

Received April 16, 2020
Revised August 1, 2020
Accepted August 27, 2020

Corresponding author: Osebor
Ikechukwu Monday
Department of Arts and Humanities,
Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku,
Ogwashi-Uku, PmB 1030, Nigeria
E-mail: oseborMonday1@gmail.com

© The Korean Society for Transplantation
This is an Open Access article distributed
under the terms of the Creative Commons
Attribution Non-Commercial License
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>) which permits unrestricted
non-commercial use, distribution, and
reproduction in any medium, provided the
original work is properly cited.

Egocentric organ distribution: a compromise of moral duty

Osebor Ikechukwu Monday

Department of Arts and Humanities, Delta State Polytechnic Ogwashi-Uku, Ogwashi-Uku, Nigeria

Organ transplantation is one of the remarkable achievements of scientists in the 21st century. The rationale for organ transplantation is therapy for patients suffering from organ failure. This remarkable achievement of science is facing a challenge of organ shortage due egocentric organ distribution. Using the philosophical analysis method, we suggest that reciprocal altruism be integrated into the organ distribution pool to save candidates on the waiting list.

Keywords: Universalisation of morals; Hypothetical imperative; Altruism and reciprocal organ donation; Altruism

INTRODUCTION

Egocentric organ distribution refers to person's powerlessness to comprehend that someone else's view or feeling might be differ from theirs. It is an intellectual predisposition of the individual to act according to duty not for the sake of duty. Egoistic organ distributor does not expect others to share points of view similar to theirs [1]. We maintain that the above assertion negates moral duty to others. Egocentric organ distribution manifests itself in ontological forms. The ontological egocentrism failed to demarcate between moral duty and self-organ distribution [2]. In a more explicit sense, ontological egocentrism failed to unwind emotional compositions or inclinations for the sake of candidates on the waiting list because it is based on individual's worth [3].

Egoism is the sense of self-importance in terms of organ distribution. It is a hypothetical duty only to the self. Egoistic organ distribution negates patients that are supposed to receive an organ through altruistic organ distribution system are unable to do so because the distribution channel is organ cannibalism. For psychological egoists,

self-interest, such as selfish satisfaction, ultimately motivates the acts of organ sharing. This, we maintain, has led to thousands of patients dying on the organ waiting list [4]. There are many methods of organ distribution; individual worth, distributive justice, and the altruistic distribution system, but the altruistic organ distribution seems the most practical approach for organ donation.

ALTRUISTIC ORGAN DISTRIBUTION

Altruistic organ distribution is a duty-based ethics, which teaches that an act is right or wrong because of the sorts of things they are, and people have a duty to act for the sake of duty, regardless of the good or bad consequences that may be produced [5]. The transplant ethics affirms the distribution of organs for the greatest good, of the greatest number of people. This, of course, affirms the social relevance of certain individuals in the community. Altruistic organ distribution is characterized by categorical imperative and mental unselfishness of the organ distributors.

HIGHLIGHTS

- Organ donation is the process of surgically removal of an organ from donors, and clinically transplant to patients suffering organ failure.
- Egoistic organ distribution is the politicalization of organ distribution channels for the sake of the self.
- Reciprocal altruism implies that every citizen is an organ donor and a potential recipient.

The objective of altruistic organ distribution is to expand the organ distribution pool, through the unselfish organ donation. Selflessness differently appears to mental vanity because it is an aspiration to build the welfare of others [6].

DUTY

Duty is a meta-ethics, it entails moral goodness of an action. The implication of altruism as a moral duty or obligation is that individual actions are geared towards the benefit of patients suffering from organ failure. Obligation is a duty or a commitment where an individual is legally or morally bound to act for the common good of the community. Moral duty obligates the individual to follow morality and social etiquette in the organ distribution. Organ distribution, for example, is a duty-based ethics, which focuses on the universalization of morals [7]. We maintain that the act of helping others is a moral duty to society. Critics of altruistic organ distribution have argued that it is a self-conciliatory approach to ethics. The ethics of duty is an expression of charitableness, evoked by empathy [8]. We contend that altruistic organ distribution is a moral duty of the citizens to save candidates on the waiting list.

Altruistic organ distribution is the feeling of dedication, predicated upon moral values. The altruistic organ distribution is good, but the critical question is, "Is genuine altruism conceivable? Would altruism motivate more potential organ distributions?" We contend that altruism is good but insufficient to close the gap between the demand and supply of organs. In this paper, we suggest "reciprocal altruistic organ distribution". Reciprocal altruistic organ distribution presents a cognitive account of motivation. It is an act of organ sharing and aiding. Reciprocal altruistic

is a character, which is inherent to rewarding organ donors. Burke maintains that fulfilling personal desires can be selfish, and such is oftentimes selfish. The real problem here is equivocating self-satiety with immorality [9]. Altruistic organ distributions can be done from one of two perspectives; from the idea of self-punishment and from the ethical idea of blessing the receiver [10]. First, we will discuss reciprocal altruistic organ distribution.

