

A CRITIQUE OF PETER SINGER'S SENTIENCE PRINCIPLE AS THE BASIS FOR ANIMALS' MORAL CONSIDERABILITY

Douglas, Jude Monday

Department Of Philosophy,
Adekunle Ajasin University, Akungba-Akoko, Ondo State, Nigeria
jude.douglas@aaau.edu.ng/douglasjudemonday1996@gmail.com
Phone: 09136512907

Abstract

Peter Singer's sentience principle, which is drawn from utilitarian foundations, has emerged as one of the most influential frameworks for grounding animals' moral considerability in contemporary bioethics and moral philosophy. The principle holds that the capacity to feel pleasure and pain is the sole criterion for inclusion within the moral community. This is a position that challenges speciesist assumptions but raises its own set of philosophical difficulties. Despite its wide acceptance, Singer's sentience principle suffers from several critical inadequacies, including its reductionist tendency, its failure to account for non-sentient living beings, its problematic implications in the marginal cases argument, and its neglect of relational and communal conceptions of moral status as found in African philosophical traditions. This paper adopts a critical-analytical methodology, engaging closely with Singer's primary texts and subjecting them to rigorous philosophical scrutiny. It draws on Western analytic philosophy as well as African philosophical thought, particularly Ubuntu ethics and Ibanyidanda complementary ontology, to construct a multi-perspectival critique. The paper finds that while Singer's principle is a significant advance over speciesist frameworks, it remains philosophically incomplete. Its utilitarian calculus reduces moral worth to a single criterion, excludes vast categories of living beings, and fails to engage meaningfully with relational and communitarian dimensions of moral life. A more adequate framework for animals' moral considerability must transcend the limitations of the sentience principle and embrace a pluralistic, relational, and ecosystem-sensitive approach to moral status, one that incorporates the insights of both Western and African philosophical traditions.

Keywords: Sentience principle, peter singer, moral considerability; utilitarianism, african philosophy, ubuntu; speciesism, ibanyidanda.

1. Introduction

This paper emerges from my long-standing fascination with the intersection of moral philosophy, animal welfare, and African thought. Having received philosophy lectures at the university level for some years, I find myself returning again and again to the question that has haunted Western ethics since the Enlightenment: who, or what, counts morally? My engagement with Singer's work began as admiration; it has since deepened into a critical appreciation, shaped in no small part by the rich resources of African philosophical traditions that too often go unnoticed in global bioethical discourse.

I have sat under trees that communities regard as sacred, not because they are sentient in Singer's sense, but because they stand at the centre of a web of relationships, ecological, social, and spiritual, that constitutes the life of the community. It is from this lived experience, as much as from the academic literature, that the argument of this paper grows. I dedicate this inquiry to every student who has ever sat in my classroom and dared to ask the uncomfortable question.

There is a moment in the history of moral philosophy when the question of who counts, who matters, who deserves to be considered in our moral calculations, ceased to be a comfortable, settled matter. Peter Singer, the Australian utilitarian philosopher, provided one such moment with the publication of *Animal Liberation* in 1975, a work that forced the philosophical community, and indeed the wider public, to confront the uncomfortable reality of how human beings treat other animals. At the heart of Singer's project is what I shall call the sentience principle, the claim that the capacity to experience pleasure and pain is both necessary and sufficient for inclusion in the moral community. This principle, grounded in Jeremy Bentham's famous observation that the morally relevant question is not "Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?", has since become the cornerstone of much contemporary animal ethics.

I find Singer's argument both compelling and profoundly unsatisfying, and it is the tension between these two reactions that drives this inquiry. The sentience principle does important moral work; it dismantles the arbitrary boundary that speciesism erects between human and non-human animals, and it forces us to take seriously the interests of creatures who cannot speak for themselves in the language of human moral discourse. And yet, as I shall argue in the pages that follow, the principle is philosophically inadequate as a complete foundation for animals' moral considerability. It is reductionist in its insistence on a single criterion for moral status; it is exclusionary in its treatment of non-sentient living beings; it generates paradoxical implications in the so-called argument from marginal cases; and it is culturally impoverished in its neglect of the rich relational and communitarian frameworks that African philosophical traditions bring to the question of moral considerability.

