# The Life You Let Die 10/13/2016

The main claim that Singer argues in “The Life You Can Save” is that there most people who sees a boy drowning would wade in the water and ruin an expensive garment to save a drowning boy, and draws the connection that the same choice can be made by donating surplus money to save a diseased boy far away. One critic Kathryn, rejects this as a moral obligation by stating the fact that it is a personal choice to determine moral obligations.

Personally I think the best thing to derive out of Peter Singer’s writing is a deeper understanding of how moral code is generated on a personal basis. In this experiment is proven to have an inclination towards experiential emotional response. Thus the experiment builds evidence for morality falling in line with psychological egoism, which is the idea that all actions are selfish. In this case it's “more selfish” to save the drowning child in the real world version because of the cultural pressure, cultural reward potential, emotional pressure, potential emotional regret, and so on.

Singer uses this emotional pressure to try and bring the rational argument forward in the reader's mind by asking the reader to put themselves in the parent’s shoes of a suffering diseased child who can be helped. Singer writes “If the desires of the parents of the dying child were our own, we would have no doubt about their suffering and the death of their child are about as bad as anything can be '' (Singer 576). He again posits that you can not deny that the life of the child is worth way more than the money it would take to save him, thus you should sacrifice as much as your wealth as possible without taking away from your own needs.

Singer says that you must find a flaw in the reasoning of the moral principle for it to not apply, and fights tooth and nail at any objection that arises. Singer goes on to clarify that you would never need to give up something that you define to be nearly as important as what reward comes from your sacrifice. Singer says “nearly as important” is deliberately vague because he believes no person can argue many things as being more important than a child’s life.

Kathryn refutes Singer by saying “There is no black and white universal code for every-one. It is better to accept that everyone has a different view on the issue, and all people are entitled to follow their own beliefs” (Singer 577). The reason this resonates with me is the fact that there is no objective truth. To accept this moral code brought forth by Singer you would also need to agree on many other things. For example, believing that every human is a human worth keeping alive, therefore you could never logically vote for the death-penalty being legal while agreeing with this moral code. You can backtrack further and further to the meaning of life and make this moral code become completely irrelevant with a whole different view of the way humans and society should work.

Singer refutes this argument by claiming it to be the same as moral-relativism. However, he assumes that we are also claiming that this statement denies the right to ever stop people from doing things we find cruel. Instead I look at it as since I am entitled to my beliefs, and others to theirs, we will all go forth with what we believe to be right, and what I believe to be right would be stopping rapists, racists, and terrorists. Singer says himself that he has no right to make us do anything, but does ask us to find a flaw in his reasoning to reject the moral principle he created.