Bangladesh Journal of Bioethics

Published by: Bangladesh Bioethics Society
https://bjbio.bioethics.org.bd/index.php/BJBio
ISSN: p2226-9231 e 2078-1458
BJBio 2023; 14 (2):19-30
Submitted:15.08.2022
Accepted: 12.03.2023
Published:01.07.2023

Review Article

Selling, Buying and Trafficking of Human Organs in Third-World Countries: Ethico-Religious Appraisal

Peter O. O. Ottuh[1], Onos G. Idjakpo[2], and Anthony A Uviekovo[3]

https://doi.org/10.62865/bjbio.v14i2.58

Abstract: This paper aims to appraise the implications of human organ commercialization and trafficking for third-world countries with special reference to Nigeria from the ethical and religious perspectives of utilitarianism, Kantianism, virtue ethics, moral necessity, *imago dei*(image of God), *Karuna* (self-compassion), *Dharma* (moral and religious obligations), *sadaqatuljariyah* (continuous charity), and *eethaar* (giving preference to others). The research utilizes both primary and secondary sources to derive its data. The findings show that selling, buying, and trafficking human organs invariably leads to unethical behaviour and has serious negative health, ethical, and religious implications for human society in general and Nigerian society in particular. It posits that underdeveloped nations should intensify efforts on educational campaigns to raise awareness of the medical, ethical, and religious implications of human organ commercialization and trafficking.

Keywords: Bioethics, Human Organs, Religion, Ethics, Third-World Countries, Nigeria.

Introduction: All over the world, people are considered commodities that may be bought and sold for the purpose of making profits. One of its more heinous forms is human trafficking with the aim of taking organs for commercial purposes. In general, women and children, who are much too ignorant of their rights, are the victims of this heinous crime [1, 2]. In Third World nations, poor people's organs are purchased and trafficked in high demand for transplantation into wealthier patients. Since 1990, it is reported that over 2,000 kidneys have been sold each year in India to affluent patients from the Middle East, Far East, and Europe [3]. Besides, transparency in organ allocation and procurement is a goal of the World Health Organization's guiding principles on human cell, tissue, and organ

1. Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria, Email: pottuh@delsu.edu.ng ORCID ID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-3587-7537
2. Associate Professor, Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy, Delta State University, Abraka, Nigeria, Email: idjakpoog@delsu.edu.ng ORCID iD: http://doi.org/0000-0001-5991-1552
3. Assistant Lecturer, Department of Religious Studies and Philosophy, Delta State University, Nigeria Email: anthonyuviekovo@gmail.com ORCID ID: http://doi.org/0000-0003-0969-6617

Corresponding Author: Peter O. O. Ottuh. Email: pottuh@delsu.edu.ng

transplantation [4]. Some people might think that coercion is taking advantage of the poor and going against basic human rights [1].

There are worries that the eagerness to increase the supply of organs would put the right to life at risk. The discrepancy between organ supply and demand is always growing [2, 5]. Some people have argued that every new law, method, or policy used to boost organ donation should be ethically evaluated [6]. Therefore, this research arguing whether altruism, medical ethics, and ethical and religious principles are important determinant factors in the matter of organ commercialization for the wellbeing of human society, especially as it affects the third world nations. Majority of those who oppose the sale of human organs do so for ethical and religious reasons. The study argues that the sale and buying of human organs always results in unethical behaviour. It further argues that under the frameworks of utilitarianism, Kantianism, virtue ethics, principlism, moral necessity, and religious ethics, the commercialization of human organs would no longer be justifiable in the absence of governmental and religious restrictions.

Human Organ in Context: As noted by the Council of Europe/United Nations joint study, there is no universally accepted definition of organ tissue and cell (OTC) trafficking, despite several efforts to do so by international organizations and initiatives [7]. Some definitions consider it to exist when the primary motivation for donation and transplantation is financial gain [8]. According to some definitions, any criminal conduct connected to donation and transplantation that violates the existing national or international norms should be prohibited. It is clear that there is little distinction between the two types of crime because some OTC definitions of trafficking are similar to the definition of trafficking for the extraction of organs. Selling, purchasing, and trafficking in human organs, tissues, and cells (OTC) could, at a minimum, be said to have occurred when there is the illegal removal, preparation, preservation, storage, offering, distribution, brokerage, transport, or implantation of organs, tissues, or cells (in case of cells for therapeutic transplantation), as well as the possession or purchase of human organs, tissues, or cells with a view to make profit [7]. On the other hand, organ transplant commercialism is defined by the Declaration of Istanbul (DoI) as a policy or practice when an organ is handled like a commodity [6]. According to Dalal, in addition to outlawing the explicit profit-driven solicitation of unrelated donors, the Council of the Transplantation Society put out a number of principles governing the use of live donors for transplantation [6].