This paper proceeds as follows. I begin with a careful exposition of Singer's sentience principle; trace its utilitarian foundations and its application to the question of animals' moral status. I then subject the principle to a series of critical philosophical challenges, which are drawn both from Western analytic philosophy and from African philosophical thought, with particular attention to *Ubuntu* ethics and Innocent Asouzu's Ibanyidanda complementary ontology. I proceed, thereafter, to examine the exclusion of non-sentient life and the paradox of speciesism within Singer's framework. I conclude by sketching the outlines of a more adequate, pluralistic, and relational framework for thinking about animals' moral considerability, one that retains the best insights of Singer's position while transcending its limitations.

2. Singer's Sentience Principle: An Exposition

To engage critically with Singer's sentience principle, one must first understand it on its own terms, and one must resist the temptation to construct a strawman where a serious philosophical position stands. Singer's argument, as he develops it in *Animal Liberation* and *Practical Ethics*, is elegant in its simplicity and radical in its implications. The argument proceeds from a utilitarian premise: the right action is that which maximises the overall satisfaction of interests, and every being whose interests are affected by an action has a claim to equal consideration of those interests. The critical question, then, is which beings have interests in the morally relevant sense, and Singer's answer is unambiguous: sentient beings, those capable of experiencing pleasure and pain, are the bearers of interests, and are therefore the proper subjects of moral consideration.

Singer draws explicitly on Bentham in grounding this claim. Bentham's famous footnote to the *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation* reads as follows: "The question is not, Can they reason? nor, Can they talk? but, Can they suffer?"¹ This shift from rationality and language as the criteria of moral status to sentience, to the bare capacity for suffering and enjoyment, is, Singer argues, the philosophical move that opens the door to genuine moral consideration of non-human animals. To feel the full force of this shift is to understand why Singer's work represented a rupture in the history of moral philosophy; it proposed that the boundary of the moral community was drawn in the wrong place, and that it needed to be redrawn along lines of sentience rather than species.²

Singer is careful to distinguish between equal consideration and equal treatment. He does not claim that all sentient beings must be treated identically; only that their interests must receive equal weight in our moral calculations. In his own words, "the principle of the equal consideration of interests does not dictate equal treatment."³ A pig and a human being both have an interest in not suffering; this shared interest commands equal moral consideration, even if the precise form that consideration takes may differ. This distinction is important because it allows Singer to avoid the *reductio ad absurdum* that a mouse's interest in living must be treated as equivalent to a human being's. What matters, on Singer's view, is the nature and intensity of the interests at stake, not the species of the being who holds them.⁴

The strength of this position is considerable. It provides a clear, principled, and non-arbitrary criterion for moral inclusion; it has the virtue of simplicity; and it demands a radical revision of the ways in which human societies treat non-human animals, from factory farming to medical experimentation. These are not trivial achievements, and I do not wish to minimise them. Nevertheless, as I shall proceed to argue, the sentience principle, as a complete and sufficient basis for animals' moral considerability, fails at several critical junctures.

3. The Reductionist Fallacy: One Criterion, Many Beings

The first, and perhaps most fundamental, objection to Singer's sentience principle is that it commits what I shall call the reductionist fallacy: the assumption that the rich and complex question of moral status can be resolved by a single criterion. Moral philosophy has long grappled with the difficulty of providing a unified account of moral status, and there are good reasons to be suspicious of any theory that claims to have found the one criterion that settles the matter. The history of moral philosophy is, in no small measure, a history of failed single-criterion theories; and the sentience principle, for all its virtues, is, I shall argue, another entry in that unhappy catalogue.

Tom Regan, whose rights-based approach to animal ethics stands as the most important alternative to Singer's utilitarian framework, argues that what grounds moral status is not merely sentience but the possession of inherent value, a value that belongs to beings who are what Regan calls "subjects-of-a-life." For Regan, a subject-of-a-life is an individual who has "beliefs and desires; perception, memory, and a sense of the future, including their own future; an emotional life together with feelings of pleasure and pain; preference and welfare interests; the ability to initiate action in pursuit of their desires and goals."⁵ This richer criterion, Regan argues, better captures the moral significance of individual animals without reducing that significance to a utilitarian calculus of pleasures and pains. It is a criterion that I find more philosophically satisfying than Singer's, precisely because it attends to the qualitative complexity of animal experience rather than reducing that experience to its hedonic dimension.

