

**IN DEFENSE OF PETER SINGER'S SENTIENTISM AS A
THEORY OF MORAL CONSIDERABILITY OF
NONHUMAN ANIMALS**

**MASTER OF ARTS (APPLIED ETHICS) THESIS
SMART YOHANE JASON MSINKHU**

UNIVERSITY OF MALAWI

OCTOBER, 2023



**IN DEFENSE OF PETER SINGER'S SENTIENTISM AS A THEORY OF
MORAL CONSIDERABILITY OF NONHUMAN ANIMALS**

MASTER OF ARTS (APPLIED ETHICS) THESIS

By

**SMART YOHANE JASON MSINKHU
BA (Theology and Religious Studies)-University of Malawi**

Submitted to the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts (Applied Ethics)

UNIVERSITY OF MALAWI

OCTOBER, 2023

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, hereby declare that this work is substantially my own work which has not been submitted to any other institution for similar purposes. Where other people's work has been used, acknowledgments have been made.

Smart Yohane Jason Msinkhu

Full Legal Name

Signature

Date

CERTIFICATE OF APPROVAL

The undersigned certify that this thesis represents the student's own work and effort and has been submitted with our approval.

Signature: _____ Date: _____

LAWRENCE MPEKANSAMBO, MA (Senior Lecturer)

Main supervisor

Signature: _____ Date: _____

JAPHET BAKUWA, PhD, (Senior Lecturer)

Second Supervisor

Signature: _____ Date: _____

GRACE BAKUWA, PhD, (Senior Lecturer)

Head of Department

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my late parents, Mr. Yohane Jason Msinkhu and Mrs. Margret Msinkhu for their encouragement they used to provide to me in as far as school work is concerned. May their souls rest in eternal peace until I join them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, i thank the Almighty God for granting me life and opportunity to complete this study.

I also humbly express my heartfelt gratitude to my supervisors Dr. Japhet Bakuwa and Mr. Lawrence Mpekansambo for their tireless guidance throughout this study. To you my wonderful supervisors, i say thank you very much for your lovely and unwavering support towards my study, may the Almighty God reward you with His immeasurable blessings.

I am also very thankful to Dr. Grace Bakuwa the head of the Department of philosophy and the entire lectures and staff for their wonderful work they have rendered to me throughout the entire study period. Lecturers know that you have done a great work on me and you have groomed me well, may the Almighty God bless you very much.

I am also very thankful to my fellow students, they have been very helpful in making debates and motivating me to study deeply, may God the Almighty bless you much.

Finally, I thank my family members for the wonderful support all the times, may God the creator bless you all.

ABSTRACT

Sentientism is one of the many theories on moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The underlying argument of this theory is that any being which has feeling should be accorded moral considerability. But sentientist scholars of nonhuman animals are of different views. Peter Singer's perspective on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is that nonhuman animals are sentient beings and emphasis of their sentientism should be put on pain and suffering. He strongly refutes other grounds of basing the sentience of nonhuman animals propagated by other sentientist scholars such as basing on cognitive grounds. He thinks that other grounds of basing sentientism of nonhuman animals are controversial and may miss the real point of awarding moral considerability to nonhuman animals (Singer, 1985). Thus, this study set out to analyse Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals in order to find out its merits and demerits so as to understand whether the theory is defensible for refuting all other grounds of basing sentientism of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The study used a qualitative research method particularly a desk research. The findings reveal that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals has a significant impact as far as the studies on moral considerability of nonhuman animals are concerned basing on the merits exposed. Further the study has also revealed that Peter Singer's sentientism is not without lacking basing on the demerits exposed. Furthermore the study argues that although Peter Singer's Sentientism has some demerits but the theory has significant positive impact as far as moral considerability of nonhuman animals is concerned therefore the theory is defensible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS	x
CHAPTER ONE	1
INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Chapter introduction.....	1
1.2 Background	1
1.3 The problem statement	4
1.4 Aim of the study	5
1.5 Research questions	5
1.5.1 Key research question	5
1.5.2 Sub key research questions	5
1.6 Justification of the study	6
1.7 Dissertation structure.....	7
1.8 Chapter conclusion	8
CHAPTER TWO	9
EXPOSITION OF PETER SINGER’S SENTIENTISM AS A THEORY OF	9
MORAL CONSIDERABILITY OF NONHUMAN ANIMALS	9
2.1 Chapter introduction.....	9
2.2 Definition of the concept of sentience.....	9
2.2.1 General definition of sentience.	9
2.2.2 Various views on sentience.....	10
2.3 A brief history of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.	15
2.4 Peter Singer’s Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals	32
2.5 Chapter conclusion	36
CHAPTER THREE	37
ANALYSIS OF PETER SINGER’S SENTIENTISM AS A THEORY OF	37

MORAL CONSIDERABILITY OF NONHUMAN ANIMALS	37
3.1 Chapter introduction.....	37
3.2 The merits and demerits of Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals	37
3.2.1 The merits of Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.....	38
3.2.2 The demerits of Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.....	76
3.3 Chapter conclusion.....	78
CHAPTER FOUR.....	79
CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	79
4.1 Chapter introduction.....	79
4.2 A summary of the findings.....	79
4.3 Implications of the findings.....	83
4.4 Suggested areas for future research.....	83
REFERENCES	84

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS

AD	Anno Domin (Year of our Lord Jesus Christ)
AIDS	Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
CHANCO	Chancellor College
HIV	Human Immune- deficiency Virus
NNCRE	Norwegian National Committee for Research Ethics
3 Rs	Replace, Refine and Reduce.

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter provides an overview of my research entitled “In defense of Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals”. The chapter begins with the background information on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. Further, the chapter explains the statement of the problem, aim of the study, research questions, significance of the study, dissertation structure and a chapter conclusion.

1.2 Background

Animals or nonhuman animals are members of the ecosystem and are supposed to be treated fairly as is with the case with human beings (Katz, 1981). This is also in agreement to what Leopold (1949; Hale, 2011) state that a community of life matters not just to its individual members. This therefore implies that a community of life is a mixture of beings including nonhuman animals. Leopold (1949) further argues that “A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise” (Leopold, 1949; katz: 1981). Naess (1973) also points out against anthropocentric view of nature (Naess, 1973, P.96). This is a spirit of putting human beings at the center of all beings and if overemphasized, it can lead to unfair treatment of other non-human beings. This is also what Warren (1997) condemns as lacking moral status, a condition of having obligations towards other entities (Warren, 1997, P.9).

Although nonhuman animals are members of the ecosystem and are supposed to have moral consideration, this however is not the case on the ground. The situation on the ground is that they are mistreated in many if not in all societies and they are mistreated in various ways. Kayange and Makwinja (2016) point out that there is severe maltreatment of animals in Malawi and other parts of the

world. It was also reported in the Nation newspaper that some people gunned down an innocent elephant at Vwaza marsh yet elephants are rare species and have to be protected (Nation, November 10, 2018). Warren (1997) also points out that there have been hot debates on the moral status of nonhuman animals and this has led to many theories about moral status or moral considerability of nonhuman animals. All this shows that there is lack of moral status of nonhuman animals in Malawi and other parts of the world.

The availability of these many theories on moral considerability of nonhuman animals implies that various people have various views on nonhuman animals and cannot agree on how nonhuman animals can have moral consideration (Warren, 1997). This also implies that nonhuman animals are in a very big problem of being denied of their moral consideration. Some argue that nonhuman animals can only be accorded moral consideration only basing on instrumental value basis. This is what Kayange and Makwinja (2016) call utilitarian value. This theory argues that nonhuman animals can have moral consideration only if they have some value which can be of benefit to the human beings.

Another theory is that nonhuman animals which can have moral consideration are those which can suffer or feel pain. Bentham (1789) came up with this theory of suffering. This means that only those animals which are perceived to feel pain are those which can have moral consideration and those perceived not to feel pain cannot have moral consideration. Another theory is that only those nonhuman animals which can feel pleasure can have moral consideration. Another theory is sentientism theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. This means having feelings whether positive or negative feelings and those animals which have such feelings should have moral consideration.

To sum up these theories of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, philosophers such as Warren (1997) outline the theories as Consequentialist theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, Deontological theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, Sentience-centred or Sentientism theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, Life centred theory of

moral considerability of nonhuman animals, Utilitarian theory of moral consideration of nonhuman animals, Egalitarian theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals and Hierarchical theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. On consequentialist theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, the criteria is that only those nonhuman animals which produce something of value to human beings are those to have moral consideration. On deontological theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, the criterion is the Kantian theory of indirect duty not that those nonhuman animals are worth of moral consideration. On sentience theory, the criteria is that only those nonhuman animals which have conscious have to be considered of moral consideration. On life- centred, the criteria is that only those nonhuman animals thought to be living are those to be worthy of moral consideration. On utilitarian theory of moral consideration of nonhuman animals, the criterion is that only those nonhuman animals which are thought of having value to human beings are those to have moral consideration. On egalitarian theory, the criteria is that all living things are the same as human beings or that they have the same value and on hierarchical theory, the criteria is that only things with high value or rank have to be accorded moral consideration.

Although sentientism is one of the theories of moral considerability of nonhuman animals but of a surprise scholars of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals are in sharp disagreement of understanding the sentience of nonhuman animals. Kotzmann (2020) clearly points out that although the word sentience is as simple and clear as simply having “feelings” whether positive or negative feelings but the word is currently very difficult to define as there are numerous understandings which have developed throughout the ages among the sentientist scholars. For instance, Brown (2015) understands sentience as ability to experience pleasure and pain. Webster (2002) understands sentience as having feelings that matter. Ryder (2012) understands sentience as ability to experience sensation. Peter Singer argues that when talking about the sentience of nonhuman animals, emphasis has to be put on pain and suffering. In this regard when talking about the sentience of nonhuman animals, Peter singer

understand sentience as feeling pain and suffering. Peter Singer's perspective on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals seems to carry more weight. Thus, this study set out in defense of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

1.3 The problem statement

Sentientism is one of the many theories of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The underlying argument of this theory is that any being which has feelings whether positive or negative feelings, has to be accorded moral consideration. Although sentience simply means having feelings whether positive or negative but the problem is that there is a sharp disagreement among the scholars of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. Kotzmann (2020) states that although the word sentience is as simple and clear as having feelings whether positive or negative but the word is currently is just very difficult to define as there are numerous understandings which have developed throughout the centuries among sentientist scholars of nonhuman animals.

For instance, Webster (2002) understands sentience as having feelings that matter. Brown (2015) understands sentience as the ability to experience pleasure and pain. Marino (2010) understands sentience as the level of awareness an individual has about himself or herself and others. He further argues that in this regard if we are asking about the sentience of other animals, we are asking about whether their phenomenological experience is similar to own. Furthermore, he gives examples of questions that are relevant to the sentience of other animals such as: Do they think about themselves as we do? Do they ponder their own lives? Do they know that other beings have feelings and thoughts? And do they have an autobiographic sense of the past and future? Here it can be observed that scholars have differing views on the sentience of nonhuman animals. Peter Singer argues that when we are talking about the sentience of nonhuman animals, emphasis has to be put on feeling pain and suffering nothing else (Singer, 1975). Many sentientist scholars as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals have given their different views but here I have just mentioned a few.

Peter Singer strongly argues that sentience of nonhuman animals should be understood as feeling pain and suffering, nothing else (1975). Singer (1975) strongly refutes other grounds of basing the sentience of nonhuman animals such as cognitive grounds, level of understating things, just to mention. Although Peter singer totally refutes all other grounds of basing sentientism theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals apart from feeling pain and suffering but the problem is that other sentientist scholars are in disagreement with him. Though other scholars of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals are in disagreement with Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals but it seems that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals has a positive impact. Thus, this study set out in defense of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

1.4 Aim of the study

This study aims at providing a defense of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

1.5 Research questions

The study was guided by the following key research question and sub-key research questions.

1.5.1 Key research question

Is Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals defensible?

1.5.2 Sub key research questions

1. What is Peter Singer's understanding of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals?
2. What are the merits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals?

3. What are the demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals?

1.6 Justification of the study

The study is very important as it will provide a defense of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. It will find out in depth its merits and demerits and establish its plausibility of refuting other grounds of basing sentience of nonhuman animals as propagated by other sentientist scholars which Peter Singer strongly refute. The study would also help People to reduce or stop completely the habit of viewing nonhuman animals instrumentally basing on the fact that nonhuman animals are sentient beings and that they feel pain and suffering.

Kayange and Makwinja (2016) state that there is a habit in Malawi of beating animals for no reason and there is a habit of interrelating individuals who have done wrong with animals which do not have instrumental value to them. This study would help people to put such habits down basing on the merits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. People will no longer interrelate individuals who have done wrong with animals which do not have instrumental value to them as it is done in Malawi, for example, interrelating such individuals with a goat (You are a goat: Ndiwe mbuzi), or with a dog (you are a dog: ndiwe galu) just to mention a few. Kayange and Makwinja (2016) point out that this habit of interrelating people who have done wrong with animals which do not have instrumental value to them, is a total negative feeling which people have towards such animals, even if such animals do not harm them but they are treated harmfully. This altitude is very unethical and this study will help to put down such attitudes.

The study would also help to put literature in place and such literature would be very important even for the generations to come hence intergenerational justice achieved. Campos (2017) argues that each generation has to behave fairly even

for the generations to come. There is lack of comprehensive literature on this topic and this study would help to increase literature on this important topic.

1.7 Dissertation structure

This study has four chapters and below are the contents of each chapter

Chapter One: The Introduction: This chapter discusses the following topics: The chapter introduction, the background, the problem statement, aim of study, key research question, sub key research questions, justification of the research, dissertation structure and a chapter conclusion.

Chapter Two: Exposition of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals: This chapter is an exposition of sentientism as a theory moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The concept of sentientism is clearly defined in this chapter. A brief history of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also provided in this chapter. Further the chapter also provides Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

Chapter Three: Analysis of Peter Singer's sentientism: This chapter is an analysis of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter provides a critique of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals are outlined in this chapter.

Chapter Four: Conclusion, Implications and Recommendations: This chapter presents a conclusion, implications and recommendations of the study.

1.8 Chapter conclusion

This chapter has presented the title of the study, its back ground, problem statement, aim of the study, research questions, significance of the study and finally the chapter has presented the lay out of the study.

CHAPTER TWO

EXPOSITION OF PETER SINGER'S SENTIENTISM AS A THEORY OF MORAL CONSIDERABILITY OF NONHUMAN ANIMALS

2.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter presents an exposition of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter clearly presents a clear definition of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter begins with a clear definition of the concept of sentience or sentientism. Further, a brief history of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is presented. Finally the chapter presents Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

2.2 Definition of the concept of sentience.

This section provides both general and specific definitions of sentience.

2.2.1 General definition of sentience.

Generally the word sentient or sentience means having "feelings" (Collins English Dictionary). Basing on this understanding, therefore any being which experiences feelings whether positive or negative feelings, is a sentient being. Kotzmann (2020) states that the word "sentient" derives from the Latin verb "sentire" which means to "feel". In this regard, any being which feels or possesses feelings is therefore a sentient being. Kotzmann (2020) further points out that it can also be observed that even the first Latin letters "sen" match the beginnings of common English words including sentiment, sensory and sensation-all of which give hints as to the meaning of the term. Following this

understanding in dictionary definition, sentience is therefore defined as being “able to experience feelings,” “responsive to or conscious of sense impressions,” and “capable of feeling things through physical senses” (Kotzmann, 2020). In this regard, Kotzmann (2020) argues that sentient beings therefore experience wanted emotions like happiness, joy and gratitude, and also unwanted emotions in the form of pain, suffering and grief.

2.2.2 *Various views on sentience*

Kotzmann (2020) clearly points out that although the word sentience is as simple and as clear as stated above but the word is currently just very difficult to define as there are numerous understandings which have developed throughout the ages and there is no single definition among the scholars. According to Kotzmann (2020) all this is due to the fact that many people do not feel comfortable to accord moral considerability to nonhuman animals and they feel that they are not human beings. Kotzmann clearly laments loudly that “The sentience of humans is widely understood and accepted while the sentience of other animal species is increasingly being recognized. Early philosophers thought of humans only as sentient” therefore the order of the day was “anthropocentrism (Kotzmann, 2020).