The majority of industrialized nations rapidly understood this idea and passed laws that included the notion of brainstem death to designate a corpse with a beating heart. The Human Organ Transplantation Act, which forbids the sale of organs in India, was approved by Parliament and formally announced in 1995 [9]. According to the World Health Organization (WHO), the COVID-19 pandemic and the WHO transformation strategy have had an influence on the Secretariat's efforts to promote human organs and tissue transplantation [10]. The WHO working group on donations and transplant of human organs and tissues was created by the Secretariat in 2018 with the goal of providing guidance and helping to design and carry out WHO operations. On the other hand, the regional committee for the Americas approved resolution CD57.R11, for example, on the policy and strategy evaluating actions regarding donations and equitable access 2019–2030 after Pan American Health Organization (PAHO) and Americas Regional Office (AMRO) of WHO performed an examination of the transplantation situation in Latin America in 2018 [11, 10]. The "gratuity package" on offer by the programme was enormous. A donor register had to be kept up to date, and transparency and ethics had to be maintained. Unfortunately, the actual results were different from what was expected.

The illicit market persisted, and intermediaries or organ brokers were still present. In five pilot provinces and cities, like the Philippines and China introduced a financial incentive compensation strategy in 2010 and for monetary recompense, two options were taken into account [12, 13]. The Israeli Organ Transplant

Law is a cutting-edge strategy to expand organ availability to satisfy the rising demand [14]. In the past, Israel had an extremely low incidence of organ donation, and many patients passed away while awaiting transplants [6]. Saving a life is valued above practically all other considerations in the *Talmud*(The core literature of Rabbinic Judaism and the main sources of Jewish theology and religious law). Therefore, it may be claimed that organ donation really satisfies a very high religious ideal. According to Njemanze, Nigeria's National Health Act 2014 enables the unauthorized harvesting of human organs [15]. This was mentioned in a long report to the Nigeria National Assembly. If the act is not changed, Njemanze worries that over 10 million Nigerians might pass away from legalized organ poaching in the next ten years. According to him, the first phase of this operation in Nigeria would include providing human organs to keep affluent Western patients alive until they were successful in cloning medicinal human organs [8]. According to him, within the next five to ten years, Western economies are expected to generate 30 trillion US dollars, which is one-third of the global economy being revenue from organ cloning utilizing embryonic stem cells [16]. This is the G7 nations' expected Western economic recovery plan, which aims to catch up to Asia [15]. This project has the support of most Western governments and a few wealthy investors who lie about their investments being for charity.

Iran has a legitimate market for the sale of organs, but it is not always efficient [17]. There are scribbled advertisements in marker on tree trunks, stone walls, and utility boxes for phones, pavements, and even a road sign directing people to one of Iran's top hospitals [8]. However, it is unknown how many of the street advertisements receive responses. But after years of pervasive corruption, poor administration, and strangling international sanctions, they act as a sign of Iran's social and economic dysfunction. In fact, Iran is the only nation in the world that allows individuals to sell their kidneys in a legal manner [17]. Buyers and sellers are registered with a government foundation, which matches them and establishes a predetermined price of about $4,600 per organ. In this way, more than 30,000 kidney transplants have been carried out in Iran by medical professionals since 1993 [17]. However, the system has not always performed as promised. Sellers have discovered that they can make thousands more by striking side deals with wealthy Iranians willing to skip the approximately one-year wait for a transplant through the government system or foreigners excluded from the national programme. In recent years, medical professionals have been found trying to perform transplants on Saudis who had fake Iranian identifications [17]. In a nation where, until recently, few organs were collected from individuals who died, Iranian officials claim their method allows impoverished people a reasonably safe opportunity to earn some money while saving lives, keeping operation expenses low, and cutting transplant waiting times. However, several worldwide transplant leaders see the advertisements as proof that commercializing organ donations preys on the most vulnerable individuals in Iran, something that laws in the US and other countries that prohibit the sale of organs are intended to stop [18]. However, the World Health Organization and other international organizations are vehemently opposed to the commercialization of organ sales, contending that it abuses sellers and encourage medical professionals to do unsafe operations. An international summit on human organ trafficking held at the Vatican has urged all nations to identify payments made to organ donors as crimes that should be denounced globally and criminally punished on both a national and international scale [19].

Pros and Coins of Human Organs Commercialization: make it short within two para or fit them in one page: Aside from the risks involved, the commercialization of human organs has some advantages. First, it may be argued that, in terms of an individual's autonomy, an individual has the freedom to use his or her body however they see fit with little interference from the government. The above argument can be considered a legal ground to permit the sales and buying of human organs since it has to do with one’s

exercise of his or her human rights. One of the economic advantages of organ sales is that people who sell their organs may be able to change their lives financially for a long time because of the money they get. As a result, the government can develop programmes that limit the profit of the middlemen to enable the money to go directly to the donors to be used for opportunities to change their lives' circumstances, such as education, purchasing a home or property, or starting a business. For Wilkinson, the idea of "self-ownership" asserts that people have a strong presumed right to treat their bodies however they wish [5]. According to Wilkinson, people should be able to sell the portions of their bodies they want if there are no compelling reasons not to [5]. Thus, people's primary rationales for approving the sale of their organs are covered. People also sell their organs for the purpose of saving lives. This argument is simple to understand: allowing organ sales would save lives by addressing the problem of organ scarcity. The saving of lives is a noble goal; hence, selling organs is justifiable as a way of accomplishing that noble goal. This life-saving argument may be refuted experimentally by claiming that legalizing the selling of organs would be ineffective or that a different system would function more effectively [19]. Alternately, one may argue that the opposing moral arguments are sufficient to support maintaining the sale ban.