Now, I think Regan is right that Singer's sentience principle is too thin a foundation for a fully satisfying account of moral status. But I also think that Regan's own criterion, in its turn, is too narrow, insofar as it still excludes vast categories of living beings, including plants, trees, rivers, and ecosystems, whose moral significance is increasingly recognised in environmental ethics and in many non-Western philosophical traditions. The point I wish to press here is not that sentience is irrelevant to moral status, but that it is insufficient as the sole criterion. Christine Korsgaard, in her searching examination of the moral status of animals, argues that what grounds an animal's claim to moral consideration is not merely its capacity to suffer but its status as a being for whom things can go well or badly, a being with a perspective on its own existence.⁶ This is a richer and, I think, a more defensible criterion than bare sentience.

In the Nigerian and African philosophical context, this reductionist tendency in Singer's thought is particularly striking. The Igbo philosophical concept of "ibuanyidanda," which Innocent Asouzu develops into his Ibuanyidanda complementary ontology, insists that reality is constituted by the complementary interrelation of all beings, and that every being has a place in this web of interrelations that is not reducible to a single property. As Asouzu argues, "every being is a missing link of other beings,"⁷ and the moral significance of a being is not a function of any one of its properties, such as sentience, but of its place within the network of interdependent relationships that constitutes the fabric of existence. This perspective does not deny the moral significance of sentience; it situates sentience within a broader relational ontology that enriches, rather than replaces, the utilitarian calculus. It is, I submit, a perspective that Singer's framework cannot accommodate, and that points toward its most significant philosophical limitation.

4. The Problem of Marginal Cases

The second major objection to Singer's sentience principle arises from what philosophers call the argument from marginal cases, and it is an objection that cuts deeply into the foundations of Singer's project because it uses his own logic against him. The argument has been pressed by several philosophers with considerable force, and it deserves careful examination.

The argument runs as follows. Singer grounds moral consideration in sentience, the capacity to feel pleasure and pain. All sentient beings, human and non-human alike, are entitled to equal consideration of their interests. This means that a chimpanzee, whose capacity for suffering may equal or exceed that of a severely cognitively impaired human being, is entitled to equal moral consideration with that human being. If we grant that the cognitively impaired human being has full moral status, then consistency demands that we grant the same status to the chimpanzee; if we deny it to the chimpanzee, then consistency demands that we deny it to the cognitively impaired human being as well.⁸ Singer, to his credit, grasps the full implications of this argument and does not flinch from them. He argues that any refusal to grant equal moral consideration to animals whose sentient capacities match those of certain human beings is a form of speciesism, morally equivalent to racism or sexism.⁹

But this position generates difficulties that Singer does not fully resolve. First, the argument from marginal cases threatens to undermine, rather than to strengthen, the case for animal rights. If we are to base moral status on a comparison of sentient capacities, then the moral status of individual animals will vary enormously depending on the sophistication of their neural and experiential lives; a conclusion that many find deeply counterintuitive. A great ape would rank far above an oyster, and a human infant would rank somewhere between the two, depending on the stage of development. This sliding scale of moral status, based on sentient capacity, is, I submit, a philosophically uncomfortable position.

Second, and more fundamentally, the argument from marginal cases reveals a deeper problem with the utilitarian framework that underpins Singer's sentience principle: it reduces moral status to a comparative, quantitative matter, and in doing so, it threatens the intuition that every individual, regardless of their cognitive or sentient capacities, possesses a dignity that is not commensurate with that of any other being. The Nigerian towering scholar, Emmanuel Ofuasia has argued, in this connection, that the African relational ethics tradition, by grounding moral status in relationship and community rather than in individual capacity, avoids the troubling implications of the marginal cases argument while still providing a robust basis for moral consideration of animals.¹⁰ On the African relational view, moral status is not a matter of possessing a certain quantity of sentient experience; it is a matter of standing in certain kinds of relationships, and every being, regardless of its cognitive or sentient capacities, stands in relationships that ground a claim to moral consideration.

I find this argument persuasive, and I think it points to a genuine and serious limitation in Singer's framework. The sentience principle, precisely because it grounds moral status in an individual property, is unable to account for the relational dimensions of moral life that are, arguably, among the most important dimensions. It is not only that sentient beings matter; it is that they matter in relation to one another, in relation to the communities of which they are part, and in relation to the natural world that sustains them. A moral philosophy that cannot account for these relational dimensions is, however powerful in other respects, incomplete.

