

ESSAY TWO graded outline

TITLE: IS EFFECTIVE ALTRUISM PRACTICAL?

NAME: M. ARHAM KHAN (21701848) | SECTION

Introduction

Background: (what will you talk about here)

In today's rapidly growing world, it is becoming increasingly easy for humans to connect with each other. But, with this globalization, comes the responsibility to direct one's attention to the underprivileged members of our species and strive for their happiness. But should this help be one's utmost priority? And if so, what defines help?

A famous approach is a concept called 'effective altruism' which by definition means applying evidence and reason to find the most effective ways of helping others. But is this idea even relevant or is it just a theory?

***Working Thesis Statement:**

The idea of 'effective altruism' is largely ineffective in the modern world because it promotes dependence, is impossible, against creativity and very relative.

***Does it answer the essay question?**

BODY 1.

***Proposed topic sentence:**

Practice of effective altruism is bound to hinder capability of the under-privileged to become independent financially as the philosophy considers only monetary help as altruism.

*** Does it answer the essay question + connect to thesis statement ?**

Sub-argument 1=

- This philosophy of Singer considers money as the only way of helping the poor
 - A constant supply of money will result in the needy ones to become reliant on immediate external help for survival, never giving them an option to become independent financially in the long term (as people strive when they're in need).
 - Money will be used to ensure survival by prioritizing food, clothes and shelter.
 - being effectively altruistic results in the poor ones never getting a chance to think about or collect sufficient funds to be able to set up a business and become self-reliant.
- Text Evidence (quote/paraphrase/summary):
 - "involves using a substantial part of our resources to make the world a better place."
 - Singer requires humans strive and give money to make "someone else better off." constantly and not occasionally.

Sub-argument 2=

- Singer thinks that one must earn only to give away, which demotes economic development.

- denies Economical development and capitalism, resulting in the overall need problem rising.
- As baggini says, singer doesn't realize that capitalizing money instead of giving it away is a long term solution to the problem of poverty.
- As, more jobs open, more chances of philanthropy, more chance of people becoming self-reliant.
- example of philanthropists.
- Teach a man to fish example.
- If capitalism and economy is not promoted, poor never get a chance to escape their conditions.
- Poor always stuck as being the one in need while the rich is always at the upper edge.
 - Text Evidence: (quote/paraphrase/summary)
 - ”economic development has done more to raise people out of poverty than aid”
 - Baggini: ‘giving up all our relative luxuries might be counter productive’.
 - Singer asks to give away till a point of marginal utility(explain it).

BODY 2.

Topic sentence:

Due to the constant quest by humans to avoid the monotony in life, It is impossible for everyone to practice effective altruism in its true essence.

Sub-argument 1=

- Living a minimally acceptable ethical life is impossible for everyone
- Humans are inclined to change their standard of living over time, which costs money (is a luxury) and isn't minimally acceptable.
- Anything, from trying a better cuisine at a restaurant, to buying a slightly better dress is extravagance, which humans tend to do.
- According to baggini, humans tend to live a “full life” which includes luxuries, necessities and pleasures that they prioritize and can afford.
- Humans tend to consider earning more as a goal in life so that they can improve their future. No one dreaming about monetary success (which singer thinks is the only way to help others) considers to live a minimalistic life in future.
- Occasional and justified charities are possible but such a harsh boundation is anything but humane.
- Being completely minimal is only possible for those with an abnormal past or a religious boundation.
- Examples: Abdul Sattar Edhi (mother ill), Gandhi (faced oppression by the British Raj), Japanese, Burmese.
 - Text Evidence:
 - ‘Living a minimally acceptable ethical life...’
 - ‘Live life as though survival was the only goal..’
 - ‘give aways almost everything..’

~add full life quote by baggini~

Sub-argument 2=

Effective altruism requires blind neutrality to others while helping them.

-Dictates that one must help others as if he were helping their own kins and never prioritize his family over others suffering more.

-impossible, as humans biologically get attached to their family and friends due to the presence of hormones like oxytocin in brain that promote attachment.

-Also wants humans to live entirely selflessly, by devoting all their assets to do the 'most good' which might involve saving someone from malaria over feeding your own children.

-This might be possible occasionally if a person has sufficient resources to do both, otherwise humans generally tend to incline towards family needs

-So, humans will always prioritize themselves and their family over others

-This is against altruism.

- Text Evidence:

“take an objective perspective and care equally about all lives”

“a kind of disinterested detachment from our loved ones.”

“the only moral way to live is to take care of all lives”

Baggini - “Singer's moral principles are not fit for human beings, because we will inevitably be self-interested to a significant degree.”