The proponents of the commercialization of human organs contend that when it is within people's power to do so, it is their moral obligation to save lives and lessen human suffering [20]. Each year, an insufficient supply of organs results in the deaths of thousands upon thousands of people [21]. Patients who need kidney transplants, for instance, wait for donors for years while enduring painful and expensive dialysis treatments. Hence, by boosting the availability of organs, allowing a market for them on an economic level may put an end to senseless pain and death [22]. There is little doubt that receiving compensation will make individuals more inclined to give body parts, thus increasing the supply. One needs only consider the commercial markets' success in expanding the supply of sperm and blood, for instance. Given the enormous number of individuals who would be prepared to sell their organs for a fee, those in need of organs will have a considerably higher chance of finding ones that are healthier or better suited, boosting the frequency of successful transplants. Up to 70% of transplanted kidneys will likely fail over the course of the next ten years, but this dismal long-term prognosis may be significantly improved if donors and recipients were better matched [23, 21]. In addition, the market mechanism will eventually drive down the price of organs by increasing the number of organs available. This will make organs more affordable for a wider range of people.

People who oppose the sale of human organs argue that although society may have a responsibility to protect life and alleviate human suffering, it does not have the right to do so in any way. In particular, society should avoid adopting any behaviour that will lead to injustices or violate people's rights. In this sense, buying and selling organs will accomplish both goals. From the preview of justice, every individual should have an equal right to life. In order to uphold this right, society has a responsibility to guarantee that everyone, regardless of wealth, has equal access to medical benefits [24, 25]. However, if a market for organs were to emerge, those who could afford organs would be able to purchase them, and those who had an economic need would be compelled to sell their organs. In each case, the organs sold by the really poor would eventually be purchased by the extremely affluent [26]. As a result, a market for organs would only favour the rich while pressuring the underprivileged to jeopardize their own health. Some have also argued that the health benefits and liabilities of organ commercialization should not be distributed in such an unfair manner.

Additionally, others have argued that people are entitled to the freedom and dignity to live their lives. The freedom and dignity of people will undoubtedly be violated as a result of organ trading [12]. Therefore, allowing the sale and purchase of organs would encourage what one opponent termed the "plundering of peasants' parts for profits," which is the

exploitation of the helpless and underprivileged, particularly in third-world nations that are already struggling economically [21]. People who are in great poverty are often hopeless and ignorant in this case. Profit-seeking individuals would take advantage of this, acquiring "permission" from people who feel forced by their need to sell their organs and who may not fully understand the repercussions of their actions. The most defenseless members of society would be encouraged to see themselves as commodities and enable others to violate their rights for financial gain if such a plan were to be implemented. As the need for organs increases, thousands of people will undoubtedly pass away every year until the organ scarcity is resolved. The moral questions raised by the sale of organs, however, are likely to be persistent. In this case, people will have to decide between two sets of moral principles: the importance people attach to averting death and easing suffering; and the importance people attach to upholding human dignity and their commitment to addressing human needs in a just and equitable way.

In light of the fact that one of the root causes of human trafficking is poverty and discrimination, including sexual discrimination, and that women and girls make up the majority of the poor and sexual assault victims, there is growing concern and evidence that trafficking in human beings has been disproportionately harming women and girls [14]. Donated human organs have not been sufficient to meet all of the world's requirements. As a result, there is an illicit market for human organs. Economic globalization has sped up the trade in human organs and increased organ trafficking. There are many different perspectives on change in a particular nation; one of them is globalization, whose features might explain specific occurrences in economic, cultural, and political developments. Globalization nowadays may mean different things for different countries. On the one hand, globalization has a number of advantages from an economic, political, and cultural standpoint. The accelerated pace of globalization speeds up the movement of people, ideas, and things across boundaries. Economic globalization has made possible the greater movement of economic assets, including money, goods, information, and people in both legal and illicit sectors.

According to Cho, Zhang and Tansuhaj, human organs are among the commodities used in the illicit economy [27, 21]. As a consequence, in a worldwide market, traffickers see human organs as nothing more than commercial commodities. Goble contends that as a result of economic globalization, human organ trafficking has seen the greatest rate of growth. Furthermore, it is said that economic globalization has accelerated the movement of human organs across international borders. The migration and flow of live donor organs, according to Cho, Zhang, and Tansuhaj, is from South to North, from the poor to the affluent, from black and brown to white bodies, and from female to male bodies [27]. For instance, Japanese kidney patients went to Singapore and Taiwan to buy kidneys from murdered criminals [28]. Even though this technique was criticized by the World Medical Association and made illegal in 1994, it is still used.

Commercializing Human Organs and the Implications for Third-World Countries: The selling, buying and trafficking of human organs raises a lot of ethical and medical issues. A kidney may be sold for $5,000 in places like Pakistan, China, or India, and the people who handle the transaction earn a sizable profit [8, 3]. Most of the time, people who sell their organs are members of marginalized groups. Illegal organ recipients have much worse survival rates than individuals who have legally obtained an organ, and they are more likely to contract infectious illnesses like hepatitis B or HIV [15]. Since the data is susceptible to survivor bias, these numbers may potentially significantly underestimate the danger. People who don't make it through the surgery and go home are often left out of studies. In 2010, a former doctor who had taken more than $400,000 from patients while making false promises about organ transplants in the Philippines was given a sentence of more than 15 years in jail [28]. Actually, more than five patients traveled to the Philippines just to learn

that no organ was ready for them. In addition, there are several frauds because of the dishonesty of the illicit organ trade.