5. The Exclusion of Non-Sentient Life

The third major objection to Singer's sentience principle is its systematic exclusion of non-sentient living beings from the moral community. For Singer, plants, trees, rivers, and ecosystems have no moral status of their own; they matter, if at all, only instrumentally, as contributors to the welfare of sentient beings. This exclusion is not a peripheral feature of Singer's position but follows directly from the sentience principle: if the capacity to feel pleasure and pain is the criterion for moral considerability, then beings that lack this capacity are simply outside the moral community.

This exclusion sits uneasily with the growing recognition, both in environmental ethics and in many non-Western philosophical traditions, that the moral community must extend beyond sentient creatures to encompass the broader web of life. Paul Taylor, in his landmark work on respect for nature, argues that every living organism has a "good of its own" that grounds a *prima facie* claim to moral consideration, regardless of whether it is sentient.¹¹ A tree has a good of its own in the sense that things can go well or badly for it, that it can flourish or fail, even if it cannot experience pleasure or pain. This "biocentric" approach to environmental ethics provides a richer and more inclusive framework for moral considerability than Singer's sentience principle; and I think it points toward a genuine limitation in Singer's position.

The African philosophical tradition, as Thaddeus Metz has argued, is particularly well-placed to challenge Singer's exclusion of non-sentient life. *Ubuntu* ethics, with its constitutive claim that "I am because we are," grounds moral status in the network of relationships that binds all beings together, rather than in any individual property such as sentience.¹² On the *Ubuntu* view, a tree or a river has moral status not because it can suffer but because it stands in constitutive relations with the community of beings, including human beings, animals, and the natural world, and because its wellbeing is inseparable from the wellbeing of the community as a whole. This is a profoundly different vision of moral considerability from Singer's, and I think it is, in important respects, a more adequate one.

Kolawole Owolabi, writing on African philosophy and environmental ethics, has made a similar point, arguing that the African philosophical tradition's emphasis on the interconnectedness of all being provides a more adequate basis for environmental ethics than the individualistic, capacity-based approaches characteristic of Western moral philosophy.¹³ I find this argument persuasive, and I think it reinforces the general point I am making: that Singer's sentience principle, precisely because it is grounded in a utilitarian framework that attends only to individual interests, is unable to account for the moral significance of the natural environment that sustains all life, sentient and non-sentient alike. The exclusion of non-sentient life from the moral community is not a minor limitation of Singer's position; it is a fundamental one, and one that points toward the need for a more inclusive and relational framework.

6. Speciesism, Anthropocentrism, and the African Philosophical Challenge

Singer's attack on speciesism is, in my view, one of the most significant contributions of his work to moral philosophy. Speciesism, as Singer defines it, is "a prejudice or attitude of bias in favour of the members of one's own species and against those of other species."¹⁴ This prejudice, Singer argues, is no more morally defensible than racism or sexism; it arbitrarily privileges the interests of human beings over those of other sentient creatures on the basis of a morally irrelevant characteristic, membership in the human species. The critique of speciesism is, I think, essentially correct, and it is a critique that resonates with elements of African philosophical thought.

Mogobe Ramose, writing on African philosophy through the lens of *Ubuntu*, argues that the African philosophical tradition has never drawn the sharp boundary between human beings and the rest of nature that characterises much of the Western philosophical tradition.¹⁵ On the African view, human beings are not the measure of all things but participants in a broader community of being that includes animals, plants, and the natural world. This is a vision of moral life that is, in its deepest structure, anti-speciesist; and it is one that African philosophy can contribute to the global conversation about animal ethics without needing to import Singer's utilitarian framework wholesale.

And yet, Singer's anti-speciesism argument is not without its own difficulties. Gary Francione has argued that Singer's utilitarian framework, despite its rejection of

speciesism in principle, remains committed to a form of anthropocentrism in practice, insofar as it allows the interests of non-human animals to be overridden by sufficiently weighty human interests.¹⁶ If a scientific experiment would cause severe suffering to a chimpanzee but would produce significant benefits for human beings, Singer's utilitarian calculus may well sanction the experiment, provided the benefits outweigh the costs. This conclusion, Francione argues, is a form of speciesism in disguise, because it systematically undervalues the interests of non-human animals relative to those of human beings.

