality really means equal opportunities for

development. In fact, when we talk of equality of all men we really mean general and fair equality and not absolute equality. We really talk of a fair distribution of opportunities reward and not equal reward for all. Equality means absence of all unnatural and unjust inequalities.

Equality aims to ensure that everyone gets the same things in order to enjoy full, healthy lives. On the other hand, equity involves trying to understand and give people what they need, to enjoy healthy lives. Sometimes, these terms are used in an interchangeable manner, which leads to confusion. For e.g. like equity, equality also aims to promote fairness and justice, but it can only work if everyone starts from the same place and needs the same things. There exists a thin layer of similarity in purpose but different approach has to be applied for fair results. One might think both are pretty much the same but in actuality, they are very different concepts that cannot be accurately explained by a simple definition. Justice is the collective responsibility of a free and just society, to ensure that civil and human rights are preserved and protected for each individual regardless of gender, race, ethnicity, nation of origin, sexual orientation, class, physical or mental ability, and age. It can be considered, as a scheme of law in which every person receives his's/her's/it's due from the system, including all rights, both natural and legal. It is good to understand the difference between equity and equality as it helps us to recognize and respond to the differences.



CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 1: State whether the following statements are true or false:

(a) Justice is the concept of a proper proportion between a person's desires and the good and bad things that befall or are allotted to him or her. (True/False)

(b) According to Salmond "Justice means to distribute the due share to everybody". (True/False)

Q 2: What is the origin of the word "Justice"?

.....

.....



ACTIVITY

Briefly discuss about the meaning of the concepts of justice and equality.

.....

.....

15.4 RELATION BETWEEN JUSTICE AND EQUALITY

We usually use the word equality in status, rights and opportunities. Justice is fairness, righteousness, morals, impartiality or neutrality. It is the system of being morally correct or fair. So, equality is based on society's rules where everybody is expected to follow to maintain a peaceful co-existence within that society. And that rule is equal to all, which means it does not excempt people in authority, or people whose position in life, rich or poor, would be given unequal conclusion or resolution reached after consideration which

favours only moneyed people.

Justice is a decision followed in the active courts. Decisions are given based on fairness, righteousness, morals, impartiality or neutrality.In a society where fairness or justice is prioritized, we could easily surmise that justice is alive. People are happy in trusting their government. If that is the case, people and government moved in one direction. This positive setting between government and people would naturally pushed for a greater life for all. This may sound idealistic, but there is possibility in it. Many countries had attained it.

Through its connection with justice, equality, like justice itself, has different *justitianda*, i.e., objects the term 'just' or 'equal' or their opposites can be applied to. These are mainly actions, persons, social institutions, and circumstances (e.g. distributions). These objects of justice stand in an internal connection and order that can here only be hinted at. The predicates "just" or "unjust" are only applicable when *voluntary* actions implying responsibility are in question. Justice is hence primarily related to individual actions. Individual persons are the primary bearer of responsibilities (ethical individualism). Persons have to take responsibility for their individual actions and for circumstances they could change through such actions or omissions. Although people have responsibility for both their actions and circumstances, there is a moral difference between the two *justitianda*, i.e., an injustice due to unjust treatment through an individual or collective action and an injustice due to a failure to correct unjust circumstances (cf. 3.1.v. below). The responsibility people have to treat individuals and groups they affect in a morally appropriate and, in particular, even-handed way has hence a certain priority over their moral duty to turn circumstances into just ones through some kind of equalization. Establishing justice of circumstances (ubiquitously and simultaneously) is beyond any given individual's capacities. Hence one has to rely on collective actions. In order to meet this moral duty, a basic order guaranteeing just circumstances must be justly created. This is an essential argument of justice in favor of establishing social institutions and fundamental state structures for political communities; with the help of such institutions and structures, individuals can collectively fulfill their responsibility in the best possible manner. If circumstances can be rightly judged to be unjust, all persons have the responsibility and moral duty, both individually and collectively, to change the pertinent circumstances or distributive schemes into just ones. In the following sections, the objects of equality may vary from topic to topic. However, as indicated, there is a close relationship between the objects. The next three principles of equality hold generally and primarily for all actions and treatment of others and for resulting circumstances. From the fourth principle onward, i.e., starting with the presumption of equality, this article is mainly concerned with distributive justice and the evaluation of distribution.