Organ providers are prone to being exploited in an organ trading system because they are ignorant of the hazards, terms of the agreement, and level of care. They are often promised a straightforward procedure and sufficient post-operative care, neither of which they normally get. Many donors ultimately use the money they were paid for the organ to pay for medical care for personal health issues connected to transplantation. Numerous criticisms of the organ market focus on the issues brought about by the uncontrolled nature of the organ trade. The issues with autonomy and the poor health outcomes in the organ trade have a detrimental impact on the notion of commercializing organ transplantation as a whole. Arguments about these things do not matter for figuring out how an organ market works because they have nothing to do with the economic transaction. There has been much debate about whether it is wise to continue the practice of paid unrelated transplants in Third World countries [29]. It is believed that ethical and medical standards should be the same everywhere. In a study of 600 adults in India over the age of 20, 54% said they would be willing to donate their organs after death, 41% said no, and the remainder said they were unsure [30, 9]. The Muslim community in Singapore was exhorted by the president of the Islamic Religious Council to donate their organs after passing away. Hinduism holds that there is an "*atma*" (soul) and a "*sharira*" (body) [31, 21]. It is believed that the body has no value when the soul has passed away.

Developing nations lack educational campaigns to raise people's awareness of the importance of organ donation and the risk of commercializing it. Rady, Verheijde, and Ali say that most countries in the third world have not yet passed the measure in their legislatures to make it official [32]. Low organ procurement rates are thought to be caused by a lack of cadaver donation education among medical professionals and the general population. According to Wilkinson, efforts to establish schemes for organ procurement and transplantation have been utterly useless in nations like Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, and Chile [5]. According to Njemanze, the British Embryology Law forbids the use of human eggs from Europe and America but allows the use of animal and human eggs from Africa [15]. It has been calculated that for around 5 years, at least 100 million ovarian eggs would need to be stolen from 10 million Nigerian women [15]. These numerous hormone injections that stimulate the ovaries administered at IVF clinics would cause these Nigerian women to die from Ovarian Hyper stimulation Syndrome complications. According to Njemanze, ovarian hyper-stimulation syndrome problems might result in the deaths of 10 million Nigerian women in two to three years (liver failure, kidney failure, cancers, infections, etc) [15]. The Nation Health Act 2014 was intended to covertly shield these unlawful activities in Nigeria by creating enabling system legislation. In-vitro fertilization (IVF) would be used to get the ovarian eggs.

Njemanze opines further that if a woman wants to get pregnant or is donating her ovarian eggs, she must undergo the process. Nigerians are being used as fronts by IVF clinics in Nigeria as they grow under the sponsorship of foreign owners who are collecting ovarian eggs. What would therefore induce Nigerian women to undergo IVF? According to Njemanze, they established a broad vaccination campaign to do this, which was financed by the wealthy "philanthropist" and his affiliated "reputable" international and national organizations [15]. Even though the international bodies deny it, the polio and tetanus vaccinations have sometimes been given in combination with "sterilizing chemicals." Under the sponsorship of foreign entrepreneurs that use Nigerians as fronts for ovarian egg harvesting, IVF clinics are mushrooming across Nigeria. According to Njemanze, over 90% of the businesses engaged in embryonic stem cell research are owned by billionaires [15]. A common infertility drug (anti-HCG) has been added to vaccinations to lower human chorionic gonadotropin and result in miscarriages. According to research by the European Union,

Nigeria is the leading exporter of human ovarian eggs [15].

Ethico-Religious Appraisal of Selling and Buying of Human Organs: *Within the context of various ethical theories, the selling and buying of human organs can be assessed. According to research, buying and selling human organs invariably leads to unethical behaviour and has serious negative impacts on underdeveloped countries. Utilitarianism, Kantianism, virtue ethics, principlism, moral necessity, and religious ethics might not accept the sale of human organs if there are no political or religious limits.*The moral implications of organ transplantation systems are often discussed in terms of their effects. According to utilitarianism, the ethically appropriate action or system is determined by the utility that it produces [31, 21]. This is done by comparing the consequences. In this sense, utilitarianism may provide a defense for the organ market and weigh potential criticisms within its confines. Despite experiencing pain and worry during the procedure, the supplier's overall satisfaction is either boosted by completing the act or temporarily diminished. According to the traditional utilitarian theory, giving a kidney or any human organ in exchange for advantages such as money is the supplier's ethically correct action if he or she is aware that the pleasure the financial rewards would bring him or her exceeds the drawbacks for the receiver [6]. In this case, the organ recipient may determine if paying for the organ for transplant will result in greater overall satisfaction or not. In either sense of the word, one would contend that the person optimizes usefulness by participating in a commercial renal transaction with knowledgeable, sensible, and willing others. Therefore, utilitarianism holds that not only is a controlled market for organs ethically appropriate and acceptable, but also that a ban is immoral since it diminishes utility. Since incentive-based systems do not exclude non-incentivized organ transplantation, this result supports the existence of an organ market where organs are sold and bought.

