

per capita - per person -

World bank - international organization that is designed to finance projects and enhance the economic development of member states. It is the largest source of financial assistance to developing countries.

230

Philosophy & Public Affairs

Singer mainly focuses on nations and governments in his first paragraph.

yes we could help, but doing so would rid us of our own happiness - sacrifice. Since we likely to live ourselves -> Singer wants us to change!

highlights the continuous effects of providing for refugees who enough support.

Several situations like this. Could agree that we can't help them all because there isn't enough resources. Another problem would arise if we would have no additional aid.

Singer's claim: we need to alter our morals & affluent ways of life.

Conclusion that Peter Singer references on next page!

3rd possibility! If we agree that suffering is bad, we ought to help, & we ought to change societies moral conceptual scheme.

highly as it values the lives of the nine million refugees. Australia is another country which, on a per capita basis, is well up in the "aid to Bengal" table. Australia's aid, however, amounts to less than one-twelfth of the cost of Sydney's new opera house. The total amount given, from all sources, now stands at about £65,000,000. The estimated cost of keeping the refugees alive for one year is £464,000,000. Most of the refugees have now been in the camps for more than six months. The World Bank has said that India needs a minimum of £300,000,000 in assistance from other countries before the end of the year. It seems obvious that assistance on this scale will not be forthcoming. India will be forced to choose between letting the refugees starve or diverting funds from her own development program, which will mean that more of her own people will starve in the future.¹

These are the essential facts about the present situation in Bengal. So far as it concerns us here, there is nothing unique about this situation except its magnitude. The Bengal emergency is just the latest and most acute of a series of major emergencies in various parts of the world, arising both from natural and from man-made causes. There are also many parts of the world in which people die from malnutrition and lack of food independent of any special emergency. I take Bengal as my example only because it is the present concern, and because the size of the problem has ensured that it has been given adequate publicity. Neither individuals nor governments can claim to be unaware of what is happening there.

What are the moral implications of a situation like this? In what follows, I shall argue that the way people in relatively affluent countries react to a situation like that in Bengal cannot be justified; indeed, the whole way we look at moral issues - our moral conceptual scheme - needs to be altered, and with it, the way of life that has come to be taken for granted in our society.

In arguing for this conclusion I will not, of course, claim to be morally neutral. I shall, however, try to argue for the moral position

1. There was also a third possibility: that India would go to war to enable the refugees to return to their lands. Since I wrote this paper, India has taken this way out. The situation is no longer that described above, but this does not affect my argument, as the next paragraph indicates.

Singer uses monetary value to compare. Point a picture of how much we can, but do not do.

Why should my be solely responsible? Why should others suffer?

highlights both individual and governments.

especially now! social media, news alerts, etc. there is no way to be unaware.

Idea of global citizens.

Singer is stating that those who agree that death from lack of food, shelter, & medical care are bad, and that it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, i.e. ought, morally, to do it. 231 should also accept his conclusion that our moral conceptual scheme & the way society lives needs to be altered!

Famine, Affluence, and Morality

focuses more on the individual here! ★

that I take, so that anyone who accepts certain assumptions, to be made explicit, will, I hope, accept my conclusion.

Assumption that formulates his position states that most people agree - common consensus

↳ some people disagree, but those opinions are deemed irrelevant.

Use of ought is significant!

regulates

What does Singer mean by deceptiveness? it is simple - we make it complicated.

drawing example! it doesn't matter if there are 100 other people that who could help, or just yourself, you are just as obligated to help. Also addresses distance, you are obligated to help no matter the distance.

global citizen!

The uncontroversial appearance of the principle just stated is deceptive. If it were acted upon, even in its qualified form, our lives, our society, and our world would be fundamentally changed. For the principle takes, firstly, no account of proximity or distance. It makes no moral difference whether the person I can help is a neighbor's child

to connect to the principle above, this example demonstrates preventing bad (death) without having to promote good - it's imagine promoting good would be like advocating for a new fence around the pond - that's not required.

This content downloaded from 152.42.96.160 on Mon, 16 Oct 2017 12:55:41 UTC
All use subject to <http://about.jstor.org/terms>

Saying that this principle should be really be argued either because it is not demanding - just prevent what is bad, you don't have to promote good.

call back to the drowning kid. Powerful sentence - clothes getting muddy is a minor inconvenience compared to death. Supports idea that we ought to do something that will prevent bad to others. Maybe our shoes were expensive but that money could have fed a family for a week - very individual focused example.

idea doesn't directly connect to the principle above but to Singer's overall idea