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 underprivileged members of our society and strive for their happiness too. But should this help be ones utmost priority? And if so, what defines help? A famous approach to this is an ideology called ‘effective altruism’. Defined by Peter Singer (2015), this ideology demands applying evidence and reason to find the most effective ways of helping others. But, the idea of effective altruism fails to be the perfect charitable model for today’s world because it promotes financial dependence, is against innovation and, delivers a subjective comprehension of the core concepts.

Firstly, since this philosophy considers only monetary help as altruism, practicing effective altruism is bound to make the underprivileged financially dependent. The idea of effective altruism by Singer (2015) “involves using a substantial part of one’s resources to make the world a better place”, which clearly means donating material wealth is the only help required from an altruist. Additionally, Singer (2015) also requires humans give money to make “someone else better off” constantly and not occasionally, which results in a regular flow of money from the rich to poor. Now since humans only strive when in need, this constant supply of money from effective altruists will result in the underprivileged lot becoming financially reliant on immediate external help for survival. This habit of expecting money from others results in the poor ones never getting a chance to ponder over striving to achieve a financially independent future. Hence, practice of effective altruism never permits the poor to break the shackles of need.

Similarly, as Singer (2015) states, effective altruism demands that one must earn only to give away, hence, denying economic development. Being an effective altruist, one is not permitted to consider any self-interest apart from a minimally-acceptable life. This approach to life, demolishes the concept of capitalism and hence, economic development. But Singer fails to realize that rather than improving the financial condition of the poor, lack of capitalism results in the overall need problem increasing. Opposing singer’s ideology of effective altruism, Baggini (2015) argues that over the years, “economic development has done more to raise people out of poverty than aid”. Economic development results in increased job vacancies for poor, more sources of philanthropic aid and higher chances of poor becoming self-reliant on a hard-earned bread. This clarifies that capitalizing money instead of giving it away is evidently a long-term solution of poverty. A very famous example nullifies the importance of ‘effective altruism’ by stating that teaching a hungry man to fish, rather than donating him one fish enables him to be independent for survival. Considering all this, if capitalism is not promoted, poor will never get a chance to escape their economic conditions, proving Baggini’s point that “giving up all our luxuries to practice effective altruism might be counter-productive”. Hence, since ‘effective altruism’ does not provide a permanent solution to poverty, it is highly ineffective today.

Secondly, practicing effective altruism prevents humans from spending on innovation, discoveries and creativity, by prioritizing immediate human good only. Innovations are a key pillar behind evolution while creativity is the very definition of a human mind, and both are equally essential for the successful continuation of humanity. But, Singer (2015) states that effective altruism permits humans to live a life of marginal-utility (feed, house and clothe themselves only) and demands one to spend rest of the resources as charity. Hence, in practice of effective altruism, there is no leniency for a human to spend on a better and more advanced future of humanity. In fact, effective altruism, as stated by Singer (2015), considers innovations, arts and music as extravagance and utter selfishness, while completely denying the fact that all these have always, and will continue to transform humanity’s future. If researches and innovations were eliminated from human life as extravagance, humans would still be living in the Stone Age. Hence, this attitude towards innovation will result in irreversible dangers to the future, evolution and adaptation of humanity, making effective altruism all the more ineffective. In the same way, Singer (2015) repeatedly mentions monetary aid as the only form of effective altruism, which, as stated earlier, is an immediate Band-Aid and not a proper solution to the problems of humanity (\*\*). Since the scope of effective altruism is limited to monetary help only and prioritizes short term assistance over long-term benefits, the concept fails to realize the importance of spending on innovations and completely denies the advantages that it has brought to humanity in the past. In the parent philosophy of effective altruism by Singer, no where is it mentioned that one must donate to research labs or scientific that regularly strive to achieve a happier future for humanity, instead it solely highlights charities as the deserving candidates for aid. Although charities have undoubtedly been successful in providing effective and immediate assistance to the unlucky lot, the concept is in complete denial of the fact that researches that led to higher genetic immunity, cure to deadly diseases, better farming practices and rapid communication mediums have done no less to make the world a better place. Today, humanity is progressing much \*fastly\* than the past only because humans looked at the bigger picture and prioritized a successful future over immediate happiness. Ironically, the example of a drowning child by Singer (2015) implicitly is against effective altruism too. Although saving the drowning child is important, but whats more important is to spend on proper safety measures to avoid any such occurrences in the future. Hence, the underlying idea behind effective altruism is very shortsighted, which, by denying long-term thinking, makes the philosophy of effective altruism ineffective today, and probably tomorrow too.

Thirdly, the key terminologies employed by Singers (2015) philosophy of effective altruism are highly subjective, which renders the philosophy ineffective. To begin with, (\*\*\*add quotes\*\*\*) one of the most important terms used to define effective altruism is ‘minimally acceptable life’, the meaning of which varies from person-to-person. This concept is correlational to the walk of life one belongs to. For some, a very expensive item might be a basic need, while others might find it utterly irrelevant. This leads to another term used by Singer (2015) that has no definite meaning: ‘basic needs’. People tend to have varying perceptions of what their basic needs are and more often than not, give in to their desires while considering them a necessity. Use of such loose vocabulary by Singer(2015) allows for leniencies in the concept of effective altruism, making it a very relative and inefficient way of helping others. Hence, the lack of concrete guidance leaves the concept of effective altruism ineffective. On the other hand, the philosophy of effective altruism provides a concrete guideline to the term ‘most deserving ones’. Singer (2015) asks humans to do the “most good one can” and implies that “saving three lives is better than saving one”. Although it is clear that one must aid the cause with the highest impact, the bias of this philosophy towards needy people of a particular walk of life is equally highlighted too. Since the philosophy employs a strict cost-to-impact ratio in determining who to help, it indirectly prioritizes life of African children dying of malaria over an English child dying of cancer just because the cause does not fulfill the cost-to-impact ratio this philosophy 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 just because it wont have the largest possible impact in that given amount of assets. Although it tries to ensure that all lives matter equally, unfortunately Singer’s (2015) philosophy implicitly demands one to favor the lives of the poorest lot in the world over ones own family, friends or others in need. Such utilitarian approach promotes a bias that renders this philosophy highly inhuman and hence, weak.

The thought of effective altruism by singer (2015) considers money as the only way of improving others lives. For instance, Singer (2015) writes humans must help others by “directing tens of millions of dollars to charities” and that in helping others, the philanthropic industry plays a vital part, but doesn’t introduce examples of a non-monetary form of help. This is very illogical as it basically means that one with a lack of money is unable to help others, which is entirely false. Singer (2015) fails to realize that there are many other ways of making others happier and having an impact on their lives. No matter if the assistance be as trivial as helping someone find their path, sharing food or motivating someone, it still is a voluntary act of kindness that must be honored equally as any other monetary aid. Several instance of highly effective altruists in the past never resorted to monetary aid and instead utilized their self to help others. This proves that idea of effective altruism, as states by Singer (2015), is very confined and hence, is irrelevant in today’s complex world.

the idea of ‘effective altruism’ is largely ineffective in todays world because

it does not allow poor to become financially self-reliant, prevents expenditures on a better future for humanity and above all, \_\_\_\_\_\_. These elements of singer’s (2015) philosophy of effective altruism render it ineffective in today’s modern and increasingly complex world.