According to Kant's ethical philosophy, humanity's reasoning essence is what makes them human. When Kant uses the word "humanity," he is not referring only to the human being as a member of the species [24, 33]. The worth of humankind is instead derived from the human capacity for reason and their ability to define their own goals. It could be contended that since human reason is attributed dignity, the commercial sale of human organs is not wrong. In this sense, Kantian ethics may not support the assertion that the organ market always involves unethical behaviour. It is further argued that purchasing and selling human organs treats people as expendable objects that cannot be replaced by other objects. For example, in exchange for payment, a blacksmith will offer his or her logical technical skills, an artist will lend his or her artistic skills, and a classroom teacher will provide his or her teaching skills. By participating in their various transactions, none of the individuals or professionals mentioned above loses their dignity; on the contrary, by pursuing their goals, they use their reasoning faculties [10]. Similar to selling an organ such as a tooth or kidney, selling an organ does not diminish one's capacity for reason and does not infringe upon the dignity of the donor. Contrary to Kant's famous argument against selling one's organ, donating or selling an organ does not always violate one's humanity. It could be contended, therefore, that rather than ethically abhorring organ sales, the formula for humanity actually dictates that they be permitted. This understanding of humanity also serves as a foundation for delving into Kant's concept of dignity and how it pertains to the organ trade.

Ottuh and Ihwighwu argue that a theory known as virtue ethics places more emphasis on an agent's moral character than on laws or consequences [34]. Virtue ethics must appeal to the motivations and character attributes of the participating actor in order to resolve contentious acts like abortion or the selling and buying of organs. It could be argued that commercial organ transactions can be carried out in a moral manner by demonstrating that moral actors would participate in an organ market.Given that money may be quickly transferred to individuals in need, compared to specialized compensation like tax discounts or

health insurance, an organ market would provide the most appropriate financial rewards. So, the good provider may balance their actions of kindness and generosity and give the needs of the people they want to aid prioritization. Giving a kidney or any human organ without expecting anything in return exemplifies solidarity and charity, whereas giving a kidney or any human organ in exchange for monetary gain demonstrates selfishness [35, 36]. The person who sells any human organ may still be acting in the patient's best interests while still thinking that other principles, such as justice or reciprocity, would permit him or her to receive financial rewards. By receiving the funds from a receiver who can afford to do so and dispersing them to others in need, the individual may instead spread the advantages among more individuals. A system without incentives does not ensure altruistic behaviour since an organ donor can also behave selfishly, such as to enhance his or her reputation within his or her social group. Thus, it could be further contended that by taking part in a controlled organ market, a moral actor would be reflecting at least as many virtues. Additionally, permitting incentives does not always remove societal virtues like altruism or solidarity, so the organ market does not prevent people from giving their organs.

At the level of principlism, numerous arguments against selling and buying human organs are founded on the values of justice, nonmaleficence, and respect for individual liberty. It could be argued that by employing these ideas, this tension can be alleviated and organ transplantation becomes acceptable. One may argue that a controlled organ market complies with principlism's standards. According to Beauchamp and Childress, the nonmaleficence principle cannot be applied in a vacuum and should be weighed against all other principles [35, 36]. Obligations to impart benefits, to avoid and eliminate ills, and to assess an action's probable goods against its costs and potential harms are all part of the beneficence concept. The allocation of costs and rewards throughout human society is one of the key concerns of the idea of fairness. The idea may be used in regard to organ transplantation to describe both the process of obtaining organs and the distribution of organs within organ transplantation systems. The concept of fairness may be broken if the receiver and the provider are barred from taking part in the business transaction. One often hears the claim that an organ market would lead to injustice because it would 'compel' impoverished people to sell their organs. This argument assumes that force, manipulation, or incompetence, which comes from being poor and is a required condition [37]. A ban inevitably deprives the poor of a viable choice in terms of its low risks and its valuable goal of making money. In this regard, one can compare and contrast incentive-based and non-incentive-based organ transplantation systems in light of the four guiding principles of principlism: justice, nonmaleficence, beneficence, and respect for individual liberty. Furthermore, it could be argued that neither system necessarily violates the norms of respect for justice and autonomy. Therefore, the conditions of the theory of principlism are not broken by a controlled organ market. Hence, one may conclude that the existing opposition to the selling and buying of human organs may be considered unfounded and dependent on false premises.

Regarding its non-empirical foundation and eschatological completion, the theological aspect of human dignity is taken into account. The question is, does it follow that if the biblical concept of humankind is made in God's likeness and living before God as *Imago Dei*(God’s image) is the foundation for inalienable human dignity?According to Welz, it then follows that human dignity endures after death [38]. The Bible is clear that people were made in God's likeness (Genesis 1:26-27, 5:1; 9:6; 1 Corinthians 11:7; James 3:9) [39, 34]. The idea that people carry God's image is known as the *imago dei* doctrine [40]. It plays a crucial role in the development of Christian anthropology and provides theological guidance for the understanding of human-divine and human-human interactions in Christian thought. The presence of the image of God in people is not a coincidence or a result of their nature; rather, it is part of what makes people human [41, 34]. The image is the

foundation for human dignity and individuality since it relates to what a human being is rather than what they do or have. For example, while assisted suicide is legal and authorized in nations such as Switzerland, some US states, and other countries, it is prohibited in African nations. According to African belief, a person who passes away naturally is regarded to have had a nice death, whereas a death due to an unnatural reason, such as suicide, is seen to have been terrible. Despite the fact that euthanasia, for instance, is forbidden in Africa, sometimes individuals beg for help in dying because they have terrible, incurable illnesses. For cultural, religious, and ethical reasons, euthanasia is morally unacceptable in Africa [29]. In all these, it is implied that Africans do not treat human beings as commodities meant to be sold. For Africans, every part or organ of the human person is life and therefore valuable. From this stance, one could argue that the human organ trade is an affront and therefore violates human dignity.