15.5 DIFFERENT THINKERS' VIEWS ON JUSTICE AND EQUALITY

For Plato, justice is a virtue establishing rational order, with each part performing its appropriate role and not interfering with the proper functioning of other parts. Aristotle says justice consists in what is lawful and fair, with fairness involving equitable

distributions and the correction of what is inequitable. For Augustine, the cardinal virtue of justice requires that we try to give all people their due; for Aquinas, justice is that rational mean between opposite sorts of injustice, involving proportional distributions and reciprocal transactions. Hobbes believed justice is an artificial virtue, necessary for civil society, a function of the voluntary agreements of the social contract; for Hume, justice essentially serves public utility by protecting property. For Kant, it is a virtue whereby we respect others' freedom, autonomy, and dignity by not interfering with their voluntary actions, so long as those do not violate others' rights; Mill said justice is a collective name for the most important social utilities, which are conducive to fostering and protecting human liberty. Rawls analyzed justice in terms of maximum equal liberty regarding basic rights and duties for all members of society, with socio-economic inequalities requiring moral justification in terms of equal opportunity and beneficial results for all; and various post-Rawlsian philosophers develop alternative conceptions.

Aurelius Augustine conception of justice is the familiar one of "the virtue by which all people are given their due." But this is connected to something new and distinctly Christian—the distinction between the temporal law, such as the law of the state, and the eternal, divine law of God. The eternal law establishes the order of God's divine providence. And, since all temporal or human law must be consistent with God's eternal law, Augustine can draw the striking conclusion that, strictly speaking, "an unjust law is no law at all,"

Whereas Plato, Aristotle, Augustine, and Aquinas all offer accounts of justice that represent alternatives to Sophism, Thomas Hobbes, the English radical empiricist, can be seen as resurrecting the Sophist view that we can have no objective knowledge of it as a moral or political absolute value. His radical empiricism does not allow him to claim to know anything not grounded in concrete sense experience. This leads him in *Leviathan*, his masterpiece, to conclude that anything real must be material or corporeal in nature, that body is the one and only sort of reality; this is the philosophical position of materialistic monism, which rules out the possibility of any spiritual substance. On this view, "*a man is a living body*," only different in kind from other animals, but with no purely spiritual soul separating him from the beasts. Like other animals, man is driven by instinct and appetite, his reason being a capacity of his brain for calculating means to desirable ends. Another controversial claim here is that all actions, including all human actions, are causally determined to occur as they do by the complex of their antecedent conditions; this is causal determinism. What we consider voluntary actions are simply those we perform in which the will plays a significant causal role, human freedom amounting to nothing more exalted than the absence of external restraints. Like other animals, we are always fundamentally motivated by a survival instinct and ultimately driven by self-interest in all of our voluntary actions; this is psychological egoism.

Hume adopts a position which, in the twentieth century, has been called a "rule utilitarian" view of justice, writing that, though individual acts of justice might be contrary to public utility, they ought to be performed if they are conducive to "a general scheme or system" of conduct that benefits society as a whole. Yet the rules of justice that are normally conducive to public utility are never absolute and can be legitimately contravened where following them would seem to do more harm than good to our society. He applies this view to the issue of civil disobedience, which is normally unjust because it threatens "public utility" but can be justified as a last resort "in extraordinary circumstances" when

that same public utility is in jeopardy. Whether that is or is not the case in specific circumstances becomes a judgment call.

Equality in its prescriptive usage has, of course, a close connection with morality and justice in general and distributive justice in particular. From antiquity onward, equality has been considered a constitutive feature of justice. Throughout history, people and emancipatory movements use the language of justice to pillory certain inequalities. However, what exactly is the connection between equality and justice, i.e., what kind of role does equality play in a theory of justice? The role and correct account of equality, understood as an issue of social justice, is itself a difficult philosophical issue. To clarify this, philosophers have defended a variety of principles and conceptions of equality, many of which are mentioned in the following discussion. This section introduces four well known principles of equality, ranging from highly general and uncontroversial to more specific and controversial. The next section reviews various conceptions of the 'currency' of equality. Different interpretations of the role of equality in a theory of justice emerge according to which of the four following principles and which measure has been adopted.

CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Q 3: State whether the following statements are true or false:

(a) Justice is fairness, righteousness, morals, impartiality or neutrality. It is the system of being morally correct or fair.(True/ False)

Q 4: Equality in its prescriptive usage has, of course, a close connection with morality and justice in general and distributive justice in particular. From antiquity onward, equality has been considered a constitutive feature of justice. (True/False)

ACTIVITY

Discuss Plato and Aristotle's view about justice and equality.

.....

.....