RECIPROCAL ALTRUISTIC ORGAN DISTRIBUTION

Reciprocal organ distribution is a civil, moral and political duty of the citizens in a community. Reciprocal altruism entails the integration of rational will of the citizens, to positively respond to moral value [10]. For instance, it is the duty of the citizens to pay their taxes because the government has provided social amenities or infrastructures. The payment of taxes would enable the citizens to continue enjoying the protection of the government and infrastructures.

The above analogy is a reflection that altruism is a selfless act without reimbursement. We maintain that altruism in pure state, juxtaposes Maussian reciprocal altruism. Reciprocal altruism is the obligation to give, receive and reciprocate. Mauss' theory focuses on distribution of gift, among individuals and groups and the building relationships among humans [11]. Mauss' theory is a cardinal test of social relevance among humankind to reciprocal distributes of an organ, unlike egoism that projects the common good, only to the self without reciprocation.

The theory of gift exchange explores the moral obligations of individuals to give gifts and, more importantly, reciprocate the equal or greater value of organs. This would inform more registration of organ donors, which also qualifies to be potential organ recipients [11]. Receiving the gift produces feeling of gratitude. We contend that Mauss' theory is a responsible innovation, which encourages registrations to donate organs into the organ donation pool. The Nuffield Council on bioethics holds that reciprocity is the act of providing benefits or services to another as part of a mutual exchange, which is not purely altruistic [12]. Thus, the idea of reciprocation in gift giving would motivate donors to give an organ, as benefactor to receivers.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS

Reciprocal organ distribution is self-sacrifice and mutual organ donation. It is a communitarian approach to organ donation. An individual donates an organ with the assurance of receiving an organ in the future. We suggest that reciprocal altruistic organ donation be integrated into the organ donation pool for the common good of society.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This paper is dedicated to researchers, clinicians, patients suffering from organ failure and organ donors worldwide.

Conflict of Interest

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

ORCID

Osebor Ikechukwu Monday

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2642-662X>

REFERENCES

1. Clarke J. What it means to be egocentric [Internet]. New York, NY: Verywell Mind; 2019 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://www.verywellmind.com/what-does-it-mean-to-be-egocentric-4164279>.
2. Kesselring T, Müller U. The concept of egocentrism in the context of Piaget's theory. *New Ideas Psychol* 2011;29:327-45.
3. Anderman EM, Anderman LH. Egocentrism. In: Anderman EM, Anderman LH, eds. *Psychology of classroom learning: an encyclopedia*. Detroit, MI: Macmillan Reference USA/Gale Cengage Learning; 2009. p. 355-7.
4. May J. Psychological egoism [Internet]. *Internet encyclopedia of philosophy* [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://www.iep.utm.edu/psycheego>.
5. Duty-based or deontological ethics [Internet]. London, UK: BBC [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/ethics/introduction/duty_1.shtml#:~:text=Duty%2Dbased%20ethics%20are%20usually,consequences%20that%20may%20be%20produced.
6. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Altruism [Internet]. Stanford, CA: *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/altruism/>.
7. What is social obligation and what are some examples? [Internet]. Quora; 2019 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://www.quora.com/What-is-social-obligation-and-what-are-some-examples>.
8. Elkind C. Theory of adolescent egocentrism [Internet]. Study.com; 2018 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://study.com/academy/lesson/elkinds-theory-of-adolescent-egocentrism.html>.
9. Burke C. In response to: altruism is impossible [Internet]. 2018 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://www.facebook.com/notes/chace-burke/in-response-to-altruism-is%20impossible/2130429820611448>.
10. Kowalski R. The gift—Marcel Mauss and international aid. *J Comp Soc Welf* 2011;27:189-205.
11. *New World Encyclopedia*. Marcel Mauss [Internet]. *New World Encyclopedia*; 2020 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: https://www.newworldencyclopedia.org/entry/Marcel_Mauss.
12. Haddow G. Nuffield Council on Bioethics: give and take? Human bodies in medicine and research [Internet]. 2012 [cited 2020 Aug 30]. Available from: <https://www.nuffieldbioethics.org/wp-content/uploads/Dr-Gill-Haddow.pdf>.