The inviolability and dignity of human existence are to be upheld by the moral code at all times and in all places. Rady and Verheijde argue that the Islamic moral code is violated when religious texts are reinterpreted to support the utilitarian goals of a contentious end-of-life procedure that is seen as beneficial by society [31]. Given that donors may experience harm before passing away, it might potentially have negative practical effects Organ donation is considered a kind of *sadaqatuljariyah* (continuous charity) under Islamic law, and people are allowed to do it in order to save lives [1]. Maslaha(a notion recognized as the foundation of law in Islamic divine law and a component of Islamic jurisprudence's expanded methodological principles) is unable to defend the early termination of human life (donors) in order to get transplantable organs since this action is immoral [42, 21]. The Islamic legal precept *eethaar* (giving preference to others) is violated by the commercialization of human organ sales and purchases, undermining the "altruistic" intentions of donors. To preserve human dignity, integrity, solidarity, and respect, such an act should not be exported to other nations. Hinduism is centered on the idea of *Dharma* (moral and religious obligations or good living) and holds that destiny is determined by a person's actions throughout each stage of life [43, 21]. It also holds that reincarnation is a reality. Hindus believe that although the body is perishable, the spirit is imperishable and immortal. Since love and compassion (*karuna* - self-compassion) are important in Hinduism, people should try to help other people feel less pain.

The Way Forward: The United Nations Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons and the Council of Europe Convention on Action against Trafficking in Human Persons both include trafficking in human beings for the removal of organs. Many professional standards and regulations should adopt and enforce the World Health Organization's guiding principles on human cell, tissue, and organ transplantation, even though, the creation of a legally binding document at the level of the United Nations is not yet available. To fight organ commercialization and trafficking, the same rules and strategies that apply to other types of exploitation of human trafficking should be used. To prevent the donation system, which should serve as the cornerstone of the organ transplantation system, the concept that forbids obtaining financial advantage from the human body is equally crucial and should be legislated on. In May 2004, the World Health Assembly told member countries to take steps to protect the most vulnerable and poor people from transplant tourism and the trade in human organs and tissues. This advice should be adhered to by all nations.

All relevant international instruments, whether at the global or regional level, are important for preventing and combating the trafficking of people for the purpose of organ harvesting, selling, and buying.As noted earlier, the most popular motive for selling human organs was to pay off debts and make ends meet. Therefore, most countries' organ donation and transplantation laws should be changed thereby, helping to prohibit the selling and buying of human organs under any circumstances. Both a nationwide cadaveric

programme and a stronger focus on primary prevention of prevalent illnesses that cause renal failure that require organ donation and transplantation laws should be changed thereby, helping to prohibit the selling and buying of human organs under any circumstances. Both a nationwide cadaveric programme and a stronger focus on primary prevention of prevalent illnesses that cause renal failure are required to tackle the root of the problem. However, organ donors should get a little bit of set compensation as appreciation for their selfless organ donation. As a result, the need to haggle about higher or lower payment amounts in return for an organ and the transactional aspect of "buyer and seller" may be eliminated. On the Nigerian scene, national security in the country requires that the federal government take into account the amendment of the National Health Act (NH-Act) of 2014 to stop the poaching of ovarian eggs and mass harvesting of human organs [15]. As things are in Nigeria today, the NH-Act's provisions allow for the un-consented removal of ovarian eggs and the trafficking of human organs, which might result in the deaths of millions of Nigerians, mostly women. This scenario is applicable to other third-world nations, most especially African nations.

Conclusion: The study established that both secular and religious spheres have always opposed the concept of a market for human organs even though the discrepancy between organ supply and demand is always growing. According to proponents of organ commercialization, permitting an organ market might reduce unnecessary suffering and death. People who oppose selling human organs claim that there is no justifiable reason for society to do so. Many other nations still experience transplant tourism and illegal organ trafficking. Like other nations, the illicit harvesting of human organs is permitted under Nigeria's National Health Act of 2014. If the legislation is not altered, the next ten years might see millionsof Nigerians killed by legalized organ poaching. Under the sponsorship of foreign businesspeople that are collecting ovarian eggs while posing as Nigerians, IVF institutions are expanding in Nigeria. Finding has shown that compared to genuine organ recipients, illegitimate organ recipients have much poorer survival rates because, they are more likely to get infected with illnesses like hepatitis B or HIV. The issues with autonomy and the subpar health results in the organ trade make the concept of commercializing organ transplantation problematic. Among underdeveloped nations, there are not enough educational campaigns to raise awareness of the danger involved in human organ commercialization, hence, they should intensify effort on educational campaigns to raise awareness of the medical, ethical and religious implications of organ commercialization and trafficking. The crux of the matter is that, buying, selling and trafficking human organs inevitably leads to unethical behaviour and has negative repercussions on the world's developing countries.