Kotzmann (2020) clearly points out that there have been sharp disagreements among scholars on the sentience of nonhuman animals and the result has been thinking of some nonhuman animals as sentient while others non-sentient and that moral considerability can only be accorded to sentient nonhuman animals not non-sentient nonhuman animals. Here it can be observed that there has been a sharp disagreement among scholars on determining which nonhuman animals are sentient and which ones are non-sentient. Further, some scholars have even argued that nonhuman animals are non-sentient. This disagreement has influenced the birth of numerous interpretations of the word sentience as each scholar would like to interpret the word according to his belief mostly thinking of the status of nonhuman animals. It can also be observed that although most scholars did not believe that nonhuman animals are also sentient as humans but of late it is being realized and accepted in many parts of the world that some nonhuman animals are

also sentient. A look at some of the definitions of sentience which have emerged throughout the centuries would be done in the following sections.

Marino (2010) understands sentience as the level of awareness an individual has about himself/ herself and others. He further explains that in this regard if we are asking about the sentience of other animals, we are asking about whether their phenomenological experience is similar to our own. He further gives examples of questions that are relevant to the sentience of other beings such as “Do they think about themselves the way we do? Do they ponder their own lives? Do they know that other individuals have feelings and thoughts? And do they have an autobiographical sense of the past and future? (Marino, 2010). Here, it can be observed that Marino is talking of “level of awareness” while the original meaning of the word just talks of awareness or feeling. In this regard, it can be observed that Marino is not positive to nonhuman animals as having sentience. His definition segregates a lot and has to be improved.

Kirkwood (2006) and Degrazia (1996) define sentience as the capacity to have feelings. Here, Kirkwood and Degrazia are not talking of whether the being is human or nonhuman but any being which has capacity to have feelings is a sentient being. This definition seems to be general and also resembling the original meaning of the term sentience according to its etymology. In this regard, this definition seems to be fair.

Broom (2019) sees that Kirkwood’s and Degrazia’s definition is too general and he opted to add some elements and defined sentience as capacity to have feelings and evaluate the actions of others in relation to itself and third parties, to remember some of its actions and their consequences, to assess risks and benefits, to have some feelings and to have some degree of awareness. Here, it can be observed that Donald Broom is not happy with nonhuman animals being thought of as sentient and is trying to include some debatable elements so as to bar some nonhuman animals from the circle of sentient beings. This definition seems to be limited in some elements and oppressive to nonhuman animals.

Brown (2015) defines sentience as the ability to experience pleasure and pain. Here, it can be observed that any being which experiences pleasure and pain, is therefore a sentient being. This understanding is also problematic as it tries to bar some nonhuman animals if not all as it is very difficult to note how other nonhuman animals feel. This definition therefore seems limited in its scope.

Ryder (2012) defines sentience as the ability to experience sensation. Here, it can be observed that beings with senses are those to be considered sentient beings or beings which have sentience. This definition is also problematic in as much as we think of nonhuman animals as it is very difficult to know whether other nonhuman animals have senses while scientists are in agreement that other some nonhuman animals have senses therefore this definition seems limited in some scope.

Webster (2002) defines sentience as having feelings that matter. Looking at this definition, it can be observed that it is very subjective not objective. It is therefore human centered not nonhuman centered therefore excludes nonhuman animals in the circle of sentient beings. In this regard, this definition seems limited in scope and needs some improvements.

Goodpaster (1978) defines sentience as an adaptive characteristic of living organisms that provides them a better capacity to anticipate and so avoid threats to life (Goodpaster, 1978, P. 316). Here, it can be observed that this definition therefore calls for a being to be conscious of its environment and also figure out or map the way forward to combat its threats. These actions therefore involve reason. In this regard, it can be said that sentient beings are also reasoning beings therefore being sentient, involves a number of capacities such as reasoning, feeling and the like

Woodhouse (2018) defines Sentience as “the capacity to experience subjectively. It is the ability to suffer, to feel pleasure, to experience flourishing or well-being. In that sense, it is the morally salient component of consciousness” (woodhouse, 2018). Looking at this definition, it can be observed that a sentient being has the

capacity of feeling or consciousness. This definition echoes the dictionary meaning of sentience.

Looking at the definitions above regarding sentience, it can be summarized in this way that scholars have varying views on the concept although its dictionary definition is simple and very clear that it simply means having feelings. This scenario emanates from various views on some beings regarding them whether they have sentience or not. One of the controversial beings are nonhuman animals, most people deny that they are sentient beings and when they are giving a definition of sentience, they make sure that the definition must exclude nonhuman animals which is also reacting against the general definition of the term.

From the preceding explication, one is drawn to make a number of inferences concerning sentience. One of such inferences is that sentience is the capability to perceive desirable or undesirable encounters. It is the ability to become aware of stimuli and respond to such stimuli intentionally. Sentience can also be seen as the ability to be aware of one's existence, and make goal directed actions.

To be sentient is also to be cognizant or conscious which means to be an experiencing subject; that is to be a being that notices what transpires to itself. It can also be said that to be sentient is to have the capacity to experience enjoyment, have a wellbeing or happiness which refer to positive experiences, pain and suffering which refer to negative experiences. One may also look at sentience as being synonymous to mental conditions

The other observation made is that sentience has been used as the most popular measure of moral status in animal ethics (Zolo, 2019). For him it has been a trademark to individuate morally relevant individuals. The more science can evidence sentience of a particular species, the higher its ethical status, and the greater the likelihood of better treatment for members of that species. He further describes sentientism as the most popular currency in animal ethics. He also observes that sentience has become a guarantee to individuate entities that

deserve moral consideration. The philosophy of according moral considerability on beings basing on sentience is what is called sentientism or sentientism theory. If the theory is applied to nonhuman animals then it is sentientism theory of nonhuman animals. In this essay, I am going to provide a critique of this theory on nonhuman animals.

Looking at the general definition of sentience, it can be observed that it has no particular boundary of beings or entities to be accorded the status of sentience. It just talks of having feelings. Further, this general definition does not even specify a particular kind of feeling such as feeling pain, feeling joy, feeling grief, just to mention a few, therefore the feeling may be positive or negative. Further, it does not specify a particular entity having the feelings. This understanding therefore means that we can talk of human sentience, social sentience, animal sentience or nonhuman animals sentience, trees sentience, environmental sentience, just to mention a few as feelings may be experienced by various beings.

It is indeed a fact to say that human beings cannot know how each being feels as feeling is in most cases very subjective in nature therefore it seems important that human beings must not set a boundary of the word sentience on beings they are not aware of their feelings, it seems good to stay neutral though we may not like those beings to be called sentient. Current scientific research works are exploring many new insights revealing sentience in many beings which human beings have been mistreating them for a long time thinking that they are non-sentient. This is what Broom (2019) states that there is confirmation of existence of refined perceptive capacities in a varied kind of nonhuman animals. The question is, where are the boundaries coming from? The clear answer is that they are coming from human prejudice of anthropocentrism. This research puts focus on nonhuman animals' sentience specifically looking at the criteria of using this concept of sentience as a theory or method of moral considerability for them. The research would provide a critique on this theory on nonhuman animals. The study would unpack the strengths and weaknesses of this theory of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

2.3 A brief history of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

Sentientism as one of the theories of moral considerability of nonhuman animals arose during the dawn of animal rights debate in the late 1970s (Preece, 2002). The whole debate looks at whether nonhuman animals are worthy of being accorded moral consideration or whether nonhuman animals have rights at all so that they can have moral considerability. Here it can be observed that the whole debate was on whether nonhuman animals are worthy of moral standing. This debate remains a hot debate until today, with some scholars supporting the idea, some scholars denying the idea and some scholars supporting the idea but with conditions such as the condition of sentience being attached to only those nonhuman animals with sentience but those thought to be non-sentient according to them, are unworthy of moral consideration and falls out of the moral circle.

Regan (1983) states that the terminology “sentience” in animal debate history was developed by John Rodman in 1977 in reference to Peter Singer’s works on nonhuman animals as a kind of “zoocentric sentientism”. Although the terminology came into use in the late seventies but the debate on whether nonhuman animals deserve moral standing, is older than the terminology. The debate started in the ancient times. In other words the debate started when human beings and animals started to exist on earth. But it was in the late seventies when the debate gained its peak (Regan, 1983).

Preece (2002) states that in the Judeo ethics and most parts of the world such as the Greeks; it was a fact that human beings are more important beings than nonhuman animals. In this regard, it was a fact that human beings deserve moral consideration and not nonhuman animals as they were thought to be non-sentient. In this regard, anthropocentrism was the order of the day in the ancient times. Preece (2002) clearly points out that the famous Greek philosopher Aristotle argued clearly that nonhuman animals are non-sentient. This view was also carried over by the early Christians (Preece, 2002). Here, it can be observed that from the ancient times even to the birth of Christianity, anthropocentrism was the

order of the day whereby human beings viewed themselves as more important than nonhuman animals and that they deserved moral considerability but not nonhuman animals. This Aristotelian view of thought was almost in many parts of the world. Aristotle who existed between 384BC and 322 BC and also being a successor of another important philosopher Plato who existed between 428 BC and 348 BC, his views were highly respected worldwide and his theory of nonhuman animals being non-sentient was highly regarded worldwide even to the birth of Christianity (Preece, 2002).

Preece (2002) points out that the Aristotelian view was highly challenged by the second century AD famous Greek writer Celsus who challenged against Jewish/Christian ethics arguing that nonhuman animals are more important than human beings as they are more loved by God and that they deserve moral considerability as they do not have to sow seeds or plow fields to live, whereas people do. Celsus further attacked the other argument which arose that humans are more superior to nonhuman animals because they capture them and eat them. It is said that Celsus did not believe that humans are superior to nonhuman animals because they are able to capture and eat them. For him, humans have to use weapons, traps and hunting dogs to capture them whereas as nonhuman animals are naturally equipped with the tools they need to capture humans.

Preece (2002) clearly points out that Celsus believed that nonhuman animals are sentient beings. Here, it can be observed that Celsus argued against the spirit of anthropocentrism which was at the center of Aristotelian and Jewish ethics thinking that human beings are sentient and that nonhuman animals are non-sentient. Here, it can also be observed that Celsus strongly attacked the Aristotelian view of nonhuman animals being non-sentient. It is said that this argument of Celsus continued triggering in people's minds to the middle Ages (1000 AD- 1500 AD) (Preece, 2002). Macgrath (1994) points out that this period combines the Renaissance period. The Renaissance period inaugurates the Middle- Ages (Macgrath, 1994)

Duncan (2006) states that during the Renaissance period, the concept of non-human animals being sentient was commonly accepted by lay people but not philosophers. He further states that during this time the ordinary or lay people acknowledged the sentience of nonhuman animals only in mammals and birds. Here, it can be observed that during this time, the fact that nonhuman animals are sentient, was well accepted by lay or ordinary people or non-experts but not by experts such as the philosophers or simply the academia. It can also be observed that although the lay people had some acceptance of sentience in nonhuman animals but it was selective as it was only in mammals and birds. Here, it can be argued that even during the middle ages, the concept of sentience in nonhuman animals was mostly alien. The fact that philosophers did not recognize nonhuman animals as sentient is a big stumbling block as from the ancient times to the said renaissance time, philosophers were highly regarded as holding the key of knowledge. In this regard anything approved by philosophers as true was accepted by the society and vice versa. This made the views of the lay people baseless.

Preece (2002) further states that during this period of the middle ages, we have good evidence from several writings such as by Leonardo Da Vinci, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Thomas More, Montaigne, Shakespeare, Francis Bacon and others, popular figures of the middle ages, that animal sentience was accepted as part of secular knowledge. He further states that many of the great artistic works of this age also portray people treating animals as if they were sentient but philosophers did not follow the views of the masses and there is a clear line of philosophical argument for non-sentience of nonhuman animals from Aristotle through Thomas Aquinas and Rene Descartes to Immanuel Kant (Preece, 2002). The clear philosophical line was that of anthropocentrism. The ancient times philosophy is hereby represented by Aristotle. The middle ages philosophy is hereby represented by Thomas Aquinas, the Reformation and the post-Reformation period is hereby represented by Rene Descartes and the Enlightenment period is hereby represented by Immanuel Kant. The say of these figures was stronger than the masses' views.

Macgrath (1994) clearly points out that the Reformation and post-reformation period is dated from 1500 to 1700 AD. The Enlightenment period is dated from about 1720 AD to about 1780 AD (Macgrath, 1994). But most of the scholars just date the Enlightenment period from 1700 AD to 1900 and the modern period from 1900 AD to the present. But it must also be stated here that within the modern period, scholars have also subdivided the period into modern period, Post-modern period and post post-modern period. Modern period is dated as from 1900 to 1950 AD, Post-modern Period is dated from 1950 to 2000 AD and Post post-modern Period from 2000 to the present 2022 AD. Here, it can be observed that from the ancient times to about 1800 AD, the popular view of nonhuman animals was that nonhuman animals were non-sentient beings. Anthropocentrism was the popular order of the day. In this regard human beings were viewed as superior and center of creation.

Kul-want and Klimowski (1996) further provide the context of the prominent or philosophical pillars who built a strong philosophy of nonhuman animals as non-sentient. Aristotle is said to have existed from 384 BC to 322 BC. Thomas Aquinas existed from 1225 AD to 1274 AD. Rene Descartes existed from 1596 AD to 1650 AD and Immanuel Kant existed from 1724 to 1804 AD. These philosophers' position on non-human animals as non-sentient carried much weight and was regarded as the popular order of the day. Although theology was regarded as the queen of sciences during the middle ages but the philosophers had a stronger voice than theology. This implies that although some writers had some view of sentience in non-human animals but that did not hold much water as the philosophers were highly respected and had a strong historical basis (Preece, 2002). It is further stated that although theology overtook the championship of knowledge from philosophy during the middle ages as theology became the queen of sciences but philosophy was still regarded as true knowledge by many people (Macgrath, 1994)

Preece (2002) further points out that of all the philosophers from the ancient times to the Enlightenment, Descartes is usually singled out for special blame for

introducing the idea of animals as “Automata” It is said that this idea of automata is difficult to understand. It is pointed out that Kenny (1970) in reviewing Descartes’ works, translates Descartes as saying “Similarly of all the things that which dogs, horses and monkeys are made to do, are , are merely expressions of their fear, their hope or their joy; and consequently they can do these things without any thought.”. It is further pointed out that present day scholars continue to argue about what he really meant by this. The fact that he was a Vivisectionist and did not treat animals as if they were sentient, suggests that he thought that fear, hope and joy were in some way unconscious emotions. Unconscious emotion is a difficult concept to understand and is currently being debated (For example: Ohman et al., 2000, Winkielman and Barridge, 2004) (Preece, 2002).

Kotzmann (2020) clearly explains that “automata” simply means “Incapable of feeling pain”. This means that nonhuman animals were viewed as non-sentient by Rene Descartes. The above discussion indicates that from the ancient times through the Middle Ages and before the Enlightenment period, most scholars especially philosophers had a view that nonhuman animals are non-sentient while some ordinary scholars and lay or ordinary people had a sense of some nonhuman animals being sentient.

Gannet and Jennifer (2011) points out that although the view of non-human animals as being non-sentient was a popular view especially among the philosophers from the ancient times, through the middle ages to the post reformation period, but the sentient view which was advocated for by some few people, still found some room in some people and agencies such as governments. They clearly state that during the same period, some governments started to introduce animal rights laws in 1635. The first country to introduce non-human animal rights is Ireland in 1635. The government of Ireland passed laws for animal protection. In this legislation, there was also an act against plowing by the Tayle and pulling the wool off a living sheep. They further state that in Massachusetts colony, a law against ‘Tyranny or cruelty’ towards non-human animals was introduced in 1641(Gannet & Jennifer, 2011). This shows us that the

sense of animals having sentience and in this case feeling pain, started to gain ground in some parts of the world.

White (2019) points out that in 1687, Japan reintroduced a ban on eating meat and killing nonhuman animals. Here, it is an important issue to note that coming to a point of banning eating meat, is a true commitment on viewing animals as fellow counterparts therefore having moral considerability for them. This also shows that people in Japan felt that animals have rights and have to be respected. It can also be pointed out that people in Japan realized that nonhuman animals need to live, they have an intrinsic value in themselves therefore it is very wrong to just kill them for no reason or killing them for instrumental value. It was also realized that even using nonhuman animals for medical testing without proper procedures is very wrong.

Preece (2002) further points out that during the Enlightenment period, the arguments of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes and Immanuel Kant that nonhuman animals are non-sentient were heavily challenged. The period of 'Enlightenment' is dated from 1720 to 1780 (Macgrath 1994). Preece (2002) clearly points out that many philosophers changed their minds on nonhuman animals, they came to believe that nonhuman animals are sentient. This is also clearly witnessed in the writings of the famous Scottish philosopher, David Hume who wrote in 1739 that "Is it not experience which renders a dog apprehensive of pain, when you menace him or lift up the whip to beat him?" (Preece, 2002). This, points out that David Hume argued that nonhuman animals are sentient. It is clearly stated that philosophers lost ground with their philosophy that non-human animals are non-sentient. David Hume existed from 1711-1776AD (Macgrath, 1994).

