
The Divide Of Rich And Poor In Singer's Article

The conclusion that Singer comes to is that we must give as much as we possibly can to help those in need. He explains that instead of buying ourselves new things or luxury items, we should be putting that extra money towards stopping famine and helping others. Singer says that we have an obligation to help those that are in need. He explains that we are obligated to help them as long as it is not significantly harming the well being of ourselves or those that are dependent on us. Singer explains that we are obligated to give as much as we possibly can to help those that are in need. One of the main arguments Singer says is if it is in our capability to help someone we need to do it. He explains this by comparing the famine in Bengal to a child drowning in a pond. He explains that if we saw a child drowning we would jump in and save them despite our clothes getting muddy. Singer explains that the same should go for helping those in Bengal. If we see someone who is in need of help and we are able of helping them we need to do so. He explains that it doesn't matter that we got our clothes dirty to save the child, so it shouldn't matter to donate money and go without some luxury items. Singer used this same metaphor to explain another one of his arguments. If we saw that drowning child and saw that other people were there and not saving him, would we not save him either? He uses this metaphor to explain that you shouldn't put the blame on others not helping and use that as an excuse to not offer your help. Instead, you should be offering as much help as you can and you should expect others to the same. If you saw that child drowning you would most likely jump in immediately even if others were doing nothing. When it comes to offering help to others it should be the same.

The last main argument that Singer has is once again explained using the metaphor of the drowning child. He explains how some people may just want to offer help to those around them and in their communities. He asks how this drowning child in the pond that you would save is any different from those that are starving in Bengal. He asks that if you did not know this child would you still save them? Obviously, the morally right thing to do would be to save this child even if you didn't know them. He then goes on to explain that saving a child that you know and helping those that are across the world is no different. We still have an obligation to help every single person in need that we can.