On the other hand, one may claim that the commercial sale of human organs is legitimate based on Kant's ethical theory since human reason is respected. In this way, neither the donation nor the sale of an organ compromises the donor's mental capacity or diminishes their sense of dignity. It may be argued also, that commercial organ transactions are ethically permissible if it can be shown that moral agents will engage in an organ market. The criteria of justice, nonmaleficence, and respect for individual liberty may be met by a market for organs that is properly controlled. This viewpoint allows one to posit that the trade in human organs offends and violates human dignity. This, however, may follow that human dignity also endures even after death if the biblical notion that people were made in the image of God serves as its foundation. Thus, this calls for further critical research on the ethical and religious status of human organ commercialization and trafficking.

References:

1. Osebor IM and Mordi JF. The culture of reincarnation: an obstacle to organ donation in Nigeria. Abraka Journal of Religion and Philosophy. 2023; 3(1): 141-153. https://abrakajournal.com/index.php/ajrp/article/view/29/34 (Accessed June 3, 2023).

2. Wilkinson M & Wilkinson S. The donation of human organs. In Zalta, E.N. (Ed.), *Stanford encyclopedia of*

philosophy, Stanford. California: 2019; The Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University; https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/organ-donation/ (Accessed March 14, 2022).

3. Andre C and Velasquez M. Kidneys for sale. Markula Center for Applied Ethics. 2019; https://www.scu.edu/mcae/publications/iie/v1n2/kidneys.htm l (Accessed March 3, 2022).
4. World Health Organization. Harvesting organs. Bulletin of the World Health Organization. 2007; 1(1): 1-84. DOI: http://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.07.000107
5. Wilkinson S. The sale of human organs. In Zalta, E.N. (Ed.), Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy, Stanford. California: 2016; The Metaphysics Research Lab, Center for the Study of Language and Information, Stanford University. ISBN: 1095-5054.

6. Dalal AR. Philosophy of organ donation: Review of ethical facets. World journal of transplantation. 2015; *5*(2): 44-51. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5500/wjt.v5.i2.44
7. Joint Council of Europe/United Nations. Trafficking in organs, tissues and cells and trafficking in human beings for the purpose of the removal of organs. 2009; https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?tab=wm#inbox/FMfcgzGgPzDpTZcpmmSJkBCcGLTjbcxG?projector=1&messagePartId=0.1 (Accessed on March 2022).
8. Perry P. What you need to know about human organ trafficking. Surprising Science. 2016; https://bigthink.com/surprising science/what-you-need-to-know-about-human-organ-trafficking/ (Accessed June 1, 2023).
9. Panwar R, Pal S, Dash NR, Sahni P, Vij A, Misra MC. Why are we Poor Organ Donors: A survey focusing on attitudes of the lay public from northern India. Journal of Clin. Exp. Hepatol. 2016; 6(2):81-6. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jceh.2016.04.001
10. World Health Organization (WHO). Human organ and tissue transplantation Report by the Director-General. 2022; https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/WHA75/A75_41-en.pdf (Accessed Feb. 14, 2022).
11. Koons B. *et al.* Factors related to international travel for transplantation among US-listed kidney transplant Candidates. Nephrology Nursing Journal. 2022; 12:261. https://tinyurl.com/457b4s2x (Accessed Feb. 2022).
12. United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. China: UN human rights experts alarmed by 'organ harvesting' allegations. 2021; https://tinyurl.com/bdhj5z4b (Accessed March 11, 2022).
13. Glazer S. Organ trafficking. *CQ researcher*. 2022; *32*: 1-30. http://library.cqpress.com/ (Accessed Feb. 2022).
14. Berzon C. Israel's 2008 organ transplant law: continued ethical challenges to the priority points model. Israel. Journal of Health Policy Research. 2018; *7*(1): 11. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1186/s13584-018-0203-6
15. Unini C. Nigerian law permits harvesting of organ without owner's consent, medical expert, Prof (Dr) Philip Njemanze, Tells National Assembly. The Nigeria Lawyers. 2022; https://thenigerialawyer.com/nigerian-law-permits-harvesting-of-organ-without-owners-consent-medical-expert-prof-dr-philip-njemanze-tells-national-assembly/ (Accessed Feb. 23, 2022).
16. Ottuh POO. A prudential personalist ethical appraisal of human cloning. Journal of Liberty and International Affairs. 2021; 7(3): 310-330. DOI: http://doi.org/10.47305/JLIA2137310o
17. Bengali S. Kidney for sale: Iran has a legal market for the organs, but the System doesn't always work. Los Angeles Times. 2022; https://www.latimes.com/world/middleeast/la-fg-iran-kidney-20171015-story.html (Accessed June 1, 2023).
18. Ayetoto-Oladehinde T. Ekweremadu: is it legal to pay organ donor in UK? 2022; https://businessday.ng/analysis/article/ekweremadu-is-it-legal-to-pay-organ-donor-in-uk/ (Accessed June 2023).
19. Iremeka C. Grappling with emerging cases of organs trafficking in Africa. 2022; https://guardian.ng/saturday-magazine/grappling- with-emerging-cases-of-organs-trafficking-in-africa/ (Accessed June 1, 2023).
20. Ottuh POO and Jemegbe M.O. Covid-19 pandemic: an eschatologico-theodical paradox. Cogito: Multidisciplinary Research Journal. 2021; 12(1): 33-47. DOI: http://doi.org/10.26574/maedica.2019.14.1.12
21. Petru C. Ethical, socio-cultural and religious issues in organ donation. Maedica (Bucur). 2019; 14(1): 12–14. DOI: http://doi.org/10.26574/maedica.2019.14.1.12
22. Held PJ, McCormick F, Ojo A and Roberts JP. A cost-benefit analysis of government compensation of kidney donors. American journal of transplantation : official journal of the American Society of Transplantation and the American Society of Transplant Surgeons. 2016; 16(3): 877–885. https://doi.org/10.1111/ajt.13490 (Accessed Feb 2022).
23. Arthur M, Hippen JB. and Satel S. In defense of a regulated system of compensation for living donation. Current Opinion in Organ Transplantation.2008; 13: 381. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1097/MOT.0b013e328308b2d9
24. Kerstein SJ. Kantian condemnation of commerce in organs. Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal. 2009; 19(2):162. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1353/ken.0.0280
25. Schnier, K, Merion R, Turgeon N and Howard D. Subsidizing altruism in living organ donation. Economic Inquiry. 2018; 56(1): 398-423. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1111/ecin.12488
26. Jarl J, Gerdtham U, Destnik P &Prutz K. Effects of kidney transplantation on labor market outcomes in Sweden. Transplantation. 2018; 102(8): 1275–81.
27. Cho H, Zhang M &Tansuhaj P. An empirical study on international human organ trafficking: Effects of globalization. Innovative Marketing. 2009; 5(3): 331-348.
28. Scheper-Hughes N. The organs watch files: a brief history. *Public Anthropologist.* 2020; *2*(1): 1-36. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1163/25891715-00201001
29. Dibua JI. *Modernization and the crisis of development in Africa: the Nigerian experience*. New York: 2017; Routledge. ISBN: 9781138356535
30. Uskun E and Ozturk M. Attitudes of Islamic religious officials toward organ transplant and donation. Clinical Transplant. 2013; 27(1): E37-E41. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1111/ctr.12058
31. Rady MY &Verheijde JL. The moral code in Islam and organ donation in Western countries: reinterpreting religious scriptures to meet utilitarian medical objectives. Philosophical Ethics Humanity Medicine. 2014; 9:11. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1186/1747-5341-9-11
32. Rady MY, Verheijde JL & Ali MS. Islam and end-of-life practices in organ donation for transplantation: New questions and serious sociocultural consequences. HEC Forum. 2009; 21(2): 175-205. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1007/s10730-009-9095-8
33. Church J. The two vocations of human nature in Kant's anthropology. *K*ant, liberalism, and the meaning of life. New York, 2022; Oxford Academic, DOI: http://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197633182.003.0003
34. Ottuh POO & Ihwighwu J. An ethical-theological assessment of in-vitro meat in human society. Ramon Llull

