Premise1: “If it is in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything morally significant, we ought, morally, to do it” (Singer, p. 231).
Premise 2: It is “in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything morally significant” (Singer, p. 231).
Conclusion: We ought “to prevent something very bad from happening” (Singer, p. 231) by giving money and other resources to those suffering (Singer, p. 235).

Singer claims in his first premise that it is everyone’s moral obligation to give financial aid to remove suffering as long as they are able to and nothing “morally significant” is sacrificed in the process. Singer clarifies his meaning of “morally significant” by appealing to common sense, offering an example of a person walking past a child drowning in a pond (Singer, p. 231). Although the person will sacrifice his or her clean clothes to the dirty waters to prevent the child from drowning, such a sacrifice is not significant, so the walker is still obligated to prevent the child from dying. However, Singer does not promote unnecessarily sacrificing one’s own time and resources, concerning his argument only with the “very bad” (Singer, p. 231). For example, if there is a rich man and a poor man, but neither are starving or in any grave preventable situation, it is not the responsibility of the rich man to give to the poor man. Furthermore, Singer states that the number of available helpers should have no impact on one’s moral duty to help. Some argue that the amount of helpers could cause problems if each individual gives as much as they should and the total given exceeds the amount needed. As a result, those who give are sacrificing some of their resources with no purpose. The objection, however, relies heavily on a strange case in which those giving do not know how much has already been given. If they knew enough was given already, no one would be obligated to give more (Singer, p. 234).

In addition, Singer claims that there are people capable of preventing suffering without sacrificing anything “morally significant” (Singer, p. 231). A common objection to this claim is that distance between those suffering and the helpers would cause the helper to be uninformed as

how to best help. Singer acknowledges that distance did pose a legitimate obstacle for those helping in the past, but believes that "instant communication" and "swift transportation" today renders the objection obsolete (Singer, p. 232). Additionally, Singer points out that people living in different places should not make them any less worthy of one's help if people are to treat people equally (Singer, p. 232). Another objection against this premise is that preventing suffering and starvation now, for example, will inevitably lead to unsustainable population growth which will cause suffering later on (Singer, p. 240). Singer agrees that it is possible for current help to be the cause of future suffering as a consequence of population growth, but suggests that, instead of not supporting charities, those concerned with overpopulation should invest their resources in population control organizations (Singer, p. 240).

Singer presents a sound argument concerning one's duty to give money and resources to those in need, since he distinguishes his argument from a description of currently accepted morals, and his argument only concerns "very bad" situations and excuses any help that might cause "morally significant" issues (Singer, p. 231). Although some may be quick to dismiss the first premise on the account that it would be unreasonable to live a life where one would have to give up any luxuries in order to prevent others suffering, Singer's argument does not prohibit enjoyment in buying unnecessary items, such as gaming consoles, designer clothes, or make up. If a person values an unnecessary item so much so that living without it would be "morally significant," he or she is morally right to live with it (Singer, p. 231). Furthermore, even if there were no provision for enjoying one's life, the argument concerns morals, not convenience or comfort. What one person wants to do should have no bearing over what one should do.