This critique is, I think, well-founded, and it reveals a tension at the heart of Singer's sentience principle: the tension between the principle's egalitarian aspiration, equal consideration for all sentient beings, and its utilitarian methodology, which allows stronger interests to override weaker ones and thereby systematically disadvantages non-human animals. Bernard Rollin has argued, in a related vein, that the utilitarian framework is ill-suited to grounding the moral status of animals because it reduces all values to a single commensurable scale, and in doing so, fails to capture the qualitative differences between different kinds of interests and different kinds of beings.¹⁷ This is a point that I find compelling, and it reinforces the general argument I am making throughout this paper.

7. Toward a more Adequate Framework

Having subjected Singer's sentience principle to these several lines of criticism, I am now in a position to sketch the outlines of a more adequate framework for animals' moral considerability. This framework, as I conceive it, must satisfy several conditions. It must retain the best insights of Singer's position, including the rejection of speciesism and the insistence on equal consideration of interests. It must transcend the reductionist tendency of the sentience principle by acknowledging a plurality of criteria for moral status. It must extend moral consideration to non-sentient living beings, in recognition of their intrinsic value and their constitutive role in the web of life. And it must draw on the rich resources of African philosophical thought, particularly *Ubuntu* ethics and *Ibuanidanda* complementary ontology, to provide a relational and communitarian dimension that is lacking in Singer's individualistic framework.

Jeff McMahan, in his challenging work on the ethics of killing, argues that moral status is a multi-dimensional phenomenon that cannot be captured by any single criterion, and that a satisfactory account of moral status must acknowledge the role of psychological complexity, relational embeddedness, and species membership in determining the moral weight of an individual's interests.¹⁸ I find this multi-dimensional approach more promising than Singer's single-criterion approach, though I think McMahan's framework needs to be supplemented by the relational and communitarian insights of African philosophical thought. A moral theory that acknowledges multiple dimensions of moral status is, in this respect, more faithful to the complexity of moral life than one that reduces moral status to a single property, however important that property may be.

Martha Nussbaum's capabilities approach offers another important resource for a more adequate framework. Nussbaum argues that the morally relevant question is not merely whether a being can suffer but whether it is able to flourish in ways characteristic of its species or kind.¹⁹ A being has a moral claim to consideration insofar as it has characteristic capabilities that constitute its flourishing, and moral consideration requires that we create the conditions under which those capabilities can be exercised. This approach is richer than Singer's sentience principle because it attends to the qualitative diversity of animal lives and to the specific forms of flourishing that are characteristic of different kinds of beings. A chimpanzee's flourishing is not merely a function of its capacity to avoid pain; it involves social relationships, cognitive activity, and the exercise of species-typical behaviours that go far beyond what the sentience principle can capture.

Fidelis Ekwueme, writing within the African philosophical tradition, has argued for what he calls an "eco-relational" approach to animal ethics, one that grounds moral consideration in the network of ecological relationships that binds all living beings together.²⁰ On this view, the moral status of an animal is not merely a function of its individual sentient capacities but of its role within the ecological community, its relationships with other beings, and its contribution to the flourishing of the whole. This approach, I submit, captures something important that Singer's sentience principle misses: the moral significance of the relational and ecological context within which individual animals live their lives.

Oladipo Olusegun, in his analysis of the idea of African philosophy, points out that the African tradition's emphasis on community and interdependence provides a more adequate foundation for environmental and animal ethics than the individualistic frameworks of Western moral philosophy.²¹ It is, I think, no accident that the most pressing contemporary challenges in environmental and animal ethics, challenges that require us to think beyond individual welfare to the welfare of communities and ecosystems, are precisely the challenges to which African philosophical thought is best equipped to respond. The African philosophical tradition has, in this respect, something genuinely important to contribute to the global conversation about moral status and moral considerability.

The framework I am suggesting, then, is one that is pluralistic in its criteria, relational in its ontology, and inclusive in its scope. It takes sentience seriously as one of the grounds of moral considerability; but it does not treat sentience as the only ground. It recognises the moral significance of non-sentient living beings; it attends to the relational and communitarian dimensions of moral life; and it draws on the resources of both Western and African philosophical traditions to construct a more adequate and more complete account of our obligations to the natural world.