15.6 LET US SUM UP

- Justice is the concept of a proper proportion between a person's desires and the good and bad things that befall or are allotted to him or her.
- The word 'Justice' has been derived from the Latin word 'Jungere' meaning 'to bind or to tie together'. The word 'Jus' also means 'Tie' or 'Bond'. In this way, justice can be defined as a system in which men are tied or joined in a close relationship.
- Equality is about ensuring that every individual has an equal opportunity to make the most of their lives and talents. It is also the belief that no one should have poorer life chances because of the way they were born, where they come from, what they believe, or whether they have a disability. Equality recognises that historically certain groups of people with protected characteristics such as race,

disability, sex and sexual orientation have experienced discrimination.

- According to Salmond "Justice means to distribute the due share to everybody".
- John Rawls of Harvard University, *"Justice is the first virtue of social institutions."* He made this statement in his book, A Theory of justice, which was published in 1971. Justice is of central importance in political practice and theory. In defending or opposing laws, public policies and administrative decisions of governments, appeals are made to notices of justice.
- Equality aims to ensure that everyone gets the same things in order to enjoy full, healthy lives. On the other hand, equity involves trying to understand and give people what they need, to enjoy healthy lives.
- For Plato, justice is a virtue establishing rational order, with each part performing its appropriate role and not interfering with the proper functioning of other parts. Aristotle says justice consists in what is lawful and fair, with fairness involving equitable distributions and the correction of what is inequitable.
- Hume adopts a position which, in the twentieth century, has been called a "rule utilitarian" view of justice, writing that, though individual acts of justice might be contrary to public utility, they ought to be performed if they are conducive to "a general scheme or system" of conduct that benefits society as a whole.

15.7 FURTHER READING

1. Rawls, John, 1971, A theory of Justice, Belknap, United States
2. Sen, Amartya, 2009, The Idea of Justice, Allen Lane & Harvard University Press,
3. Sandel, Michael, 2008, Justice: What is the right thing to do?, Allen Lane, Penguine Books.
4. Bourgeois, Trudy, 2017, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform; 1 edition (October 26, 2017)

15.8 ANSWER TO CHECK YOUR PROGRESS

Answer to Q.no. 1: (a) True (b) true

Answer to Q.no. 2: The word 'Justice' has been derived from the Latin word 'Jungere' meaning 'to bind or to tie together'. The word 'Jus' also means 'Tie' or 'Bond'. In this way, justice can be defined as a system in which men are tied or joined in a close relationship.

Answer to Q.no.3: (a) True (b) True

Answer to Q.no. 4: John Rawls of Harvard University, *"Justice is the first virtue of social institutions."* He made this statement in his book, A Theory of justice, which was published in 1971. Justice is of central importance in political practice and theory. In defending or opposing laws, public policies and administrative decisions of governments, appeals are made to notices of justice.

15.9 MODEL QUESTIONS

A) Very short questions

Q 1: Define Justice.

Q 2: Define Equality.

Q 3: From where did the word “Justice” come?

Q 4: Who said, *“Justice is the first virtue of social institutions.”* /

Q 5: What is Salmond’s definition of Justice?

B) Short questions

Q 1: What is the origin of the word “Justice”/

Q 2: State the relation between justice and equality.

Q 3: What was Plato’s view about justice?

C) Long questions

Q 1: Give a detailed discussion about justice and equality.

Q 2: Describe the relation between justice and equality.

Q 3: Discuss about the different philosophers view about justice and equality.

