

In "Famine, Affluence and Morality", Peter Singer tries to convince us, the readers, to follow a principle - "to prevent bad things from happening unless in doing so we would be sacrificing something of comparable moral significance". By "comparable moral significance" he means that nothing comparably as bad as the "bad things" happens to the person helping. Singer creates this principle as a general rule, but uses the specific case of people dying due to famine and poverty in East Bengal to help justify his argument. Singer makes one major assumption that he claims needs no justification, "suffering and death from lack of food, shelter, and medical care are bad". This conjoined with his claim that most people, by which he is referring to most people in western "privileged" society, have not helped in any significant way gives way to his finding of a flaw in today's societal structure. Singer finds that "the charitable man may be praised, but the man who is not charitable is not condemned", and Singer believes this is unjustifiable. He believes that giving, in the way of his principle, should be a duty not an act of generosity - and only in this way will we be living in a fair and moral society that can help those truly in need.