Singer

"if it is in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything else morally significant, we ought, morally, to do it. "

P1: It is bad for people to "suffer from lack of food, shelter, and medical care"

P2: If people can prevent P1 event from happening without doing anything unethical, people should.

C: It is wrong to not help when able.

Example: You should save child drowning, regardless of damage to clothes you might receive in the process.

Advancements in communication technology removes the excuse of not being able to help due to distance.

The amount of people helping should not change the responsibility one has to help others.

Common Objections:

1. One of the reasons why it is uncommon to regard giving help to other societies as a moral duty is that morals are often used to enable humans to live together in community. Anything outside the community is not a duty, since it does not help nor hinder the ability to live in one's community.
2. If people were to work full time to help others, the helpers would tire out and not be as effective. Counter argument: Overworking is not necessary to follow the moral obligations of helping.

If people give to private charities, governments will be less likely to give help.

Author: I don't believe that.

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.

Premise 2: It is in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without sacrificing anything morally significant.

Conclusion: We ought to prevent something very bad from happening by giving money and other resources to those suffering.

"Strong Version": "If it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it."

"Moderate Version": "If it is within our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything morally significant, we ought, morally, to do it."

Difference: 1. While strong version requires helpers to prevent anything defined as "bad," the moderate version only asks that help be given to "very bad" situations.

2.. While the strong version suggests that one should give until the helper reaches a situation "comparable" to that of the helped, the moderate version gives helpers the ability to stop giving more when anything "morally significant occurs"

(232) Implications

1. Distance makes no difference
   1. If people are to treat everyone equally, distance should not make people any less worthy for one's help.
   2. Even though it used to make it inefficient for helping, with "instant communication" and quick "transportation," that problem no longer exists.
2. Number of helpers makes no difference
   1. Many people excuse themselves of not giving because they can point the blame to others who also can give.
      1. What others do should not determine morality
   2. If there are a lot of helpers, each can give little and outcome is good
      1. Although sound , the argument assumes everyone helps and can help, which is not the case.
   3. What if people give too much and therefore sacrifice too much?
      1. If too much help was given, people would figure that out and stop giving.
      2. Very unrealistic situation.

(235) Charities vs. Duty

Our preconceived notion of charities is that they are not mandatory / not a duty, but they are, and our notions should not determine moral duties.

Ex: Clothes we don't need, we buy, but we should give to those in need.

(236) Two Objections:

1. The idea that people must help those in need is too big of a change from present morals.
   1. Singer says his goal was to determine moral obligations, not describe the morals people believe in
2. Moral code should be easy enough to follow, because if it is too difficult, who would attempt to follow it?
   1. Asdf

(239) Arguments against giving money

1. Should not give privately, since that will lead to less government help
   1. Singer: premise that governments give less when private gives is false.
   2. Singer: Actually, governments' actions reflect the will of the people
2. (240) helping prevent death leads to unstainable population growth
3. (241) Helping causes helpers to come into the same state as those being helped
   1. "moderate version" - no, one can stop giving once he or she has experienced something morally significant
   2. "strong version" - yes, if economies give so much that they cannot be self sustaining and continue to give as much later, that would be a problem. But that has no affect on the individual.