Bentham (1789) strongly argued that an animal's capacity to suffer- not their intelligence, means that they should be granted rights. He clearly pointed out that "The question is not, can they reason? Nor, can they talk? But can they suffer? Why should the law refuse its protection to any sensitive being? (Bentham, 1789). Bentham put his arguments in his 1789 book entitled "An Introduction to the

principles of Morals and Legislation”. In this book, Jeremy Bentham argued that it is necessary for his country (England) to include laws regarding animal protection rights in the legislation as they also suffer and feel pain. Here, it can be observed that Jeremy Bentham admired the legislations of animal protection in the neighboring Ireland.

Duncan (1981) strongly points out that during the Enlightenment period, philosophers came into acceptance that non-human animals have sentience. He clearly states that “It was not until the Enlightenment of the 18th Century that philosophers started to accept the notion that animals have feelings. Towards the end of the 19th Century, Scientists and Philosophers had developed a fairly sophisticated concept of sentience. Little consideration was given to sentience by scientists through much of the 20th Century due to the inhibiting influence of Behaviorism” (Duncan, 1981). Here, it can be observed that during the Enlightenment of the 18th Century (1700s), Philosophers had lost ground with their philosophy that nonhuman animals are non-sentient and that by the end of the 19th Century (1900 AD), philosophers and scientists had come to accept that non-human animals are sentient.

Duncan (1981) further points out that although scientists supported the idea of non-human animals having feelings but had not put much concentration on the concept due to being engaged in another field of study called “Behaviorism” but in the last quarter of the 20th Century (1975s), there was a surge of interest in animal sentience and animal welfare scientists quickly realized that animal welfare problems can be better tackled with an understanding of how animals feel. Here, it can be observed that scientists came into acceptance that non-human animals are sentient during the Enlightenment of the 18th Century and by the end of the 20th century, they started to concentrate much research on the sentience of non-human animals.

Looking at the Enlightenment period, it can be observed that the philosophical line of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Descartes and Immanuel Kant that nonhuman animals are non-sentient, terribly lost ground, most people came to accept that

nonhuman animals are sentient. Most of the philosophers and scientists came to believe that nonhuman animals are sentient. This means that although Immanuel Kant is regarded as the chief philosopher of the enlightenment but his view that nonhuman animals are non-sentient was heavily challenged. Fellow philosophers such Jeremy Bentham argued against him. In this case it can be said that by the end of the 18th Century AD (1800AD), the view that nonhuman animals have sentience gained much weight against non-sentient view.

Hayward (1994) looking at Immanuel Kant's lectures, he argues that although Kant is viewed negatively on nonhuman animals as viewing them as non-sentient but what must be known is that Kant did not deny moral considerability of nonhuman animals. Hayward (1994) clearly points out that when Kant said that human beings have no direct duties to non-rational beings in his lectures, this does not mean that he denied moral considerability of nonhuman animals. Here, it can be observed that Tim Hayward is in total defense of Immanuel Kant. This argument seems to carry some weight but in this paper on sentience, the truth is that Immanuel Kant viewed nonhuman animals as non-sentient. It must also be agreed upon that Immanuel Kant as the highly respected philosopher of the enlightenment, did not deny moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

The beginning of the 19th Century saw many countries embracing the idea that nonhuman animals are sentient beings and following this view, many countries introduced laws to protect nonhuman animals from abuse (Preece, 2002). Uvarov (1985) points out that between 1822 to 1892, more laws were passed in many countries to protect animals. He further points out that the British parliament passed out laws against the "Cruel Treatment of cattle Act" in 1822. It is also reported that in 1824, the first animal rights society was founded in England by Richard Martin, Arthur Broome, Lewis Gomperts and William Wilberforce. It is said that the society was called "The Society for the Prevention of Cruelty of animals" (Uvarov, 1985).

The above information is very important and has to be appreciated in the sense that the argument of Jeremy Bentham in his "An Introduction to the Principles of

Morals and Legislation” of 1789 gained ground and this influenced the introduction of the laws against the “Cruel Treatment of Cattle Act” in 1822. Bentham’s work also found space in most people’s minds as witnessed by the introduction of the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals in England in 1824 by Richard Martin, Arthur Broome, Lewis Gompertz and William Wilberforce, the society which later became the RSPA.

Beauchamp (2011) points out that Lewis Gompertz also published his book entitled “Moral Inquiries on the Situation of Man and of Brutes” in the same year of 1824 when he and his friends founded the society for the prevention of cruelty to animals. It is said that this Gompertz’ book embraced the ideas of Veganism, the idea which came into existence about a hundred years after his publication. This means that many people in Britain had come to realize that non-human animals are fellow counterparts therefore no need of eating them or causing harm on them as they also feel pain and that they have intrinsic value in themselves.

Bentham (1823) while appreciating the dawn of legislation act against cruelty of cattle as introduced by his British government in 1822, he further argued for all nonhuman animals’ protection legislation in his second edition of “An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation”. Here it can be observed that Jeremy Bentham was not happy with the legislation of cattle protection act only introduced by his government in 1822, his intention was to see all nonhuman animals having legislation act of preventing them from cruelty acts.

Carr and James (2017) points out that the British government passed the first anticruelty laws to animals in 1835 (Carr & James, 2017, PP. 10-31). This also tells us that the argument by Jeremy Bentham of 1823 also found room in many people including the British government. This legislation therefore meant that all nonhuman animals not only cattle got legislation of prevention from human cruelty. This also implies that the idea that animals also suffer and feel pain as humans do, got deep into the minds of many people in Britain.

Duncan (1987) points out that “There also seems to have a fairly wide acceptance of sentience within the scientific community of the early 19th Century”. He went on quoting the English veterinarian scientist, Youatt who wrote in 1839 that animals have senses, emotions and consciousness; they demonstrate sagacity, docility, memory, association of ideas and reason; they also have imagination and the moral qualities of knowledge, friendship and loyalty. It is further pointed out that Youatt also argued that sentience in human beings and nonhuman animals only differ in degree but not in kind. This means that Youatt believed that nonhuman animals have sentience too as humans have.

Duncan (1987) further points out that by the middle of the 19th Century another scientist, Spencer had postulated in 1855 that ‘Feelings’ are adaptations. He clearly states that Spencer suggested that feelings combine with memory and reason to form a flexible mechanism by which an animal can react adaptively to environmental change. Duncan (1987) further points out that during the same period, Darwinism theory of evolution emerged and following Darwin, feelings came to be viewed as adaptations to pressures of natural selection. He went on giving an example of Romanes who wrote in 1884 that “Pleasures and pains must have been evolved as the subjective accompaniment of processes which are respectively beneficial or injurious to the organism, and so evolved for the purpose or to the end that the organism should seek the one and shun the other” (Duncan, 1987). Here, it can be observed that the concept of sentience in other beings such as nonhuman animals gained much ground and much interest was generated in many study fields such as philosophers and scientists in many countries.

Looking at the information above, it can also be observed that the concept of sentience is changing and a number of elements are being added to the concept especially on the sentience of nonhuman animals. By the close of the 19th Century, scientists had discovered more elements present in nonhuman animals such as memory, reason, consciousness, pleasure, pain, just to mention a few. This is why Duncan entitled one of his articles as the “Changing Concept of

animal Sentience”. It started with doubts in animal sentience and then later, many elements are being discovered of animal sentience. It can also be observed that the scientific discoveries were also very helpful in the field of understanding the status of nonhuman animals. Further, it can also be observed that scientific studies on nonhuman animals generated interest in many countries.

Schaffer and Joan (2011) point out that the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was founded by New Yorker Henry Bergh in 1866. Further it is said that Frances Power Cobbe established the National Anti-Vivisection society in Britain in 1875. In 1892, the English social reformer Henry Stephens Salt published his book entitled “Animal Rights: Considered in Relation to Social Progress”. Here, it can be observed that Salt thought it good that as human rights were progressing, animal rights too had to progress. This shows us that nonhuman animals’ rights debate was gaining ground. It can also be observed that by the close of the 19th century (1900 AD) there was a general clear line of agreement that nonhuman animals are sentient. This is what Duncan (2004) points out that “So, 120 years ago, it was commonly accepted by scientists that animals were sentient and this was also the commonsense view held by the community” (Duncan, 2004).

Duncan (2004) further points out that during the first 70 years of the 20th Century (1900s), Scientists were heavily engaged in “Behaviourism” Science, a branch of psychology which came to be a topic of much focus during the early years of the 20th Century. He clearly states that “Through much of the 20th Century, behavioral scientists eschewed any study of animal feelings. The reason is that a branch of psychology called “Behaviourism” had a huge effect on the way that behavioral scientists thought about the mind, consciousness and feelings through the first 70 years of the 20th Century” (Duncan, 2004).

Duncan (2004) further points out that the seeds of behaviorism science were sown by James, the psychologist, who is also regarded as the founder of “functionalism” who wrote in 1904 that “Consciousness...is the name of a nonentity and has no right to a place among first principles. Those who still cling

to it are clinging to a mere echo, the faint rumour left behind by disappearing 'soul' upon the air of philosophy...it seems to me that the hour is ripe for it to be openly and universally discarded". It is further stated that following this idea, Watson founded the discipline of behaviourism in America in 1928 when he wrote that "The behaviourist sweeps aside all medieval conceptions. He drops from his scientific vocabulary all subjective terms such as sensation, perception, image, desire and even thinking and emotion".

The above explanation shows that scientists had been busy with behavioral science during the first 70 years of the 20th Century. What is of importance of this study is that it came into light that the behavior of nonhuman animals proves that they have sentience. This is evidenced when McDougall (1926) proposed a theory of motivation based on feelings. He suggested that an animal's subjective experiences such as fear, sexual desire, and maternal tenderness, which he called "Emotions", could motivate activities such as escaping from danger, courtship and copulation, and caring for young". Here, it can be observed that animal sentience theory had gone deep into the minds of scientists and philosophers. Young (1959) was another scientist who suggested that effective subjective states have central role in regulating and directing behavior.

Duncan (2004) further points out that behaviourism flourished in North America through much of the 20th Century. This means that behaviorism science took much space therefore it was a reckoning force of the early 20th Century. Skinner (1975) stated that "We seem to have a kind of inside information about our behavior-we have feelings about it. And what a diversion they have proved to be!..Feelings have proved to be one of the most fascinating attractions along the road of dalliance" (Skinner, 1975). Here, it can be observed that behaviorism was a big challenge of the early 20th Century. Duncan further points out that James, Watson and Skinner were powerful figures and their influence was wide spread to the extent that there was little consideration of consciousness and feelings in North American schools of psychology (Duncan, 2004).

Duncan (2004) further points out that even the European – founded ethology was influenced by behaviourism: ethologists generally restricted their considerations to observable behaviour. McFarland (1981) points out that their use of terms such as ‘hunger’, ‘pain’, ‘fear’ and ‘frustration’ suggests that affective states were still guiding their thinking on behavior although the subjective component was not openly discussed. Griffin (1975) broke this pattern when he gave a paper on subjective feelings at the international ethology conference in Parma in Italy and later published a book on the topic in 1976. It is said that since then, an animal sentience has become an important topic in its own right and there has been an ever increasing flow of publications (Griffin, 1975).

Duncan(2004) further points out that although behaviourism had swept much of North America in the early years of the 20th century but still there were some scientists who had focused on feelings directly and one of such scholars was McDougall who proposed a theory of motivation based on feelings in 1926 and suggested that animal’s subjective experiences such as fear, sexual desire and maternal tenderness, which he called ‘emotions’, could motivate activities such as escaping from danger, courtship and copulation and caring for young (Duncan, 2004).

Beauchamp (2011) points out that between 1944 to 1998, animal rights gained increasing support. He further points out that in 1944, Donald Watson, an English animal rights advocate, founded the Vegan Society in Britain. Here, it can be observed that the view that nonhuman animals have feelings grew deep and many had developed a sense of viewing them as counterparts therefore eating them was viewed as unethical.

White (1967) points out that during the same period of the early years of the 20th Century, in the 1940s, ecological or environmental concerns emerged. This phenomenon of ecology or the environment called for environmental ethics. These discussions also helped a lot in advancing animal rights debate as the field of nonhuman animals also falls under environmental ethics. While reflecting on ecological issues, some also reflected on nonhuman animals therefore a blessing

in disguise for nonhuman animals. It is pointed out that Aldo Leopold was the first to write about the ecological concerns as a response to them in 1949 in his article entitled “The Land Ethic” in “A Sunday County Almanac” in which he argued that the ecological concerns are philosophical in nature and there is a need for the philosophers to debate about them. In search for the answers of the ecological concerns, Leopold also argued that the concerns have emerged as a result of the lack of land ethics and this is why he entitled his article “The Land Ethic”.

Leopold (1949) further argued that “A thing is right when it tends to preserve the integrity, stability and beauty of the biotic community. It is wrong when it tends otherwise” (Leopold, 1949). This definition shows us the need for moral considerability for the entire biotic community which includes nonhuman animals therefore advocating for the rights of nonhuman animals as well. The environmental ethics debate also motivated nonhuman animals’ rights debate at a higher level.

In 1959 Russell and Burch first introduced the 3 R’s of animal testing. These stand for Replacement, Reduction and Refinement. In the case of replacement, the philosophy is that researchers have to consider alternatives if they are available instead of using an animal in research. It also goes on further that if researchers argue that there is no alternative then they have to be accountable if an alternative is found by others. Further if it is true that there is no alternative then researchers have to release results of the test. On reduction, the idea is that researchers have to reduce the number of animals to be used in research. On refinement the idea is that researchers have to consider of minimizing the risk of suffering, they have to make sure that pain is minimized. They also have to make sure that there is adequate care of the animals after the research. All these principles indicate that during the early years of the 20th Century, there was a deep understanding that nonhuman animals are sentient beings.

Mench (1998) points out that in the 1960s another philosophy called Animal Welfare Science developed and this movement also helped a lot in developing

nonhuman animals' rights (Mench, 1998, p.91). It is said that Harrison published a book entitled "Animal Machines" in 1964 in which he argued that "An animal that was stressed would have poor welfare and an animal that was not stressed would have good welfare" Here, it can be observed that welfare or performance of an animal would be determined by the stress the animal has. In this regard, it was observed that nonhuman animals are sentient and they feel stress.

Harrison (1964) clearly argues in his book "Animal Machines" that it was not only the welfare which motivated him to write the book but the suffering of animals in intensive agriculture, in biomedical research and in product testing that spurred him to write her book. She clearly points out that it was not just the fact that these animals were stressed that troubled her but it was the fact that they were sentient and could feel stressed. Here, it can be observed that Harrison had full knowledge and trust that nonhuman animals are sentient and that they feel pain, suffering and stress.

The British Government in 1965 as a follow up to Harrison's argument, made an investigation, published the report and called it the Brumbell Report. It was viewed that welfare would be intimately connected with the physiological stress response. This was also approved by Bareham (1972), Bryant (1972), Wood-Gush et al (1975) and Freeman (1978). The Brumbell committee also acknowledged that Sentient was important. They said that "Welfare is a wide term that embraces both the physical and mental well-being of the animal. Any attempt to evaluate welfare, therefore, must take into account the scientific evidence available concerning the feelings of animals that can be derived from their structure and functions and also from their behavior" (Brumbell Command Paper, 2836, 1965). In this regard the Brumbell committee also realized that nonhuman animals are sentient and understanding it is an essential part of assessing welfare.

White (1967) argued in his book entitled "The Historical Roots of our Ecological Crisis" that environmental ethics is vital in solving the ecological crises. He also pointed out that apart from ecological issues there is also a need of treating

nonhuman animals ethically as they are sentient. Here, it can be observed that the concept of sentience in nonhuman animals had gone deep in people's minds. Hardin (1968) also argued in his book entitled "Tragedy of the Commons" that nonhuman animals are sentient. It is said that by the close of the 1960s, it was generally agreed that the ecological crises emerged due to lack of environmental ethics. It was viewed that there is a great need of treating the environment including nonhuman animals ethically. Nonhuman animals were believed to be sentient by many people. In 1970 "Earth Day" was introduced. This is the day when to celebrate or remember the importance of the environment, nonhuman animals included. In the same year 1970, Ryder coined the term "Speciesism", a term for discrimination against animals based on their species membership (Ryder, 1970). It is said that the term was popularized by the philosopher and ethicist Peter Singer. Here, it can be observed that Ryder saw the need of treating nonhuman animals ethically as they have rights and that they are sentient.