REFERENCE

1. Ashcroft, R. E. (2007). *Principles of Health Care Ethics.* John Wiley & Sons.
2. Ashley, B. M., & O'Rourke, K. D. (2002). *Ethics of Health Cre: An Introductory Textbook.* Georgetown University Press.
3. Ashley, B. M., DeBlois, J., & O'Rourke, K. D. (2006). *Health Care Ethics: A Catholic Theological Analysis.* Georgetown University Press.
4. Alvarez, A., 1982, The Savage God: A Study of Suicide. New York: Bentham.
5. Burke, Edmund. 'A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful'. 1757.
6. Bourgeois, Trudy, 2017, CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform; 1 edition (October 26, 2017)
7. Craig, E. (1998). Moral agency. In E. Craig (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of philosophy*. Routledge.
8. Donnelly, J. (Ed.), 1998, Suicide: Right or Wrong? Amherst, NY: Promthens.
9. Dwyer, S., & Feinberg, J. (1997). The Problem of Abortion. wdworth Publishing Company.
10. Economides, Louise. 'The Ecology of Wonder in Romantic and Postmodern Literature'. Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.
11. Edwards, J. (1754/2004). *The freedom of the will*. Yale University Press.
12. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics.
13. Frankfurt, H. G. (1971). Freedom of the will and the concept of a person. *The Journal of Philosophy, 68*(1), 5–20. https://doi.org/10.2307/2024717
14. Helen McCabe, "John Rawls and Justice", Philosophy now: A Magazine Idea
15. Hilpinen, Risto. (2004). "Artifact." 'Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy'.
16. Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy – Human Rights
17. Jamieson, Dale. *Ethics and Environment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009.
18. John, H. Piet & Ayodhya Prasad. *An Introduction to Applied Ethics.*
19. John Scott and Gordon Marshal (2009, 3rd edition): Oxford Dictionary of Sociology
20. John Rawls theory of Justice: Summery and Analysis, School work Helper
21. Joiner, T., 2005, Why People Die by Suicide. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
22. Jonsen, A. (2000). *A Short History of Medical Ethics.* Oxford University Press.
23. Jonsen, A. R. (2010). A History of Bioethics as Discipline and Discourse. In N. S. Jecker, A. R. Jonsen, & R. A. Pearlman, *Bioethics: An Introduction to the History, Method, and Practice.* Jones and Bartlett.
24. "Justice ", Political Theory: Concept and Debates, Virtual Learning Environment, ILL
25. Kant, Immanuel. 'Critique of Judgment'. 1790.
26. Kant, I. (1997). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)
27. LaFollette, Hugh (2002). Ethics in practice: an anthology. Oxford: Blackwell.

28. Lee, Choong Hoon. 'A Romantic Theodicy: Sublime and Grotesque in Les Misérables by Victor Hugo." 'Literature and Film', vol. 14, no. 3, 2013, pp. 585-614.
29. Longinus. 'On the Sublime'. 1st century CE.
30. Mepham, B. (2005). *Bioethics: An Introduction for the Biosciences.* Oxford University Press.
31. Monk, Samuel Holt. *The Sublime: A Study of Critical Theories in XVIII-Century England*. 1935.
32. Nicolson, Marjorie Hope. 'Mountain Gloom and Mountain Glory: The Development of the Aesthetics of the Infinite'. 1959.
33. O'Neill, O. (2002). *Autonomy and Trust in Bioethics.* Cambridge University Press.
34. Patrick Hayden.(2001) *Philosophy of Human Rights*: *Readings in Context*. Paragaon House Publishers
35. Perrett RW (October 1996). "Buddhism, euthanasia and the sanctity of life". J Med Ethics
36. Plumly, Stanley. 'Elegy Landscapes: Constable and Turner and the Intimate Sublime'. W. W. Norton, 2018.
37. Rawls, John, 1971, A theory of Justice, Belknap, United States
38. Rachels J (January 1975). "Active and passive euthanasia". N. Engl. J. Med.
39. Rachels, J (ed). 1997, *Moral Problems,* Harper Collins Publishers.
40. Reich, W. (1978). Introduction. In W. Reich, *The Encyclopedia of Bio-ethics* (Vol. 1, pp. xiv-xx). The Free Press.
41. Rolston Holmes III. *Environmental Ethics*. Temple University Press, 1989
42. Rolston, H., III. (1988). *Environmental ethics: Duties to and values in the natural world*. Temple University Press.
43. Sandel, Michael, 2008, Justice: What is the right thing to do?, Allen Lane, Penguine Books.
44. Sen, Amartya, 2009, The Idea of Justice, Allen Lane & Harvard University Press,
45. Singer, Peter, 2011, *Applied Ethics*, Oxford University Press.
46. Singer, Peter, 1979, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge University Press.
47. Simon, Herbert A. (1996). 'The Sciences of the Artificial' (3rd ed.). MIT Press.
48. Sinha, J.N., Manual of Ethics, New Central Book Agency (p) Ltd. London
49. Shneidman, E. S., 1998, The Suicidal Mind, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
50. Steven Luper & Curtis Brown, The Moral Life, Second Edition, Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
51. Tanzi—A Text-book of mental Diseases,
52. Vincent, Patrick. "The Romantic Sublime." 'The Cambridge History of European Romantic Literatur', Cambridge University Press, 2023.
53. Weiskel, Thomas. 'The Romantic Sublime: Studies in the Structure and Psychology of Transcendence'. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1976.
54. William, B. (1993). *Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy.* Fontana
55. World History Encyclopaedia. "The Idea of the Sublime in the Enlightenment."