BODY 3.

Topic sentence:

Practicing effective altruism prevents humans from affording innovations, discoveries and creativity, prioritizing immediate human good only.

Sub-argument 1=

Inventions require assets and efforts, which the concept of effective altruism bounds to be directed only to needy humans.

-Effective altruism requires humans to direct all spare resources solely to the welfare of ones in need, which does not allow the liberty to spend on a better and more advanced future of humanity.

-Effective altruism considers innovations, art and music as extravagance and utter selfishness.

-This attitude and approach results in fatal dangers to the future, evolution and adaption of humanity making effective altruism all the more ineffective.

- Text Evidence:

“singer: feed, house and clothe yourself and our families only...”

“singer: clarifies that spending on art and other not-immediately-essential innovations is not justified”

Sub-argument 2

-Since, the scope of effective altruism is very limited to monetary help only (as mentioned by singer at several points in the essay) and prioritizes short term help over long term and more effective advantages, the concept fails to realize the importance of spending on innovations and the advantages that it has brought to humanity in the past.

-No where in the philosophy is it mentioned that one must donate to research labs, instead charities are prominently highlighted everywhere.

-Several example including treatments to diseases, better genetic immunity, better farming practices and much more are all outcomes of prioritizing innovations over immediate monetary help.

-The idea must be to look at the bigger picture and think rationally by spending on long term well-being and happiness for humanity.

-This all makes this ‘effective altruism’ philosophy weak.

-Taking the example of the drowning child philosophy, one must save the child, but must not stop there. How many children will one save? Instead, building proper safety measure in the pond must be the utmost priority too.

- Text Evidence:

“providing incentives for charities to help others”

-use all spare resources to help the ones in desperate need

BODY 4.

Topic sentence:

The concept of ‘minimally acceptable life’ and ‘most-deserving ones’ is very relative and the perception may vary from person-to-person, resulting in an inefficient practice of altruism.

Sub-argument 1=

-The terminologies that highlight the idea of effective altruism are very vague and relative.

-minimally acceptable: meaning changes from person to person, one might find an expensive item as a basic need, others might find it completely irrelevant.

-Which lead us to ‘basic needs’: needs to be clearly defined in this ideology what items are the basic necessity.

-Different priorities.

-These loose vocabulary allow for leniencies in the philosophy of effective altruism making it a very relative and inefficient way of helping others.

-Makes the concept of effective altruism ineffective.

- Text Evidence:

“Living a minimally acceptable life”

-Fulfill your basic needs..

Sub-argument 2=

The ideology of effective altruism is very biased towards needy people of a particular walk of life only.

-It prioritizes life of many African children dying of malaria over a British child dying of cancer just because his operation does not fulfill the cost-to-impact ratio this ideology proudly dictates.

-Everyone deserves the right to have a ray of light known as 'hope' in life, and no 'effective altruist' has the right to deny one his life because it won't have a largest impact possible in that given amount of money.

-Although the philosophy tries to ensure that all lives matter equally, unfortunately it unwillingly demands one to favor the lives of the poorest lot in Africa, Bangladesh or India over ones family, friends or other needy people.

-This bias makes the philosophy very weak and ineffective

- Text Evidence:

‘involves doing the most good we can’

‘saving three lives is better than saving one’

Sub-argument 3=

The thought of “effective altruism” by Singer considers money as the only way of improving others lives.

-throughout the essay mentions money as help, no other examples shown.

-This is highly illogical as it basically means that the ones with a lack of money cannot help others.

-There are many other ways that one may help others including helping someone find his way, giving someone motivation and hope, sharing your food, volunteering to care for others or above all, helping someone achieve independence in life.

-So, the idea of effective altruism is very confined and hence, irrelevant in todays complex world.

-Since it focuses only on resources and money as help, it is not an ideal solution to this worlds problems and hence, is very weak.

- Text Evidence:

“directing tens of millions of dollars to charities..”

“Philanthropy is a very large industry..”

VOCAB TO USE:

-utilitarianism/ minimally effective/ 'full life' / basic needs / point of marginal utility / fully effective altruism

Works Cited

- Baggini, J. (2015, August 14). The gift that keeps on giving. *New Stateman*, 46-49.
- Singer, P. (1997, April 5). *The drowning child and the expanding circle*. Retrieved from <https://newint.org/features/1997/04/05/drowning>.
- Singer, P. (2015, July 6). *The logic of effective altruism*. Retrieved from <http://bostonreview.net/forum/peter-singer-logic-effective-altruism>.