Duncan (2004) points out that from the 1970s, many publications were made on the environment and animal ethics. My focus here is on the animal ethics. Warnock (1971) argued that moral considerability must not only be restricted to rational beings but even to non-rational beings. He also felt that nonhuman animals are sentient and that they need to be respected of their rights. Naess (1973) argued for libertarian extension, that is extending rights from human beings to nonhuman beings. Arne Naess preferred the term "Deep Ecology" to Libertarian extension. Here, it can be observed that the basics of 'deep ecology' lie in extending rights from human beings to nonhuman beings. For Naess, nonhuman animals have value in themselves therefore intrinsic value and they must not be viewed instrumentally. He viewed nonhuman animals as sentient in nature.

Brennan (1973) also possessed the same view as Naess that nonhuman beings must also be treated ethically as they have intrinsic value and that nonhuman animals are sentient. He advocated for eco-humanism, that is viewing the environment as human beings. Here, he thought it good to view nonhuman

animals as human beings. He strongly pointed out that nonhuman beings must be accorded moral considerability on the basis that they live. For him, nonhuman animals must be accorded moral considerability on the basis that they live. He also clearly pointed out that nonhuman animals are sentient beings.

Singer (1974) argued for libertarian extension theory. He clearly stated that “Expanding circle of moral worth should be redrawn to include the rights of nonhuman animals and not to do so would be guilty of speciesism” (Singer, 1974). Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer is very much interested in other species too not human beings only. He also sees the need for extending moral worth to nonhuman animals too. He believes that nonhuman animals are sentient. Although earlier Singer pointed out that abiotic beings must not be included in the moral circle but after reading Arne Naess’s work, he changed his mind and admitted that even abiotic beings must be accorded the moral consideration though debatable. In 1975, Singer published the popular book entitled “Animal Liberation” in which he clearly argued that nonhuman animals are sentient and they need to be liberated from human oppression so that they should have their own rights as sentient beings. Peter Singer is thought to be a chief philosopher advocate of nonhuman animals in the Post Modern Period (1950-2000 AD). Aldo Leopold is thought to be the chief philosopher of animal advocate of the Modern Period (1900- 1950 AD).

Goodpaster (1978) pointed out that some nonhuman beings also deserve moral considerability as long as they are rational beings. He further pointed out that some nonhuman animals are rational and are sentient and such nonhuman animals deserve moral considerability. Although Goodpaster’s condition for moral considerability as being a ‘rational being’ is very much debatable but what is important is that he acknowledged sentience in some nonhuman animals.

Duncan (2004) Points out that through the 1980s, and triggered by the publication of Dawkins book entitled “Animal suffering” (Dawkins, 1980), behavioural scientists gradually accepted the importance of feelings in their investigations into animal welfare problems (Duncan, 2004). Here, it can be observed that from the

1980s, sentience or feeling was viewed as important tool for animal investigations. In this regard, animals were viewed as sentient in many fields of study. Further it can also be stated that from the 1980s, it was generally agreed upon even by scientists of welfare science that nonhuman animals have sentience and this element became very helpful in animal studies regarding their welfare.

Duncan (2004) further points out that with the publication of Dawkins book entitled “Animal Suffering” in 1980, many people came to believe that nonhuman animals have feelings and that they experience pain and following this view, many scholars published books on animal suffering or animal sentience such as Dawkins (1980, Duncan (1981), Duncan and Dawkins (1983), Duncan (1987), Dawkins (1990), Duncan (1996). Here, it can be observed that by the close of the second millennium (2000AD), it was generally accepted that nonhuman animals are sentient or that they have feelings. It can also be stated that by the close of the Post-Modern period, the general understanding was that nonhuman animals are sentient beings.

During the Post-Post-Modern period (2000- 2022 AD), the general view is that nonhuman animals are sentient beings (Duncan, 2004). Philosophers and other scholars of various fields have and are publishing material on sentience of nonhuman animals and the general view is that nonhuman animals are sentient beings. Am not sure who can be the chief philosopher advocate of animal sentience of this period (Post Post Modern Period) but as the Australian philosopher Peter Singer is still alive, perhaps he continues to cherish in this field. Below is the section of his understanding on sentientism of nonhuman animals.

2.4 Peter Singer’s Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals

This section provides Peter Singer’s perspective on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

Singer (1974) advocated for libertarian extension theory. He clearly argued that “Expanding circle of moral worth should be redrawn to include the rights of

nonhuman animals and not to do so would be guilty of speciesism” (Singer, 1974). In this regard, it can be observed that Peter Singer became very much interested in other species too to accord moral considerability not human beings only. He also saw the need for extending moral worth to nonhuman animals as well. His belief was that nonhuman animals are sentient beings. Although it is pointed out that earlier, Singer pointed out that abiotic beings must not be included in the moral circle but after reading Arne Naess’s work, he changed his mind and admitted that even abiotic beings must be accorded the moral consideration though debatable.

In 1975, Singer published the popular book entitled “Animal Liberation” in which he clearly argued that nonhuman animals are sentient beings and they need to be liberated from human oppression so that they should have their own rights as sentient beings and have moral consideration. Peter Singer is thought to be a chief philosopher advocate of nonhuman animals in the Post Modern Period (1950-2000 AD). Aldo Leopold is said to be the chief philosopher advocate of nonhuman animals of the Modern Period (1900- 1950 AD).

Peter Singer continues to be chief advocate of nonhuman animals in the Post Modern period (2000 AD- 2022). Peter Singer was regarded as among the ten top and celebrated intellectuals of Australia because of his book entitled “Animal Liberation” published in 1975. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer has contributed a lot in as far as animal rights are concerned. He really shows that he has a passion for other beings apart from human beings. For him anthropocentrism is not important.

Peter is very aware of the presence and arguments of other sentientist schools of nonhuman animals. But for him the best ground for basing sentientism of nonhuman animals is on pain and suffering and not other grounds such as cognitive. His sentientism is that emphasis should be capitalized on pain and suffering. He refutes all other grounds of sentientism of nonhuman animals. This study analyses and defends Peter Singer’s perspective on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

In summarising this chapter, it may be stated that the terminology “Sentience” comes from the Latin verb “Sentire” which simply means “feeling or having feeling”. The word has been used differently in relation to nonhuman animals. This has been the case in the sense that there has been a sharp disagreement throughout the centuries among people of different fields on whether nonhuman animals are sentient or not. This has aroused interest among scientists in making a research on nonhuman animals in order to establish the fact. Following this, the concept of Sentience has been changing on nonhuman animals basing on the findings.

Basing on the changing views on sentience, this is why Duncan (2006) entitled his article “The Changing concept of Animal Sentience”. It has been an interesting phenomenon throughout the centuries to note that whenever a scientific discovery of animal sentience has been found, for example, a discovery that nonhuman animals are conscious, then some scholars would immediately define sentience as consciousness and this tendency has been changing the definition of sentience throughout the centuries hence a changing concept of sentience, the contentious area being that of nonhuman animal sentience. This is what Kotzmann (2020) says that ‘Human sentience is widely understood and accepted, while the sentience of other species, including farmed animals, is increasingly being recognized (Kotzmann, 20220, p.1).

Further, it may also be stated that for a long time, from the ancient times to the dawn of the Enlightenment, the popular view had been that of viewing nonhuman animals as non-sentient. The views of most celebrated scholars or philosophers such as Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Rene Descartes and Immanuel Kant that nonhuman animals are non-sentient had been carrying more weight although some lay people and some theologians had possessed the opposite view. It must also been said that during the Enlightenment, the philosophical view of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Rene Descartes and Immanuel Kant that nonhuman animals are non-sentient, was heavily challenged. From then to the present, the most popular

view is that nonhuman animals are sentient although some possess the opposite view.

Furthermore, it may also be stated that from the Middle Ages to the present, many countries have introduced animal legislations protecting them from human cruelty. This is a clear line that most countries have come to accept that nonhuman animals are sentient and they need much protection from human abuse as they also feel pain. Ireland is the first country to pass nonhuman animals legislation protecting them from abuse in 1635.

It may also be stated that following the scientific discoveries revealing that nonhuman animals are sentient, Animal Welfare or Animal Welfarist beings movements or groups have been formed worldwide. These groups have helped a lot and are helping a lot in promoting nonhuman animals' rights. It is a fact to say that most countries have acknowledged and legalized animal rights. This is an important development in the history of nonhuman animals. It must also be stated that scientists have helped a lot and are helping a lot in making discoveries through research in identifying the truth that nonhuman animals are sentient. Although they have not yet completed making research on other nonhuman animals finding out whether they are sentient or not but it is commonly agreed upon that most of them have been proved to be sentient and it is therefore right to generalize that nonhuman animals are sentient.

The scientific discoveries have helped a lot in putting down the arguments of those who claim that nonhuman animals are non-sentient, views of prominent and pillars of philosophy such as Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Rene Descartes and Immanuel Kant. It is true to say that without these scientific discoveries, it would have been too difficult to defend that nonhuman animals are sentient. These scientific discoveries are helping adding weight to the ordinary knowledge.

It must also be pointed out that philosophers such as Jeremy Bentham, Ado Leopold, Duncan, Dawkins, Peter Singer, just to mention a few, have helped a lot in developing a convincing philosophy regarding animal sentience. Further, it

must also be stated that philosophers, scientists and other scholars of other fields have to continue working on the rights of nonhuman animals so that they can find peace and salvation as creatures having their own intrinsic value. Many people worldwide have not yet come to light, respecting the intrinsic value of nonhuman animals. Nonhuman animals are still being mistreated in many parts of the world. Most people are still viewing nonhuman animals from instrumental value. Many people have not come to acknowledge that nonhuman animals are sentient. A very good example is here in Malawi where nonhuman animals are not respected, they are killed without reason, they are whipped for no reason without knowing that they feel pain, they have a capacity of feeling pain as they are sentient too as human beings.

Finally, it must also be stated that the animal rights debate is not over. The war is still on. Many countries have not completed making legislations of animal protection and this is a big concern. It must also be said that there are still some controversies among philosophers and other scholars regarding the moral status of nonhuman animals and it is my plea that debates have to continue to establish the moral status of nonhuman animals. The fact that nonhuman animals are sentient beings is now a generally accepted fact. Further, it must also be stated that there are various views of sentientism of nonhuman animals. This study focuses on Peter singer's sentientism as a theory nonhuman animals.

2.5 Chapter conclusion

The chapter has presented an exposition of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter has clearly provided a definition of sentience or sentientism. Further, the chapter has also provided a brief history of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

CHAPTER THREE

ANALYSIS OF PETER SINGER'S SENTIENTISM AS A THEORY OF MORAL CONSIDERABILITY OF NONHUMAN ANIMALS

3.1 Chapter introduction

This chapter presents the analysis of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter presents the merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter is very important as it is the heart of this study and it is in this chapter where an analysis of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is done. The chapter unpacks the merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals therefore this chapter is the hub of this study as it lays the ground of whether Peter singer's sentientism is defensible or not.

3.2 The merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals

This section unpacks the merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The section is very important in the sense that it clearly unpacks arguments in favour of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The section also unpacks arguments against Peter Singer's Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The section is very important as it warrants a favourable ground of basing Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals whether it is defensible or not.

3.2.1 *The merits of Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.*

Peter Singer’s sentientism helps human beings to focus on what they have in common with nonhuman animals that they both feel pain and suffering. This is what Woodhouse (2018) states that sentientism helps human beings to focus on what they have in common with nonhuman animals therefore it helps in realization of having common identity.

Woodhouse (2018) goes on further stating that “While identity politics can help identify identity problems and provide mutual support within groups, humanism and sentientism can develop collective solutions that they can both identify with and work on together” (Woodhouse, 2018). Here, it can be observed that Sentientism helps human beings to realize that nonhuman animals have also feelings like those of human beings and this can help to sort out problems which exist between them. In this regard, sentientism helps human beings to realize that nonhuman animals have feelings too therefore they are both sentient beings and there is a need of supporting each other as they fall in the same group of sentient beings.

The above explanation implies that Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very vital as it influences human beings to realize that nonhuman animals are also sentient like them, they also feel pain and suffering therefore they are common and must not mistreat each other.

The second implication is that Peter Singer’s sentientism helps human beings to realize that they have a common war with nonhuman animals and this is a war of fighting for rights. Humanism fights for human rights while sentientism fights for nonhuman animals’ rights. In this regard the two groups have the same or common fight, that of rights and as they have the common agenda, they can also talk, work together and support each other. They are beings of the same fight or

beings of the same war or beings of the common agenda. In other words Peter Singer's sentientism helps to promote the common agenda the human beings and nonhuman animals have, the agenda of fighting for rights. In this regard, as beings of the common war therefore they cannot mistreat each other but work together as beings of the same identity, longing for rights. In this regard Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very vital.

Further, the implications above are also very important in the sense that the realization that both parties (The human beings and the nonhuman animal beings) have sentience or feelings or that they both feel pain and suffering and also that they have the same war of fighting for rights, they can start respecting each other and solve the differences between them. This means that there can be a good relationship between the two parties as they have a common war and that they can love each other therefore no party can discredit the other.

The above implications therefore indicate that Peter Singer's sentientism promotes love between human beings and nonhuman animals. In this regard 'Anthropocentrism' falls. Human beings can stop immediately the tendency of viewing themselves as more important than nonhuman animals. The tendency of viewing human beings as at the center of all creation would immediately stop. The Greek-Judeo ethics that human beings occupy the center of all creation faces heavy challenge with Peter Singer's sentientism. Mbiti (1969) also points out that in African philosophy, human beings are at the center of all creation and this African philosophy therefore faces challenges with Peter Singer's sentientism philosophy. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very vital as it promotes love between human beings and nonhuman animals.

Peter Singer's sentientism helps to point out to a number of mistreatments that human beings pose on nonhuman animals thinking that they do not feel pain and

suffering. This is what Woodhouse (2019) further argues that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is helpful in the sense that it points out to a number of ills or mistreatments by human beings on nonhuman animals. This is what he says below:

This sentientist approach has far reaching implications, particularly for how we treat animals. As with humans, causing suffering and even death is sometimes justified, but the reason needs to be powerful and robust. Using animals for our food, drink and in products is not sufficient justification. We need to think of causing suffering and death to farm animals in the same way as we think of causing suffering and death to pets or charismatic wild animals. Farmed animals are just as sentient. Granting even basic rights of physical security to sentient animals requires an end to animal farming and a complete transition to arable agriculture. This would avoid the suffering and death of over 100 billion sentient animals every year, would radically reduce our climate impact, and might even help to save the rainforests, while freeing vast expanses of land for tree planting or re-wilding. This may seem a radical change given the scale of animal farming and its traditional and cultural importance, but the benefits are clear. Serious work has already been done to show how we can make this transition work, including this UK focused analysis by the New Economics Foundation and the Vegan Society. The process includes re-

orienting government subsidies, providing support for farming communities as they transition and managing the animals themselves during the process. (Woodhouse, 2019, p.2).

From the statement above, it can be observed that Jamie Woodhouse is arguing that Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps to reflect on various evil relationships that exist between human beings and nonhuman animal beings. He points out a number of areas where human beings oppress or mistreat nonhuman animals, areas such as eating meat, killing animals either for food or for exploitation of some products such as skins for leather bags, leather shoes, leather clothes, causing suffering and deaths of farm animals and deforestation. For sentientist view, this is very unethical as nonhuman animals have feelings and they deserve life as human beings. It can also be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps to correct a number of evils which human beings inflict on nonhuman animals thinking that they do not feel pain and suffering. In this regard, the Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is vital.

The above statement has further pointed out a number of human cruelty acts on nonhuman animals which need to be corrected and here it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in pointing out the grey areas and further helps to correct such grey areas. In this regard, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also a very important theory in the sense that it makes human beings to start thinking of new ways of relating with nonhuman animals after learning the grey areas pointed out by the theory therefore correcting the grey areas. In this regard Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is indeed a very important theory as it helps to correct negative human acts on nonhuman animals. In the following paragraphs, a more detailed look at these human evil acts

mentioned above on nonhuman animals would be done and I hope new benefits of the theory would also be discovered.

The first human cruelty act on nonhuman animals mentioned here is eating them as food or drink. According to the sentientist view as Peter Singer, this is very unethical as nonhuman animals have intrinsic value and must not be used instrumentally. Here, the major problem is that when one wants meat, then he has to remove the life of an animal and this is murder according to a sentientist view as Peter Singer. This is because the animal has feelings and it is entitled to live as human beings, therefore taking its life away is just very unethical while its fellow counterpart, the sentient human being is enjoying life.