Journal of Applied Ethics. 2023; 14: 29-51. DOI: http://doi.org/10.34810/rljaev1n14Id413654
35. Beauchamp TL & Childress JF. Principles of biomedical ethics, 6th ed. New York: 2009; Oxford University Press. ISBN: 97801953357054
36. Kaballo M, Canney M, O'Kelly P, Williams Y, O'Seaghdh C & Conlon P. A comparative analysis of survival of patients on dialysis and after kidney transplantation. Clinical Kidney Journal. 2018; 11(3): 389. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1093/ckj/sfx117
37. Mohan S, Chiles M. Patzer R, Pastan S, Husain S, Carpenter D, Dube G, Crew R, Ratner L & Cohen D. Factors leading to the discard of deceased donor kidneys in the United States. Kidney International. 2018; 94(1): 187–98. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.kint.2018.02.016
38. Welz C. *Imago dei* and human dignity: reciprocal regard and an unfulfilled demand. In Humanity in God's image: an interdisciplinary exploration (pp. 230-254). Oxford: 2016; Oxford University Press. ISBN:9780198784982
39. Jotkowitz A. Theological reflections on donation after circulatory death: the wisdom of Paul Ramsey and Moshe Feinstein. Journal of Medical Ethics. 2008; 34(10): 706-709.DOI: http://doi.orh/10.1136/jme.2007.023267
40. Hackett C, Stonawski M & McClendon D. The changing global religious landscape. Pew Research Center. 2017; https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/wp-content/uploads/sites/7/2017/04/FULL-REPORT-WITH-APPENDIXES-A-AND-B-APRIL-3.pdf (Accessed March 11, 2023).
41. Boaheng I. The doctrine of *imago dei* and the challenge of euthanasia. E-Journal of Religious and Theological Studies. 2020; 6: 158-168. DOI: http://doi.org/10.38159/erats.2020062
42. Padela AI. Islamic medical ethics: a primer. Bioethics. 2007; 21(3): 169-178. DOI: http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467 8519.2007.00540.x
43. Shroff S &Navin S. Hinduism and organ donation. Indian Transplant Newsletter. 2006; VII(22/23):33. https://www.itnnews.co.in/indian-transplant-newsletter/issue22/23/Religion-and-Organ-Donation-339.htm (Accessed Jan. 21, 2022).

Conflict of Interests: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests in this study.

Author Declaration: The author conceived the idea, did the literature and wrote the manuscript and checked the manuscript meticulously.

Funding: Not funded.