

MORAL RELATIONS BETWEEN HUMANS AND ANIMALS

Abdi Kitesa Keno

Kremer, A. (2018). "The Moral Relationship of the Human and Non-Human Animals in Light of Ethology," *Applied Ethics: From Bioethics to Environmental Ethics*. Trivent Publishing.

The Hungarian philosopher Alexander Kremer attempted to break down this subject in his (2018) manuscript "*The Moral Relations of Humans and Non-Human Animals in Light of Ethology*," and offered a pragmatist solution. The central debate about moral relationships between humans and non-human animals has been going on for over half a century. The authors argue that animals need more specific defenses than humans because they cannot protest and give informed consent. Peter Singer and Tom Regan have done their best as animal liberators, but their ideas are philosophically unfounded. We must return to Immanuel Kant's point of view, which is compelling and defensible.

According to Singer and Regan, animals must have moral rights. They used the ability to feel pleasure and pain and the themes of life as criteria for moral standing, respectively. Moreover, they also argued that rationality could not serve as the basis for morals and morality. In contrast to this work by two eminent environmental ethicists, the author was adamant that rationality is the foundation of morals and morality. His two main arguments run into this claim: (1) logical and experiential; (2) historical and ethological.

According to the first argument, moral agents and choices must be rational; otherwise, it is impossible to speak of morals and morality. Therefore, animals cannot be moral agents because rationality is an essential element of morals and morality, without which morals and morality cannot be discussed. Similarly, animals cannot be moral agents because they cannot know what is good and bad in a moral sense. In the same way, morals and morality are not identical to their biological basis in animals.

Morals and morality, as the second argument states, are exclusively the product of social history and the re-

sult of human rationality. Moreover, Singer's idea that replaces rationality with the ability to suffer rather than how people become moral agents through their ability to suffer is futile.

The dynamism of the article has propelled a broader view of philosophy to include multidisciplinary fields such as biology, sociology, socio-biology, neurology, evolutionary psychology, ethology, human ethology, and more. However, for the purposes of the study, the author has emphasized only ethology and human ethology.

In the view of ethology, discovering the evolutionary history of species helps to understand and explain various forms. Kremer used the Hungarian human ethologist Vilmos Csanyi to identify traits that distinguish humans from primates. The first features are community, reduced hostility to sharing food and sex, new forms of division of work, group mental expression, and group loyalty. The second characteristic is compassion (emotional synchronization), imitation (behavioral pattern synchronization that allows teaching), discipline, and the ability to follow the rules. The synchronization of these activities, emotions, and behavioral patterns is learned not only through language but also through music, singing, dancing, rituals, and image-making. A third characteristic is the use of language, the creation of tools, and abstract thinking. Most importantly, the implications of these facts have shown some consequences. Humans are culture inventors, also determined by biological and cultural evolution.

According to Kant, man has no immediate duty to animals. However, cruelty to animals is wrong. Because in doing so, we share their pain and undermine and destroy the natural tendencies that underpin our moral relationships with other people. Kremer also believed that humans have no direct moral obligations to animals because they are not rational beings. Our duty to animals is indirect, in the sense that we are obliged and have a moral duty to animals to protect them.

As an article written by an environmental ethicist, the moral relationships between humans and non-human animals in the light of ethology are fascinating and thought-provoking. Likewise, it has both practical

and theoretical agendas and should be evaluated from both perspectives. The author presents a poignant relationship between humans and animals since the 1960s. Attempts have been made mainly by philosophers to solve this problem. However, Kremer argues that while a philosophical and ethical approach to the topic under discussion is necessary, this alone is insufficient. So, we also need scientific arguments.

In sum, it is an interesting addition to the literature on the discussion of human beings and non-human animals' relationships and an essential contribution to the broader field of environmental ethics. Likewise, he has made significant contributions to the field by extending the scope of philosophy into a positive science and deepening the debate about environmental ethics.