The whole issue above is that it is unethical to just view nonhuman animals from an instrumental value but that it is also very important to appreciate the intrinsic value of nonhuman animals. In this regard, taking care of nonhuman animals as deserving the right to live and that are sentient just as human beings are, is very important, not just viewing them from the point of food or drink. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is a very helpful theory as it points out the human cruelty acts of using animals for mere food or drink without recognizing their intrinsic value. The theory also helps in putting down an assignment of thinking for new methods of treating nonhuman animals towards food or drink.

The other area of human cruelty on nonhuman animals mentioned here is about using animal products for the sake of using them. This tendency is influenced by a kind of utilitarian philosophy. This tendency looks at nonhuman animals from an instrumental value point of view. The tendency of using animal products such as animal skins for leather shoes, leather clothes and leather bags is a very unethical one according to sentientists' view as Peter Singer. The problem is that when one wants to get skins for such products, it means that animals have to lose their lives and in a very painful way as the methods used for slaughtering them

are just very painful. This tendency can also extinguish the nonhuman animals yet nonhuman animals have intrinsic value therefore to view them from an instrumental value point of view is unethical. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it restricts the use of animal products from an instrumental value point of view. The theory is also very important as it lays down an assignment of pondering over for new methods of using animal products. It may be good to use animal products such as animal skins only when an animal dies on its own following the natural death principle.

On the use of animal products, it must also be pointed out that especially in Africa, animal products are used in various functions and another function worth of not being forgotten is using animal products for traditional medicine. This is what Kayange and Makwinja (2016) call an instrumental value of Cultural Utilitarianism. One good example here in Malawi is where Chickens are used for various beliefs. Among the Chewa tribe, chickens are used for boys' initiation ceremonies. During the ceremony, chickens are slaughtered by using a very painful method of piecing them at the sitting bottom so that they are mixed with traditional medicine for the initiates to eat so that they become very faithful or strong members of their religion which is characterized by a very attractive dance called 'nyau' commonly called big dance due to the attractive behavior which pulls many people together both Christians and Muslims (fellow big religions in Malawi) to watch. The big dance is performed by spirits called zinyau or zilombo. The big dance performers are also just called nyau (Nyau, singular, plural: Zinyau)

It is further pointed out that the boys are initiated at puberty age and the ceremony takes place in the grave yard where the big dance performers (Gulewamkulu: Nyau performers) reside. It is at this Nyau residence, the boys' initiation ceremony mostly takes place. The medicine which is called 'Khundabwi' is also given to the initiates in order for them to have a peaceful sleep whereby the

initiates do not remember or dream some frightening events which they see at the grave yard such as dead peoples' graves, masked spirits (Zinyau) just to mention a few. The medicine is also given to them in order for them to become courageous .Here, it can be observed that at every moment there is a boys initiation ceremony, innocent lives of chickens are taken away in a very painful manner yet they are sentient beings. This also means that chicken species will fade away on the universe therefore a very unethical behavior which needs to be corrected.

Further, taking away innocent lives such as of chickens in this aspect, is very wrong as this is what Leopold (1949) condemns as not respecting the beauty and integrity of the biotic community. This is unethical as it is just viewing the chickens from an instrumental value point of view not from an intrinsic value point of view. Inflicting such a terrible pain on them is very just unethical. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in correcting such evil acts.

The other second dangerous cultural ceremony to look into is by herbalists (Asing'anga, singular: Sing'anga: African traditional doctor) whereby they demand a chicken or chickens to be used for medicine preparation for the sick. Parts or products of chickens are used and the chicken is killed in a very painful method. This makes the chicken to feel lots of pain as it is a sentient being. This situation makes lots of chickens to lose their lives once one gets sick. This practice is very wrong as it makes chickens very big victims on earth and it seems good that the practice has to stop as it only views chickens from an instrumental value point of view not from an intrinsic value point of view. Here, it can be observed that Peter singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in correcting such evil acts.

On the traditional medicine, Kayange and Makwinja (2016) point out another traditional medicine activity called 'mchape' (Village cleansing medicine of witchcraft) which took place in 1995 here in Malawi in Balaka District, a District

in the Eastern Region of Malawi where a man called Goodson Chisupe claimed to cure the dangerous disease of HIV/AIDS by using mchape. It is said that Doctor Chisupe was using a crocodile's gallbladder for his medicine of village cleansing (Kayange & Makwinja, 2016, P.34). Here, it can be observed that animal parts or products are being used in this exercise and this means that many crocodiles would lose their lives and in a very painful method as this Chisupe is not a surgeon and can cut them with lots of pain forgetting that they feel pain as they are sentient beings. In this case it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in restricting the practice of using animal products for other functions. Further, it advocates against rendering pain and suffering on nonhuman animals therefore a very vital theory.

Apart from using animals for food or drink or animal products, the other human cruelty act on nonhuman animals mentioned here to think about is the method of killing the animals which are very painful. In this regard Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is important in the sense that it helps to advocate for proper methods of slaughtering nonhuman animals for food which inflict less pain on them. In most cases animals are slaughtered using very painful and sympathetic methods. A good example is here in Malawi where the methods of slaughtering animals are just very pathetic. One of the areas to note is on slaughtering cattle. In most cases, a cow is knifed at the joint between the head and the neck and it immediately falls down and then after, the butcher men do continue to hit the head with axes in order to put it to full death. This system is very painful and seems very unethical as animals are sentient and that they feel pain. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism is very vital.

The other method of slaughtering cattle in Malawi is by strangling them. By this system, a wire or a rope is set tight around the neck of the animal and a group of

people pull the rope fixing the animal against a wall or a pole until the animal is killed. This method is also very painful as the animal feels pain as it is sentient.

Looking at both methods stated above, it can be observed that they are both painful methods and must not be accepted. Here, it can be observed further that Malawians do not see the intrinsic value of cattle but their instrumental value and this is very unethical. It is very surprising in Malawi to see even religious people killing cattle without praying for them and this attitude signifies the fact that the Malawians do not see the intrinsic value of cattle but only see their instrumental value therefore very unethical. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism is vital.

Worse still, to note is that when beef is being sold, it is hanged on a pole for people to see so that they can buy it. This attitude seems to be very unethical as it does not take into consideration the dignity of cattle. It is interesting to note that when a human being is dead, he is immediately covered by a cloth to show human dignity but this is very opposite when it comes to cattle when slaughtered. It seems very ethical to cover them when they are slaughtered and find other methods of advertisement. This is what Leopold (1949) fights for as lack of maintaining the beauty and integrity of the biotic community. Peter Singer's sentientism therefore helps to accord beauty and dignity of nonhuman animals.

Another good example in Malawi is on slaughtering goats. They are slaughtered using various methods. The first method of slaughtering them is by strangling them. A rope is set tight around the neck of the goat and several people pull the rope choking the goat on the neck against a pillar and it dies on the same spot. This method can be observed that it is very painful, think of a human being treated like that, ethical? It is very bad indeed. This method is therefore very unethical and must be banned with urgency as it makes the goats to feel too much pain as they are sentient beings. In this regard Peter Singer's sentientism is very vital.

The second method of slaughtering goats in Malawi is by hanging them. Two poles with a bar on top are erected and a rope is set on the bar with a hole and the neck of the goat is inserted into the hole of the rope which is tied in a stylish manner of a hook which immediately tie the neck of the goat and as the goat is left hanging on its own, the rope becomes tight on the neck of the goat and the goat is choked and dies at the same spot. After the goat dies, the butcher men start skinning it while hanging making it ready for sell and it is sold while hanging. Here, it can be observed that this method of slaughtering goats is very unfair and it is very painful. This symbolizes lack of moral considerability on non-human animals such as goats. It seems good that this behavior must stop without any debate. Further the system of selling goat meat while hanging is also very unfair as it is one way of disrespecting goats. When a human being dies, he is immediately covered with a blanket or any form of a cloth as a way of respecting him therefore why not with goats? This method is very unethical and it must be revised. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism helps to correct such evils therefore very vital.

The third method of slaughtering goats in Malawi is by just catching them and tying their legs together and cutting their neck with a knife and they die. Here it can be observed that this method of killing goats is also very painful as it is done even at the open space while the public including children are viewing. This means that children would grow up hating goats and having a spirit of mistreating them all the times. Children would grow up with a spirit of thinking that goats are only meant for food hence a form of an African utilitarian philosophy. This spirit of viewing goats from a utilitarian point of view, is not a good one, it is very unethical. This view must be looked into with urgency. Peter Singer's sentientism in this regard helps to correct such evil acts therefore very important theory.

Another good example of unethical methods of killing nonhuman animals in Malawi is on slaughtering chickens. Various methods are used. The first method of slaughtering chickens is by just cutting their necks and they die immediately.

The butcher man just steps on the chicken and cut its neck. This is the commonest method used. It must also be stated that before cutting the neck, some feathers are taken out around the area of the neck where the knife would be placed. This is done in order to allow the knife to cut the neck deep without being confused by the feathers. This method as observed is also very painful as the chicken is cut while seeing the process and it is very unethical. It is imperative that this method be looked into. Worse still, sometimes the process is done in the public even in the sight of children. This makes the children to grow with a negative attitude against chickens and whenever they see chickens, they chase them and threaten to kill them. The same happens when women are washing kitchen utensils and if a chicken is drinking water close to them, they threaten it with a knife saying that they would cut it for food. This attitude is just very unfair as it shows a negative relationship between chickens and human beings therefore keeping chickens not for love but for instrumental value not intrinsic value therefore very unethical behavior and has to be looked into with urgency. Peter Singer's sentientism in this regard, helps a lot in putting down such evil acts.

The second method of slaughtering chickens in Malawi is by twisting their necks several times (Kupotola khosi or kupotokola khosi) until they die. This method is very fast but very painful. This method is also done while the chicken is seeing the process. Again, the public viewing such a process, it is indeed just very unethical. Chickens also feel pain as human beings do as they are sentient too therefore they need to be respected and have their rights respected. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism helps a lot in putting down such acts.

The third method of slaughtering chickens in Malawi is by a method which is done at the grave yard during boys' initiation ceremony. This method is very unique and very unethical in nature. The method uses a sharp stick mostly a stick made from the believed medicine tree (Chabzero) which the boys take so that they can become courageous even walking during the night. This stick is set at the sitting back of the chicken and is inserted into the chicken stomach until coming

out at the mouth of the chicken. Here, it can be observed that this method is very cruel as it is very painful indeed and this method has to stop with immediate effect as the chicken feels very painful as it is a sentient being. Here, it can also be viewed that chickens are only viewed from an instrumental value point of view not intrinsic value point of view therefore there is a very great need of giving more light to Malawians in order to promote the intrinsic value point of view of chickens. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism helps a lot in correcting such evil acts.

Another important example worth noting regarding unethical behavior of killing nonhuman animals in Malawi is the area of slaughtering pigs. Pigs are said to be self- defensive animals. It is said that it is difficult to handle pigs as they do bit terribly, even hyenas do fear them. In this regard, pigs are mostly slaughtered by using an axe which is placed through a small space of the kraal and hit the head of the targeted pig until it dies and it is hooked out of the kraal. Here, it can be observed that this method used to slaughter a pig is very painful and very unethical in nature as pigs are sentient beings and they feel pain. Further pork is sold at an open ground and this method is also very unfair as it is disrespecting the pig while dead. It is important to keep them covered. When human beings die, they still deserve much respect even more respected than before death. Human beings when they die even assume the status of a chief (Mfumu) yet they were even very poor before death and lacked respect because of the poverty. This symbolizes that once the human being is dead, he becomes elevated and exalted therefore it is also necessary to treat pigs in a respected manner when they are slaughtered. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism helps a lot in correcting such evil acts.

The other area mentioned of human cruelty on nonhuman animals is the area of overusing farm animals. This is unethical. Farm animals are supposed to be treated fairly regarding the fact that they do suffer as human beings do. In this regard, using animals for farming the whole day is very unethical as they do

suffer by feeling pain and getting tired. This system for example, is also common here in Malawi where farm animals are overworked without considering that they are sentient and feel pain. Here, Woodhouse (2019) sees that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps to protect nonhuman animals from being overused. Peter Singer's sentientism in this regard helps a lot in correcting such evil acts therefore a very important theory.

Another example here in Malawi where animals are overused is when animals are used for transportation such as pulling wagon (Kukoka ngolo). In some cases the wagon is filled with more goods beyond capacity and the animals are forced to pull it and in most cases they are whipped so that they pull the wagon by force. Here it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in ending such unethical behavior of overusing and mistreating nonhuman animals taking into consideration that nonhuman animals also feel pain and suffering.

On the aspect of using animals for labor, Kayange and Makwinja (2016), call this "Labour Utilitarianism". This is a tendency of viewing nonhuman animals as means of labour not viewing them as having value on their own. They argue that Africans especially in Malawi, view nonhuman animals from an instrumental value point of view not from an intrinsic value point of view. On this labour utilitarianism, it is also worthy to point out another form of transportation means, this is not using animals as mentioned above such as pulling wagons or carrying goods on their back but here, it is the act of transporting themselves from one place to the other for being sold. This is mostly done in transporting cattle in Malawi. In most cases, cattle are transported from other distant places for a market at other distant places, for example from Nsanje to Lilongwe or from Mzimba to Lilongwe, these are very long distances that many human beings cannot walk but in Malawi cattle are made to walk such distances for markets.

It is further stated that cattle markets are mostly done by small scale business people who slaughter them and sell beef to various places and as these people, who ran simple businesses, usually have no cars to transport cattle from distant places to various potential markets in the country, therefore they usually transport them by making them walk and they accompany them. In most cases they hire other experts to accompany them. These people who transport cattle from place to place, must indeed be experts, just imagine for example, from Nsanje to Lilongwe, is a distance of about six hundred kilometers and walking on foot such a distance, indeed requires an expert. In Malawi thinking zone, these people are thought to play magic (African traditional medicine). These are some of the things which Parrinder (1954) narrates that the early pioneers of African philosophy and Religion thought of the Africans as people who practice magic or juju (Parrinder, 1954, P.15). The distance is just very long and animals feel tired as they are sentient beings. In this regard Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in correcting such evils.

It must also be stated that there is no stop when the journey starts. This means that there is no rest on the way therefore cattle have no time to eat, rest and drink water but the transporters themselves buy food on the way. They also ride on them when they get tired. This altitude raises several questions such as, is it ethically justifiable to treat cattle in such a way? Do cattle have rights? Just to mention some few questions. This altitude seems very unethical and must not be accepted, it must be abandoned once and for all. Further, it must also be reported that while travelling such a very long distance, cattle are also beaten claiming that it is the method of directing them. This also seems very unfair as they are already walking a very long distance therefore beating them too, is indeed very unethical. Bentham (1789) is very much against of such altitudes as it is applying pain on the innocent beings. Nonhuman animals are sentient beings and they feel pain. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability is very important as it helps to correct such evils.

Another important example of evil method of transferring nonhuman animals in Malawi is on transporting goats. Goats are transported to various markets using various methods. The first method is by a car. Sometimes goats are transported in a van from long distances to market places and this makes them to suffer from lack of ventilation. Here, it can be observed that transporting goats using this method, is very unfair and must be thought of all over again as goats also feel pain and they need to be morally considered. In this regard, Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in correcting such behavior.

The second method of transporting goats in Malawi is by carrying them in a lorry. This is an open van but the problem with this method, is that goats are not fed on the way and just imagine that if the distance is too long then goats are deprived of food which is also very unethical. This food issue is also the same even when carrying them in a closed van therefore in a closed van goats terribly suffer from lack of ventilation as well as from lack of food. What is also shocking is that on the way, human beings on the same trip, do stop and buy food and drinks such as frozy or coca cola or water for themselves while not for the goats. This can be observed that human beings do consider themselves as more important than the non-human animals. Again, human beings regard themselves as only sentient beings but not nonhuman animals. This is in line with what Mbiti (1986) states that in African philosophy, human beings are thought of being at the center of all creation (Mbiti, 1986, P.38). Here, it can be observed that human beings are getting food on the way while animals with them on the same trip are getting nothing. This altitude has to be decolonized with urgency as it is very unethical. Nonhuman animals are sentient beings as human beings are and are supposed to be treated fairly. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it helps to correct such evils.

The third method of transporting goats to markets in Malawi is by carrying them on a bike whether a motor bike or a bicycle (commonly known as Kabaza). Sometimes, goats are put in a big basket (Gondolo or a small basket: Dengu) and tie it to a carrier of the bike (kaliyala). Food is not served in the basket for the goats until they reach their destination, only the driver gets food on the way. Here, it can be observed that goats are thought of having no rights and this altitude is very unfair. Further, it must also be stated that, sometimes goats are not put in a basket but are just tied to the bike handles upside down. This is very shocking as it is making the goats to terribly suffer as they feel pain. Goats are sentient beings and they feel hungry and pain. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it helps to correct such behavior.