8. Conclusion

I began this paper with a provocation: that Singer's sentience principle is both compelling and profoundly unsatisfying. I hope to have shown, in the preceding

pages, that this tension is not merely a matter of personal taste but reflects genuine philosophical difficulties in Singer's position. The sentience principle does important work. It dismantles speciesism, grounds moral consideration in a principled and non-arbitrary criterion, and forces us to take seriously the interests of creatures who cannot speak for themselves. These are genuine achievements, and the philosophical world is indebted to Singer for pressing them with such clarity and force.

And yet, the sentience principle is inadequate as a complete foundation for animals' moral considerability. It is reductionist in its insistence on a single criterion; it excludes non-sentient living beings from the moral community; it generates paradoxical and deeply uncomfortable implications in the argument from marginal cases; and it is culturally impoverished in its neglect of the relational and communitarian frameworks that African philosophical traditions bring to the question of moral considerability. A more adequate framework must be pluralistic in its criteria, relational in its ontology, and inclusive in its scope; extending moral consideration beyond sentient individuals to encompass the broader web of life within which all beings exist and flourish.

I do not pretend to have provided that framework in this paper. What I have tried to do is to clear some of the conceptual ground on which such a framework must be built, by identifying the specific limitations of Singer's sentience principle and by pointing toward the resources, both within Western philosophy and within the African philosophical tradition, that might help us construct a more adequate account. The work of animal ethics, like the work of philosophy more generally, is never finished. But that, of course, is precisely what makes it worth doing; and it is in the spirit of that continuing inquiry that this paper is offered.

Works Cited

1. Jeremy Bentham, *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996, p. 311.
2. Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*, New York, HarperCollins, 2009, p. 8.
3. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p. 20.
4. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p. 50.
5. Tom Regan, *The Case for Animal Rights*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 2004, p. 243.
6. Christine Korsgaard, *Fellow Creatures: Our Obligations to the Other Animals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2018, p. 17.

7. Innocent Asouzu, *Ibuanyidanda: New Complementary Ontology*, Zurich, LIT Verlag, 2007, p. 45.
8. Jeff McMahan, "Challenges to Human Equality," *The Journal of Ethics*, vol. 12, New York, Springer, 2008, p. 81.
9. Peter Singer, *Practical Ethics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2011, p. 55.
10. Emmanuel Ofuasia, "Beyond Singer: African Relational Ethics and the Moral Status of Animals," *FilosofiaTheoretica: Journal of African Philosophy, Culture and Religions*, Lagos, FilosofiaTheoretica Publishers, 2020, p. 188.
11. Paul Taylor, *Respect for Nature: A Theory of Environmental Ethics*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 2011, p. 99.
12. Thaddeus Metz, "African Values and Animal Ethics," *South African Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 31, no. 3, Cape Town, Taylor and Francis, 2012, p. 237.
13. KolawoleOwolabi, "African Philosophy and the Question of Environmental Ethics," *Philosophia Africana*, vol. 11, no. 2, Chicago, DePaul University Press, 2008, p. 115.
14. Peter Singer, *Animal Liberation: A New Ethics for Our Treatment of Animals*, New York, HarperCollins, 2009, p. 6.
15. Mogobe Ramose, *African Philosophy Through Ubuntu*, Harare, Mond Books, 1999, p. 71.
16. Gary Francione, *Introduction to Animal Rights: Your Child or the Dog?*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 2000, p. 92.
17. Bernard Rollin, "Animal Pain," in *The Oxford Handbook of Animal Ethics*, New York, Oxford University Press, 2011, p. 452.
18. Jeff McMahan, "Challenges to Human Equality," *The Journal of Ethics*, vol. 12, New York, Springer, 2008, p. 86.
19. Martha Nussbaum, *Frontiers of Justice: Disability, Nationality, Species Membership*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 2006, p. 325.
20. Fidelis Ekwueme, *Environmental Ethics and African Thought*, Lagos, Concept Publications, 2019, p. 67.
21. OladipoOlusegun, *The Idea of African Philosophy: A Critical Study of the Major Orientations in Contemporary African Philosophy*, Ibadan, Hope Publications, 2000, p. 33.