Another important example of evil methods of transporting nonhuman animals in Malawi is the area of transporting chickens. In most cases, chickens are transported to various markets using multiple means such as by a car (mostly a van), bicycles, human power, just to mention a few. Mostly the hybrid ones are those which are transported in a van. It must also be stated that those who transport chickens in a car, are big companies such as CROWN, kapeni, DUDU, and the like but small business people usually transport chickens by human power or bicycles. It must also be stated that the big companies transport chickens long distances to get potential business markets. All this long distance, chickens are kept confined in either a closed van with small windows or cages, they are not offered a chance of even a little movement while human beings transporting them, do stop at some point and rest and get some refreshments but why not with chickens?. This practice is very unethical as it is putting the chickens in captivity. This practice must be abandoned with urgency. Chickens do suffer a lot as they feel pain following the fact that they are sentient beings. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory moral considerability of nonhuman animals is a vital one as it helps to correct such evils.

The other common method of transporting chickens in Malawi is by using bicycles. Most business people use this method as it is a bit simple in terms of costs. Again, most chicken business people are in this category as they penetrate deep into customers of various locations even where roads are not passable by cars. Using this bicycle method, chickens are tied in bundles and are tied to bike handles and the carrier upside down. Sometimes if they are too many to fit on the handles and carrier spaces, the driver even put some bundles of chickens around his shoulders upside down. Looking at this system, it can be observed that it is very painful indeed that even human beings cannot bear, why with chickens? Do they not feel pain as human beings? Kayange and Makwinja (2016) also lament a lot over this cruelty altitude. This practice has to be cancelled once and for all. Chickens as sentient beings and they do feel pain. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in correcting such evil altitudes.

The other common method of transporting chickens in Malawi is by using man power. This is a method whereby human-beings do carry them. Human beings usually carry them by tying them in bundles and carry them upside down by hand or putting them around their shoulders. This method can be observed that it is very unethical as the chickens do feel pain and this method has to be corrected. Here, it can also be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it helps to correct such behavior.

Peter Singer's Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also very important in the sense that it helps in conservation indirectly. Woodhouse (2019) thinks that when nonhuman animals are being treated as sentient beings, then human beings would start considering them of their habitat therefore forests would be conserved and in this aspect there is also forest conservation process. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a

theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it helps in forest conservation.

Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also very important in the sense that it helps to correct some evil cultural practices. Kayange and Makwinja call this Cultural "Utilitarianism." This is indeed very important especially in Africa where some cultural practices affect nonhuman animals negatively. One good example here is what Kayange and Makwinja (2016) point out that in Malawi, some nonhuman animals are used for cultural beliefs. They further give a very good example where a hyena tail is used as medicine for stealing so that people can be made to sleep deeply and one steals peacefully without being noticed. Here, it can be observed that if many people become thieves, then many hyena tails would be lost in the practice. What is also painful is that the method of cutting the tail from the hyena is very painful as it is just cutting it while living by strategically targeting it. The other method is by hunting and killing them either by a sword or a bow. In this regard, hyenas feel very painful as sentient beings and this is very unethical. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it helps to correct such evils.

Another important example of cultural activity which is worth noting here is that of using nonhuman animals as sacrifice. This is mostly common in Africa. Kayange and Makwinja (2016) also laments terribly over this act. It is said that cattle are mostly the victims of this aspect whereby they are offered as sacrifices to the ancestral spirits. Parrinder (1954) narrates that the Swazi people of South Africa makes an annual sacrifice of cattle to the royal graves (Parrinder, 1954, P.63). Although Parrinder speaks of Swazi people of South Africa but the act is found all over Africa including Malawi, it is only the fact that Parrinder is regarded as the genuine pioneer scholar in the field of African philosophy and religions and he started studying this element among the Swazi people of South Africa but the conduct was all over Africa.

One might think that this conduct is over in this 21st century but this is not true as the conduct is still live in people's hearts as this is part of their African philosophy and religion. Mbiti (1969) defines African Philosophy as "Refers to the understanding ,attitude of mind, logic, and perception behind the manner in which African peoples think, act or speak in different situations of life" (Mbiti,1969, P.2). The scholars are also in total agreement that there is no curtain between African philosophy and Africa Religion. Mbiti (1969) clearly puts it right by saying that "Because Traditional religions permeate all the departments of life, there is no formal distinction between the sacred and the secular, between the religious and non- religious, between the spiritual and the material areas of life. Wherever the African is, there is his religion: he carries it to the fields where he is sowing seeds or harvesting a new crop, he takes with him to the beer party or to attend a funeral ceremony, and if he is educated, he takes religion to the examination room at school or in the university, if he is a politician, he takes it to the house of parliament" (Mbiti, 1969, P.2).

In adding more weight to the above statement by John Mbiti, many scholars are also in total agreement that even in the event of new religions coming to Africa and claim African converts, those converts still remain Africans in mentality- Here, it can be observed that African philosophy is highly valued in African life since it is the culture of the Africans therefore no difference between culture and value. Again, it must also be stated that African philosophy is also religion therefore religious in nature. In this regard, the spirit of cattle sacrifice is still present in Africans only that it has changed form in this 21st century or that some are making the sacrifice in secret.

Parrinder (1954) indeed broke the silence of genuine studies in African philosophy and religions. The study among the Swazi people of South Africa on cattle sacrifice is indeed an eye opener on African religions. Early studies before Parrinder, were done by westerners hence whites mostly anthropologists and had

a tendency of despising African Philosophy and religions therefore could not narrate much on African philosophy and religions. Mbiti (1969) clearly states that genuine studies in African philosophy started to be studied seriously and in reality in the mid-20th century (Around 1950s) (Mbiti, 1969, P.6).

Echoing, the same words, Idowu (1973) also points out that early studies on African philosophy before mid-20th century AD, was done by westerners and was characterized by bias and hatred on the Africans (Idowu,1973, PP.108-130). Here, it can be observed that serious or genuine studies of African philosophy got started in the mid of the 20th century. Magesa (1997) also clearly states that these serious studies of African philosophy were done by Africans themselves though some few whites also helped (Magesa, 1997, PP. 7-10). Mbiti (1969) clearly explains that since African philosophy is religious in nature therefore it is difficult to differentiate between African religion and African philosophy, much of African Philosophy was covered in African religions studies from mid20th Century (Mbiti, 1969, P.6).

The statement above therefore means that both African philosophy and African Traditional religions came into serious studies in the mid20th Century. Gehman (1989) clearly reports that the first book to be published was that by Geoffrey Parrinder of 1954 entitled “African Traditional Religion” , the second one by P. Temples, entitled “ Bantu Philosophy, published in 1959, the third one by Geoffrey parrinder, published in 1961, entitled “West African Religions”, the fourth one by J. Taylor, published in 1963, entitled “ The Primal Vision” ,the fifth one by John Mbiti entitled African Religions and Philosophy, published in 1969, the sixth one by Geoffrey Parrinder in 1969 entitled “ African’s Three Religions”, the seventh one by John Mbiti in 1970, entitled “Concepts of God in Africa”, the eighth one by Bolaji Idowu in 1973, entitled “African Traditional Religion, A Definition” and the ninth one by Adgbola Ade in 1983, entitled “ Traditional Religion in West Africa” (Gehman, 1989, P.23).

The problem we have in African philosophy studies is that not long after serious studies emerged on African philosophy, the philosophy of Globalization emerged in the 1990s and this disturbed the serious production of studies of African philosophy and religions (Mwale, Lecture notes, CHANCO, Zomba). This makes it difficult to understand that cattle sacrifice is still present in Africa including Malawi yet the practice is still available in various forms such as killing a cow for food during funerals especially a funeral of the owner of such a cow. This act is done for the sake of African traditional religion's philosophy as a sacrifice to the dead so that the spirit of the dead person must be happy and feel respected.

The whole philosophy behind the above practice is that the animal has gone with the owner (*yapita ndi mwini wake*). Here, it can be observed that although cattle are not sacrificed on the altar directly as before but they are still being sacrificed in other forms and this altitude of sacrificing cattle is very unethical as it promotes the spirit of taking away cattle lives. This is what Leopold (1949) condemns as not respecting the beauty and integrity of the biotic community. The system of sacrificing cattle makes cattle to be victims of sacrifices once one dies therefore very unethical in nature. According to the sentientists view such as Peter Singer, cattle have sentience as human beings and they deserve to live for their intrinsic value not being victims during funerals. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it helps to correct such evil acts.

Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also very important in the sense that it helps to promote animal welfare. By welfare here, it simply means taking care of animals or in other words animal farming or taming nonhuman animals. Nonhuman animals are mostly mistreated in many parts of the world especially in Africa in as far as their welfare is concerned. Malawi is a good example where nonhuman animals' welfare is not practically respected. This can be witnessed in how nonhuman

animals are treated in as much as welfare is concerned. One example of such areas is on how cattle are cared for.

The first area of cattle welfare to note is a place where they are kept. Cattle do not have houses to spend their night comfortably; they are mostly kept in a kraal made from wooden fence which contains very sharp wires to piece them if they want to go out without the owners directives. This fence is not also protected from harsh weather as it has big spaces which also allow cold, rainy and hot weather to penetrate into them hence affecting the cattle inside. Again, the fence has usually no roof therefore very open for rains, wind and sunny weather to trouble the cattle inside. Aldo Leopold (1949) sees this as a very unethical altitude as this does not tend to preserve the beauty, integrity and stability of the biotic community.

Bentham as cited in Singer (1978) also sees this altitude as unethical one as it promotes suffering on other beings. The element of putting very sharp or razor wire to piece cattle if they want to go out, seems very harsh behavior and really making animals suffer from feeling too much pain. Further, the behavior of leaving animals exposed to hot, windy and rainy weather also seems very unethical as it is also making the animals suffer. It must be pointed out that as animals are sentient beings as human beings are, they are supposed to be treated fairly as human beings do. They are supposed to have good houses which must give them comfort. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability is very helpful as it promotes positive welfare for nonhuman animals.

Further, another area of cattle welfare to note is on feeding them. Cattle are mostly left out to feed themselves in the bush or grazing areas mostly in the fields or along mountains or along rivers where grass and water are mostly found and are directed by shepherds (Abusa, singular M'busa). These shepherds usually beat them while travelling without any due cause. This system is just unjustifiable

according to Leopold (1949) and Singer (1974). It is also very painful that these shepherds also climb on the cattle while beating them hence providing double pains on them.

Further, feeding cattle at grazing areas, does not grantee proper nutrition methods, only one single meal nutrient is taken which is also very unhealthy to the cattle and most cattle become thin due to poor feeding methods. It is indeed true that some people do give cattle additional food supplement such as maize husks (Madeya/ gaga) and the like but this is not done by many people, less than one third who do that and even those who do that, they do that for a purpose of having them work hard or become very fat for an attractive market value therefore doing that from an instrumental value point of view not intrinsic value point of view. This is very unethical as it is important to treat cattle fairly as they are sentient beings and they feel pain when beaten.

The other area of cattle welfare to note is on the health care of cattle. There is no proper health care for cattle in Malawi these days. During the single party democracy era, Malawi had dipping tanks for cattle in various centers to promote cattle health but after attaining multiparty democracy, all these centers were closed leaving cattle to suffer from various sorts of diseases therefore very unethical behavior. Although this issue of dipping cattle has also an African element that in Africa, dipping of cattle is also an alien phenomenon but it is very important for animal health. It is indeed a fact that even during colonialism, even the whites had problems to convince the blacks the need of dipping animals and as a result the Africans rose against the whites claiming that the system angers their ancestral spirits and animals cannot reproduce favorably.

The first black Malawi president managed to defeat this belief and introduced many dipping centers and as a result Malawi had lots of cattle. But now in multiparty democracy, the dipping centers have been neglected and there are lots of cattle diseases which are reducing cattle population. Further, kraals are not

swept daily hence attracting many diseases which are killing cattle each day. It must be pointed out that cattle are sentient beings and are supposed to be provided with good healthcare as they feel pain when they get sick and need to be treated. Here, it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps a lot in correcting such animal health issues.

The other area to note is on how goats are tamed in Malawi. The first aspect to note is how goats are accommodated in Malawi. There are various types of goats' accommodation systems in Malawi. The first system is that goats are kept in a small round house (khola la mbuzi: goat house). In most cases this small round house has no windows hence no enough ventilation. Although it is argued that they do not set windows in order to protect the goats from thieves but it is a big surprise that houses where human beings sleep have windows, can we say that human beings do not fear thieves? This seems to be an African point of view of respecting human beings more than non-human animals. This is what Mbiti (1986) states that African philosophy put human beings at the center of all creation (Mbiti, 1986, P.38).

Looking at the point above of accommodating goats in a house without ventilation, it can be said that this is very unfair as it is causing pain on them and this is what Bentham (1789) is against of. It must also be stated that these small round houses are smaller than the goats they accommodate therefore this makes goats to suffocate and lack peace as they scramble for space. This altitude of accommodating goats is very unfair as it lacks moral considerability of goats in Malawi. Goats are sentient beings and are supposed to be taken care of very well.

The second system of accommodating goats in Malawi is by accommodating them in a raised poles constructed house whereby goats enter into the house using constructed steps made of poles too. These houses have spaces between poles and this makes the goats to suffer from unfair weather. Sometimes such houses have no roof and even if they have roofs, the spaces in between poles still remain a big

challenge as goats do suffer from all sorts of bad weather therefore very unfair to the goats. It must also be stated that goats also feel pain as human beings do therefore it is necessary to treat them fairly as human beings do.

Apart from accommodation of goats, the other area to look into is the area of feeding them. This is indeed another second area of concern. Goats are fed using various systems basing on seasons. During the rainy season, goats are fed along rivers where there is grass available or along hills. Goats are also shepherded by a goat shepherd (M'busa wambuzi: goat shepherd or simply m'busa: shepherd). This system therefore means that goats only get grass as food, no more. This therefore means that goats do not get a balanced diet therefore very unfair to them and very unethical behavior. It seems good that goats also get balanced diet as human beings do. This altitude of mistreating goats clearly agrees with what Mbiti (1969) states that in African philosophy, human beings are put at the center of all creation. Worse still, the shepherds do beat them while going to and from the grazing area claiming that it is giving them the right direction. This is unfair as it is applying pain on innocent sentient beings.

The other system of feeding goats during the rainy season, is by tying them to a tree in a bush where there is grass with the aim of letting them eat the grass while being tied so that they cannot run away and vandalize other people's fields since during rainy season, fields are planted. Here, it can be observed that goats get food while tied to a tree and this raises very serious questions: is this ethically justifiable? Can human beings get food while tied? Can one enjoy food while tied to a tree or something else? This system is very unfair as goats cannot enjoy the food while being tied.

The other problem with the above practice is that goats only get one type of food therefore not nutritious. Further, the tying system acts as jail for the goats yet they have not committed any crime. Furthermore, this practice is also bad as it leaves goats alone without being monitored until evening comes to collect them home

and goats can be eaten up by hyenas or other more powerful beasts than them. The other challenge is that goats are also exposed to harsh weather such as rains, wind or sun and this is very unfair. The other challenge of tying goats is that they are deprived of their freedom of movement and this is very unethical. It must be understood that goats are sentient beings and that they feel pain, they need to be treated fairly.

The other system of feeding goats during the rainy season, is by keeping them closed in the kraal (Kholo la mbuzi: goat house) and give them some food such as grass and maize husk (gaga or madeya). This system seems unfair too as goats stay indoors the whole day hence infringing them from their right of movement. Again, goats are only fed with similar food types therefore keeping them unnourished. This system raises several questions such as: is it fair to keep goats closed in a house the whole day or the whole month? Is it ethically justifiable to infringe goats from movement? Can human beings be kept closed in a house for the whole month? Is it ethically justifiable to infringe human beings from movement? Here it can be observed that with human beings, the answer is no, so why with goats? It seems good that better ways of feeding goats be developed so that their rights are also respected. They are sentient beings, they feel pain and have to be treated fairly.

The other area to look into is the health area of the goats. There are no dipping tanks in Malawi for goats and this makes them to be infected by various types of diseases. Although Malawi has veterinary personnel but they do not go to villages to provide goat health services. This altitude makes a number of goats to die and this is very unfair. Goat kraals are not even swept daily and this increases the rate of diseases. Human beings have hospitals and are encouraged to follow proper health systems but why not having goat hospitals? This is a total selectivity practice and must be decolonized with urgency. Human beings do bath daily though some take some days without bathing but that is due to some mental problems or by poor choice but why not having dipping tanks for goats? It seems

good to have dipping tanks for goats in order to promote their health. They feel pain when they get sick and they need to be treated fairly. Here it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it helps to correct such evil practices.

It is also important to talk of how chickens are tamed in Malawi as a good example of poor welfare of nonhuman animals in Malawi. The first area to look into in regard to treating chickens in Malawi is the area of accommodating them. Chickens are commonly kept in some small round houses. These houses where chickens are kept are also called chicken kraals, singular chicken kraal (Khola la nkhuu: Chicken kraal.) These houses are usually small as mentioned and they usually accommodate more chickens than it should be therefore making them uncomfortable to live as they live at a panicking space and a scramble for a space becomes the order of each day. Here, it can be observed that living space is a big challenge and this seems very unethical in nature and has to be revised. It must be known that chickens are sentient beings and that they feel pain. Worse still, these houses usually have no windows for ventilation and this makes the chickens to suffocate and live a very uncomfortable life. This situation really needs to be corrected as soon as possible as chickens also need good life as human beings as they also possess life. It is very unethical to mistreat them as this. They are sentient beings.

The second area of concern regarding treating chickens in Malawi is the area of feeding them. Chickens are normally released each morning to fetch food on their own and return home in the evening to get their night in their small houses. It is interesting to note that chickens indeed return without missing their destiny. This on its own also shows that chickens are intelligent and have knowledge of what they do as human beings. Newly obtained chickens are introduced to the knowledge of the home by making them jump a cooking pestle (Mthiko) set across the door in the morning as they are released to fetch food and this action makes the new chickens to remember the new home without forgetting.

The above practice of leaving chickens to get food on their own is also very unethical as sometimes food may be unavailable and this makes them to starve hence very unfair. Again, chickens may not get a balanced diet and this is not fair at all. This practice must be corrected in order to achieve moral considerability of chickens in Malawi. Further, when a chicken gets sick in the bush while on the mission of seeking food, it becomes difficult to know that it is sick and the time the owner comes to know of this, may be very late in the evening when the chicken returns home with difficulties or when someone by chance notices that and reports to the owner. In most cases, the sick chickens usually die in the bush and most of the times are eaten up by dogs and other wild animals. Here, it can be observed that free range system of feeding chickens is very unethical and it needs to be looked into. Chickens are sentient beings and they feel pain, they need to be treated fairly. Here, it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it helps to correct such miseries.

The other area worth noting as another good example of poor welfare of nonhuman animals in Malawi is the area of taming dogs. The first concern regarding treating dogs in Malawi is that of a negative religious feeling factor raised by the Muslim community. It is very hard to get dogs in a community where the majority, are Muslims. In most cases, once a Muslim sees a dog, he spits on it and this seems very unfair as dogs have lives and are part of the ecosystem and deserve existence. Further dogs are biotic beings therefore they deserve respect. This is what Leopold (1949) argues that a thing is right when it tends to preserve the beauty and integrity of the biotic community. Following this argument, it can be observed that, it is very wrong to treat dogs as in the way Muslims do as that is not respecting the beauty and integrity of the biotic community. Further, hating any being which has not done any wrong to you is very unethical and such a spirit must be exorcised with urgency. Dogs are sentient beings, they have feelings as human beings have therefore they need to be treated fairly.

The second concern regarding treating dogs in Malawi is on how they are accommodated. Dogs are kept outside the house all the times. It is very rare if not impossible to see a dog entering a house. If a dog tries to get into a house, it is immediately beaten up and removed from the house. It is heart breaking too to see a dog being exposed to harsh weather even if it gets sick. This situation is alarming. Here, it can be observed that the relationship between human beings and dogs in Malawi is very terrible and very unfair. Dogs are only loved from an instrumental value point of view not an intrinsic value point of view. Kayange and Makwinja (2016) call this type of instrumental value as labour utilitarianism. There is a great need of shading more light on this in Malawi in order to promote the intrinsic value point of view of dogs. It seems good that when dogs are sick, they must be accommodated in the house where it is warm and be given the best care as human beings get. Dogs are biotic therefore they deserve respect. It is not good to trouble a living being according to Leopold (1949). Dogs are sentient beings as human beings are and are supposed to be treated fairly.

The third area of concern regarding treating dogs in Malawi is the area of feeding them. First and foremost, it must be stated that it is interesting that dogs usually get almost the same food which human beings take such as Nsima (thick porridge: main meal of Malawians), meat, just to mention a few. But it is very shocking to note that there is no way a dog and its master can eat close to each other. It is always the routine that the master gets a meal first and then the left overs are thrown to the dog to eat. Dogs are usually fed by giving them food on floor or in dirty and broken plates, not new or good ones. This attitude already clarifies the poor relationship between human beings and dogs in Malawi. But the question is, what wrong have dogs committed against human beings in Malawi? This seems to be a traditional thinking of acting against dogs and each generation takes up the legacy. Dogs are living beings as human beings are therefore they are supposed to be treated with dignity. They are sentient beings as human beings are.

The fourth area regarding treating dogs in Malawi is the area of equating people who have done wrong to dogs (Ndiwe galu: you are a dog). This means that dogs

are regarded as bad all the times even if they have not done something wrong to you. This tendency of categorizing dogs in the community of evil doers is very unethical. It is indeed unfair to hate a being which has not hated you or which has not committed any wrong to you. This tendency of hating dogs makes even children to grow up with the same tendency and they stone dogs wherever they see them even if they just sleep without committing any crime against them. Here, it can be observed that such a habit is indeed very unethical and it needs to be looked into. Dogs are sentient beings as human beings are and therefore need to be treated fairly. They feel pain as human beings do.

The fifth area regarding treating dogs in Malawi is the area of their burial when they die. In most cases, dogs are not respected when they are dead. This is very shocking as human beings are highly respected. Human beings have decent burial while dogs not. This raises several questions such as: Are dogs beings without rights? Are dogs not part of the ecosystem? Are dogs sentient beings? It is indeed sympathetic to see dogs just left out on the road when they die or when they are hit by a car, sometimes they even rot on the road, very bad indeed. In some cases, dead dogs may only be removed aside or just been thrown in the bush but without proper burial and is this ethical? This is very unethical indeed as dogs also deserve decent burial as human beings have as they also have their rights and are part of the biotic community. They are sentient beings and they deserve decent burial as human beings have.

The sixth area of concern regarding treating dogs in Malawi is the area of poor policies concerning them. In most cases the city councils do shoot homeless dogs as a way of preventing rabies in the society, this is allowed in Malawi but is this ethical behavior? Are all homeless dogs having rabies? It is not true that all homeless dogs have rabies and this practice has to be corrected with urgency. Dogs are sentient beings and they need to be treated fairly. Here, it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it helps to correct such evil acts.

Another important area worth mentioning as another good example of indicating poor welfare or poor care of nonhuman animals in Malawi is the area of taming pigs. Pigs are mostly kept in small houses constructed from wood (Kholo la nkumbi: Pigs kraal), sometimes even without a roof. The poles have spaces which allow harsh weather to penetrate into and make the pigs feel uncomfortable. Here, it can be observed that this is very unethical to the pigs and this situation has to be corrected. It is important that pigs be accommodated in a very friendly environment as they are sentient beings and that they feel pain as human beings do.

Another area of concern regarding treating pigs in Malawi is the area of feeding them. Pigs are confined in their houses and they are fed while there. What is shocking is the type of food which is provided to them, mostly they are given maize husks (Machila or gaga) and some leaves. This system deprives pigs of getting a balanced diet and makes them live in a very undernourished situation. This system is therefore very unethical and has to be corrected. Pigs have rights and it is important that their rights are highly respected. The practice of keeping them confined in a house is also a very unethical one as it is infringing them from their right of freedom therefore it is necessary that this situation is checked with urgency. Pigs are sentient beings and that they feel pain as human beings do therefore they need to be treated fairly.

Another important aspect to note is the situation of cats in Malawi. Cats are among tamed nonhuman animals mentioned earlier but it must also be pointed out that for a casual visitor from outside Malawi, can be surprised to see only a cat among all the important and big domesticated animals in Malawi, present in the house or even at state house or even in kings palaces and he can think that cats are more loved than all domesticated animals in Malawi but the issue is not that, the visitor needs deep research. Cats are mostly kept for catching rats in the house and kill them. In this regard, cats are found in the house not because they are loved as part of the family but because their duty is in the house.

The above situation clearly indicates that cats are kept in Malawi for an instrumental value. Kayange and Makwinja (2016) call that type of instrumental value as Labour Utilitarianism. In this aspect, cats are kept in Malawi for labour utilitarianism not for intrinsic value point of view. Viewing cats from an instrumental value point of view is very unethical as cats have also an intrinsic value and that has to be appreciated too. There is a great need of promoting the spirit of intrinsic value point of cats in Malawi. Cats are sentient beings as human beings are and are supposed to be treated fairly.

Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also very important in the sense that it helps to correct some religious misconceptions on nonhuman animals. Some religions have negative attitudes towards nonhuman animals and sentientism helps to shade more light on that and helps to correct such misconceptions. A good example is the relationship we have here in Malawi with pigs and dogs. Pigs are not domesticated in Muslim homes claiming that their religion does not allow that. The facts are not well outlined as such. But the rumors in circulation are that pigs aided by dogs dug the grave of their founder of their religion prophet Muhammad. Some Christians also hate domesticating pigs claiming that their founder of their Religion, Jesus Christ of Nazareth at some point shifted evil spirits from a mad man to pigs and that meant condemnation of pigs therefore unethical to domesticate them.

Further, it is also heart breaking to see some many Christians and Muslims spitting on pigs once they see them, what type of enmity is this? This for sure clearly shows the strong negative feelings that do exist between Christian- Muslims and pigs. This situation has to be checked in order to correct the mistake. It is not true that Jesus Christ condemned pigs as pigs had been part and parcel of the Jewish society and even after that event of exorcism, He did not command to throw pigs out of the society therefore they have to be respected, they have rights and they need to have their rights respected. It is very unethical to spit on a being which has not done wrong to you therefore the situation has to be corrected with urgency. Pigs and dogs are sentient beings created by the same God for a purpose

and have to be respected and treated fairly. They have sentience as human beings are therefore they are counterparts.

The above situation must also be deeply understood knowing that Christianity and Islam have contexts of origin. Christianity originated from Jerusalem in Israel among the Jews while Islam originated from Saudi Arabia among the Arabs and each context has its own culture. The founders of the religions sometimes spoke on things relevant to those particular cultures not to us here in Malawi. This is what Stein (2011) argues that we must differentiate of what is ‘Absolute’ and what is ‘Relative’. Absolute is what is of universal value while relative is what is of a particular space value (Stein, 2011, P.30-41). Here, it must be understood that the event of transferring evil spirits to pigs took place in Israel not in Malawi therefore a relative issue not an absolute issue. In this regard, it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it helps to correct such religious misconceptions.

Peter Singer’s sentientism is pro-science, reason and evidence. This is what Woodhouse (2018) points out that Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also important in the sense that it is pro-science, reason and evidence. This means that the discovery of some animals to be sentient is not a mere fabrication but that it is scientific in nature and has a good reason to claim that and that it is open to be proved. This is why Woodhouse (2018) further points out that “Like humanism, Sentientism is pro-science, reason and evidence- so is against fabrication, fake news, unsubstantiated conspiracy theory, cultural relativism, religious and supernatural thinking”. Here, it can be observed that sentientism is scientifically grounded and that the claim that animals are sentient is a genuine one therefore it has to be taken seriously, it is a reasonable theory which must be supported. In this regard, sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is an important theory as it has a scientific backing. This means that what the sentientists are claiming are not mere fabrications that nonhuman animals are sentient but that they have a scientific backing of which they are ready for any proof which may be required.

Woodhouse (2018) further points out that Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important in the sense that it promotes humanism or human rights agenda. He clearly points out that “Sentientism also reinforces the human rights agenda (Woodhouse, 2018). This means that as scientific discoveries on sentience of nonhuman animals increase to prove positive results then fight for animal rights would also increase and as a result fight for human rights (Humanism) would also increase as human beings would feel bad to have been surpassed by nonhuman animals. In this case the race is good as it motivates each other, Sentientism and Humanism. Here, it can be observed that Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very helpful as it promotes humanism.

Peter singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is also very important in the sense that it protects nonhuman animals from poor methods of animal testing in research. Animal testing research is a type of research whereby nonhuman animals are used instead of human beings in order to establish a human fact through nonhuman animals. For example, when researchers want to find out a suitable medicine for human beings for a particular disease, instead of testing such medicine on human beings themselves, for fear that it may be poisonous, nonhuman animals are used on behalf of human beings so that if it is poisonous, nonhuman beings must die but not human beings. This tendency derives from anthropocentric theory which views human beings as more important than nonhuman beings. This attitude is very unethical as it puts innocent beings on danger. Nonhuman animals are sentient beings and they deserve to be protected from danger. Here, it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it helps to correct such unethical behavior.

Further, Peter Singer’s sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is important in the sense that it helps in introduction of ethical principles regarding animal testing research. Following this fact, Russell and Burch in 1959 introduced the 3Rs of animal testing. These stand for Replacement,

Reduction and Refinement. The 3Rs are the guiding principles for the ethical treatment of animals used for testing and experimentation. On replacement, it is argued that researchers have to go for an alternative if available instead of using nonhuman animals for research. On reduction, it is argued that researchers have to consider to reduce the number of animals to be used for testing research and on refinement, it is argued that researchers have to consider of ways of reducing suffering or pain on the animals and also providing much care.

The Norwegian National Committees for Research Ethics (NNCRE) further points out that the 3Rs of animal testing have been expanded in many countries and ten most popular animal testing research guide lines are being used worldwide and these are : Respect Animal Dignity, Responsibility for Considering Options (Replace), The principle of proportionality: Responsibility for considering and balancing suffering and benefit, Responsibility for considering reducing the number of animals (Reduce), Responsibility for minimizing the risk of suffering and improving animal welfare (Refine), Responsibility for maintaining biological diversity, Responsibility when intervening in a habitat, Responsibility for openness and sharing of data and material, Requirement on expertise on animals and requirement of due care. Here, it can be observed that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it helps in developing ethical guidelines further for animal testing research. It can be observed here that these guidelines are just very important and they really protect the rights of nonhuman animals. A look at them will be done below so as to appreciate their significance.

On Respect Animal Dignity, the argument is that researchers must have respect towards the animals' worth regardless of their value but as living sentient creatures. Further, researchers must have respect when choosing their topics/ methods and when expanding their research. Researchers have also to supply care that is adapted to needs to each laboratory animal.

On Responsibility for considering options (Replace), the argument is that when there are alternatives available, researchers are responsible for studying those

options for animal experimentation. When there is no good alternatives available, researchers have to consider if the research can be postponed until a good alternatives are developed. While being able to justify the experiments on animals, researchers then have to be accountable for the absence of alternative options and the urge to obtain the knowledge immediately.

On The Principle of Proportionality: Responsibility for Considering and Balancing Suffering and benefit, the argument is that researchers have to consider both the risks of pain and suffering that laboratory animals will face and assess the value of relationship to the research of animals, people, and the environment. Researchers have a responsibility on whether or not the research will have improvements for the animals, people or the environment. All of the possible benefits of the study have to be considered, substantiated and specified in both the short and long run. This responsibility also entails the obligation to consider both the scientific quality of the experiment and whether or not the experiment will have relevant scientific benefits. Suffering can only be caused if there is a counter balance of a substantial and probable benefits for animals, people or the environment. Since there are many methods of analyzing the harm and the benefits, research institutions have to provide training on suitable models and researchers have the responsibility to use the methods of analysis when planning any experiment on animals.

On responsibility for considering the number of animals (Reduce), the argument is that researchers have the responsibility to consider whether or not it is acceptable to reduce the amount of animals that an experiment plans to use and include the number necessary to both the scientific quality of the experiment and the relevance to the results only. Before the experiment, researchers have to conduct reading studies and consider alternative designs and perform the calculations that are needed before beginning an experiment.

On responsibility for minimizing the risk of suffering and improving Animal welfare (Refine), the argument is that researchers have the responsibility to assess the expected effect on laboratory animals. Researchers have to lessen the risk of

suffering and provide excellent animal welfare. Suffering includes pain, hunger, malnutrition, thirst, abnormal cold/heat, fear, stress, illness, injury and restrictions to where the animal can't be able to behave naturally and normally.

On responsibility for maintaining Biological diversity, the argument is that researchers are responsible for ensuring that the use of laboratory animals don't disrupt or endanger biological diversity. This means that researchers have to consider the consequences to the stock and their ecosystem as a whole. The use of endangered species has to be reduced to a minimum. When there is credible and uncertain knowledge that the inclusion of animals in research and the use of certain methods may have ethically unacceptable consequences for the stock and the ecosystem as a whole, researchers must observe the precautionary principle.

On responsibility when intervening in a habitat, the argument is that researchers have a responsibility for reducing the disruption and any impact of the natural behaviors of the animals, including those who aren't direct test subjects in research, as well as the population and their surroundings.

On Responsibility for openness and sharing of data and material, the argument is that researchers have the responsibility for ensuring the transparency of the research findings and facilitating sharing the data and materials from all animal experiments. Transparency and sharing are important in order to not repeat the same experiment on animals. Transparency is also important in order to release the data to the public and a part of researcher's responsibility for dissimulation. Negative results of the experiments on animals have to be for the public knowledge. Releasing negative results to other researchers could give them more on the information about which experiments that are not worth pursuing, shine a light on unfortunate research designs and can help reduce the amount of animals to be used in research.

On requirement of expertise on animals, the argument is that researchers and other parties who work and handle live animals are required to have adequately and updated documentation expertise on all animals. This includes knowledge

about the biology of the animal species in question, and willingly be able to take care of the animals properly.

On requirement of due care, the argument is that there are many laws, rules, international conventions and agreements regarding the laboratory animals that both the researchers and the research managers have to comply with. Anyone who wants to use the animals in experiments should familiarize himself with the current rules.

Looking at the ten expanded guiding principles of animal testing research, it can be observed that a number of strict protective aspects are embraced taking into account that nonhuman animals are sentient as human beings are and must be treated ethically. It is even interesting to note that even when catching an identified animal for research in the habitat, a researcher must make sure that he doesn't disturb the rest of the animals. Here, it can be observed that this is very difficult taking into account the behavior of many animals that they do collide each other and it becomes very difficult to catch some animals without disturbing the rest. This is a clear indication that the main point is to prohibit using animals for testing research. In this regard, it can be observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it protects nonhuman animals from testing research.

Another important observation on the ethical guidelines of animal testing research is that of not leaving animals on research thirsty, hungry and exposed to cold or too hot weather. It can be observed that fair treatment for nonhuman animals is needed all the times even for those animals on research or those ill. This also implies that even those animals to be slaughtered, must be fed, must be given water to drink while waiting to be slaughtered. It is unethical to leave an animal unfed or untreated if sick while waiting slaughter. This is all seeking for ethical behavior for nonhuman animals as they are sentient beings as human beings are.

Further, the idea of looking for option is another important fact to note. This aims at protecting nonhuman animals from animal testing research in the same way

human beings are protected from such an activity, both are sentient beings and they feel pain therefore another option must be got rather than human beings or animal beings. This really shows love and concern on nonhuman animals. Here, it can be observed that Peter singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very important as it protects nonhuman animals from such miseries.

I conclude this section of merits of Peter singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals by saying that the theory has many significant positive impact as exposed in this section. It seems that the theory is very vital but before making such a stand, there is a need of having a look at the demerits of the theory so that we could put the two on the scale and weigh them. The following section focuses on the demerits of the theory.

3.2.2 The demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals

The previous section has looked at the merits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals while this section will look at its demerits. This section is also very important in the sense that it will help us to weigh the challenges or demerits against the merits we have looked at in the previous section in order to come up with a fair ground of judgment of whether Peter Singer's sentientism is defensible or not.

First and foremost, it may be pointed out that the first point to start with in this section is by reflecting on the definition of sentience again. As observed earlier, Sentience simply means having "feelings". This definition is very challenging to non-sentient beings. This means that basing on Sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals would be problematic as all non-sentient beings would be excluded from the moral circle. In this regard, this criterion of basing on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is a big threat to non-sentient beings therefore a very big challenge of this theory.

Peter Singer's sentientism falls within this dilemma as those nonhuman animals thought not to feel pain and suffering face this challenge.

The second demerit of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is what Kotzmann (2020) narrates below:

Even modern scientists have difficulty establishing with certainty which animals are sentient because humans cannot know definitively how another being (Animal or human) is feeling. The agreed circle of sentience has expanded to include vertebrate animals (Creatures with spines), and in particular parrots, dogs, pigs, cows, other farmed animals, and other companion animals. Studies of non-vertebrate animals, including octopus, squid, and cuttlefish, and decapod crustaceans (e.g. Shrimp, lobsters, crayfish, and crabs), indicate that they too are probably Sentient. Scientists have not yet conclusively determined whether spiders, other insects, and gastropods (e.g. slugs and snails) are sentient.

Looking at the statement above, it can be observed that it has some dilemmas regarding sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The first dilemma is that scientists have not yet concluded determining which animals are sentient and which animals are non-sentient. This situation is very dangerous as some nonhuman animals may be mistreated today thinking that they are non-sentient but tomorrow it may be discovered that they are sentient therefore persecution of the innocent. In this regard, basing on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is very challenging because of this dilemma.

The other challenging factor narrated in the statement is that it is difficult for humans to know how another being (Animal or human) is feeling. This statement

gives us doubts whether, it would be possible for humans to positively conclude this mission of determining which animals are sentient and which animals are non-sentient. The statement shows us that it is very difficult to accomplish this mission in a rightly manner. In this regard, basing on sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is a very challenging one bearing in mind of this dilemma as many animals cannot be accorded the moral worth gained by the means of sentience as a canon. In this aspect, sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is problematic because of this challenge as other nonhuman animals may be mistreated on the basis that we cannot correctly know whether they are sentient or not. The theory in this aspect may be a try and error and it may be dangerous as it may oppress the innocent. Peter Singer's sentientism in this aspect, has a challenge as it may not exactly know whether other nonhuman beings feel pain and suffering.

3.3 Chapter conclusion

The chapter has presented the merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. Looking at the merits and demerits presented in this chapter, it has also been observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals has merits and demerits but as observed the merits weigh more than the demerits. In this regard it may be argued that Peter Singer's sentientism has significant positive impact despite the demerits.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION, IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Chapter introduction

This study set out with the aim of providing a defense of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. This chapter presents a conclusion of the study. First of all a summary of the findings is presented. Second, implications of the findings are presented and finally suggested future research areas are presented.

4.2 A summary of the findings

In chapter one I have pointed out the main purpose of this research and I have clearly stated that the main purpose of this research is to provide a defense of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral Considerability of nonhuman animals. Several theories of moral considerability of nonhuman animals have been laid down by various scholars and sentientism is one of them. I have also pointed out in chapter one that there are different views among sentientist scholars and this study would put focus on Peter singer's sentientism. Further, I have also pointed out in chapter one, the background of the whole issue on why I have chosen this topic and this has also been pinned down in the problem statement where it has been clearly stated that the purpose of this study is to analyze Peter Singer's sentientism in order to expose its merits and demerits so as to provide a ground of basing its defense. Further, it has also been stated that the study is a desk research therefore the issues of methodology were not applied as such in this study.

Further, chapter two has outlined an exposition of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The chapter has clearly provided the definition of sentience or sentientism. The chapter has also provided a brief history of sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman

animals. Chapter three has provided an analysis of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. The merits and demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals have been expounded in this chapter.

Looking at all the discussions made in this study, it has to be pointed out that a number of issues have been discussed. The major important issue discussed here which is the hub of this study, is the analysis of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals which has been done in chapter three where merits and demerits of the theory have been looked into deeply. But before that, it has been pointed out that sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals arose as one of the responses to the hot debate over nonhuman animals in regard to whether they have rights and whether they deserve moral considerability. It has been pointed out that the animal debate on whether they have rights and whether they deserve moral consideration or considerability is an issue of a very long history. It has been pointed out that the debates of animal rights existed even during the ancient times and it has also been pointed out that during the ancient times the popular position regarding animal rights as argued by Aristotle, the prominent philosopher of this time, was that nonhuman animals are non-sentient. This position also meant that nonhuman animals have no rights and they do not deserve moral considerability. This view was very dangerous to nonhuman animals as they would just be mistreated anyhow yet they are living beings too as human beings are.

The Aristotelian view was also carried over through the Middle Ages by Thomas Aquinas and through Rene Descartes to Immanuel Kant during the dawn of the Enlightenment. It has also been observed that during the Enlightenment of the 18th Century, the views of Aristotle, Thomas Aquinas, Rene Descartes and Immanuel Kant were heavily challenged. During the Enlightenment, the popular view was that nonhuman animals have sentience and scientific research on this gained ground and it was generally accepted by many that nonhuman animals are sentient beings.

Further, it has also been pointed out that although from the ancient times to the dawn of the Enlightenment, the popular view was that nonhuman animals are non-sentient but it has also been pointed out that still some people thought of nonhuman animals as sentient. It has been pointed out that the Greek writer or philosopher Celsus argued against the Greek- Jewish view that nonhuman animals are non-sentient. He argued that nonhuman animals are more favoured by God as they do not plow fields or sow seeds. For him, nonhuman animals are sentient beings. It has also been pointed out that even during the Renaissance period, some lay people and some theologians possessed the view that nonhuman animals have sentience. It has also been pointed out that from the Middle Ages, some countries started to formulate animal protection laws and that Ireland was the first country to formulate legislations in 1635.

Furthermore, it has also been pointed out that during the Enlightenment the popular view became that nonhuman animals have sentience. From this period we see several groups such as animal welfare movements advocating for animal rights and animal moral consideration. We see that in the 1940s, the animals debates gained much ground as 'Ecological crisis' debate gained roots and this ecological crisis debate helped animal debates to gain much influence. It has further been pointed out that during the late seventies, debates on animal rights gained roots. The debate is still hot until today but in most countries, it has been generally accepted that nonhuman animals are sentient. Most countries have passed out legislations protecting animal rights. This is also true here in Malawi.

Further, the study has stated that there are different views on the sentience of nonhuman animals among various sentientist scholars of nonhuman animals. The study has also provided an analysis on Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. Merits and demerits of the theory have been looked into deeply in chapter three of the study. It has been observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals has many significant merits. We have also observed that the theory helps human beings to realize that nonhuman animals are sentient and are supposed to

be treated fairly as they also feel pain as human beings do. Here, it must be pointed out that many people are cautious these days when treating nonhuman animals as they think of this concept of Sentience. It has also been observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps to promote humanism. As people see that the rights of nonhuman animals are being promoted highly, they are also motivated to advance humanism agenda.

Further, it has also been observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals helps to promote animal welfare. We have seen various animal welfare groups being advanced promoting animal welfare. Here, we have also looked at a number of evil acts being done to animals here in Malawi as examples and we have come to conclude that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals is indeed a very helpful theory in protecting animal rights. In addition to these merits, we have also looked at a number of benefits and these have just been mentioned by passing as a summary.

Apart from the merits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals we have also looked at its demerits. We have observed that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals segregates animals thought to be non-sentient from the moral worth circle. This has been said that it is very unfair. This may be the cause for multiple theories of sentientism of moral consideration of nonhuman animals and it may also be the cause for continued developments of other theories of moral considerability of nonhuman animals. It has also been observed that scientists have not yet concluded on which animals are sentient and which ones are non-sentient. This situation has been pointed out as unfortunate as other animals may be mistreated today while tomorrow may be proved sentient and this situation may sacrifice the innocent.

Basing on the findings of the study, it can be concluded that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals has its

merits and demerits. It can also be stated that basing on this study, the merits outweigh the demerits but that fact cannot also overrule the demerits as the demerits also carry weight. Although the theory has some demerits but it has many significant positive merits therefore it can be argued that Peter Singer's sentientism as defensible as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

4.3 Implications of the findings

The study found that Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals has more merits than demerits and may imply that that the theory is defensible as a moral considerability of nonhuman animals.

Further, basing on the demerits of Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral considerability of nonhuman animals, the implication is that the demerits would sacrifice some nonhuman animals not in favour of this theory.

4.4 Suggested areas for future research

The researcher suggests that there is a need for future research on this topic taking into consideration that he may not have exhausted all the literature on Peter Singer's sentientism as a theory of moral consideration of nonhuman animals.

REFERENCES

- Beauchamp, T. (1982). *Philosophical Ethics. An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*. McGraw Hill Book Company.
- Beauchamp, T.L. (2011). *Animal Ethics*. Oxford Press.
- Bentham, J. (1781). *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Heffner.
- Bentham, J. (1989). *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. Clarendon Press.
- Brink, D.O. (1980). *Moral realism and the foundations of ethics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cambridge Dictionary (1995). *Cambridge Advanced Learner's Dictionary*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dawkins, M.S. (1980). *Animal Suffering*. Chapman and Hall.
- Dawkins, M.S. (1983). *Through our eyes only: The search for animal sentience*. W.H. Freeman
- Duncan, I.J.H. (1987). *The Welfare of farm animals: An ethological approach*. SCI.
- Duncan, I.J.H. (2004). *A concept of Welfare based on feelings*. Blackwell.
- Eze, M. (2008). What is African Communitarianism? *South African Journal of Philosophy*, 27(1), 386-399.
- Gompertz, L. (1997). *Moral inquiries on the Situation of Man and of Brutes*. Edwin Mellen Press.
- Goodpaster, K. (1978). On Being Morally Considerable. *Journal of Philosophy*, 75(6), 308-325.

- Goodpaster, K. (1978). On Being Morally, Considerable. *Journal of Philosophy*, 75(6),308-310.
- Griffin, D. (1976). *The Question of Animal Awareness*. Rockefeller.
- Hale, B. (2011). Moral Considerability. *Ethics and the Environment*, 16(2), 37-62. <https://doi.org/10.2979/ethicsenviro.16.2.37>
- Harrison, R. (1964). *Animal Machines*. Vincent Stuart.
- Hume, D. (1739). *A Treatise of Human Nature*. Clarendon Press
- Humphrey, N. (1992). *A History of the Mind: An Evolution and the Birth of Consciousness*. Springer-Verlag.
- James, D. (2017). *The Historical Development of Animal Welfare Law in Nineteenth century*. Rochester.
- Kayange, G., & Makwinja, S. (2016). Exploring the basis of Animal treatment in Malawi. *Journal of Humanities*, 24(1), 23-34.
- Kenny, A. (1970). *Descartes' Philosophical Letters*. Clarendon Press.
- Kotzmann, J. (2020). *Sentience: What it means and why it's important*. Sentient Media.
- Leopold, A. (1949). *The Sandy County Almanac*. Aldo Leopold Foundation
- Mbiti, J.S. (1969). *African Religions and Philosophy*. Heinemann Educational Books
- Metz, T. (2011). *An African Theory of Moral Status: A Relational Alternative to Individualism and Holism*. <http://doi.org/10.1007.1007-9302>.
- Naess, A. (1973). The Shallow and Deep Ecology, Long Range Ecology Movement: A summary Inquiry. *An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, 16(1-4), 91-100.

- Nagel, T. (1974). What is it like to be a bat? *Philosophical Review*, 83(1), 435-450.
- Ndasauka, Y., & Manthalu, C. (2018). *Cultivating Animal Rights in Africa: Africa and her Animals*. UNISA Press.
- Ndasauka, Y., & Manthalu, C. (2018). *Cultivating Animal Rights in Africa; Africa and her animals*. UNISA Press.
- Ndasauka, Y., & Kayange, G.M. (2016). Existence and Needs: A Case for equal moral considerability of non- human animals. *Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics*, 1(3), 23-33.
- Preece, R. (2002). *Awe for the tiger love for the lamb: A Chronicle of sensibility to* . UBC Press.
- Ramose, M. (1999). *African Philosophy Through Ubunthu*. Mambo press.
- Romanes, G.J. (1884). *Mental Evaluation in Animals*. AMS Press
- Singer, P. (1980). Utilitarianism and Vegetarianism. *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 9(4), 328-37
- Singer, P.(1974). All Animals Are Equal. *Philosophical Exchange*, 1(5), 103-16
- Skinner, B.F. (1975). *The steep and thorny path to a science of behavior*. OUP
- Spencer, H. (1855). *The Principles of Psychology*. Longmans.
- Valdy, P. (1999). *The Puzzle of Ethics*. Haper Collins.
- Warnock, G.J. ((1971). Object of Morality. *Journal Of Philosphy*, 75(6).308-325.
- Watson, J.B. (1928). *Behaviorism*. Routledge and Paul.
- White, L. (1967). *The Historical Roots of Our Ecologic Crisis*. SCM Press
- Youatt, W.H. (1839). *The Obligation and Extent of Humanity to Brutes*. Lewiston.