**Singer’s Argument**

1. Dying of starvation is bad.
2. (Singer’s Strong Principle) If it is in one’s power to prevent something bad from happening without sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, one is morally obligated to do it.

1. I can prevent people from dying of starvation by giving more money to famine-relief organizations than I currently give.
2. By giving more money to famine-relief organizations than I currently give I would not be sacrificing anything morally comparable to the evil of dying of starvation.  
   —————————————
3. Therefore, I am morally obligated to give more money to famine-relief organizations than I currently give.

**Shallow Pond Argument**

1. The death of the child from drowning is a very bad thing.
2. If it is in your power to prevent something bad from happening without sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, you are morally obligated to do it.
3. It is within your power to prevent the death of the child from drowning by sacrificing clothes and shoes worth $200.
4. The sacrifice of clothes and shoes worth $200 is not morally comparable with the death of the child from drowning.  
   ———————————
5. Therefore, you are morally obligated to save the child from drowning.

**Moving from the Shallow Pond Case to Famine Relief**

1. Refraining from saving the child in the shallow pond is seriously morally wrong.
2. Refraining from saving the child in the shallow pond is morally analogous to refraining from sending money to famine relief to prevent a child’s death by starvation.  
   ———————————
3. Therefore, refraining from sending money to famine relief is seriously morally wrong.

**Outcome of Singer’s Argument**

“The outcome of this argument is that our traditional moral categories are upset. The traditional distinction between duty and charity cannot be drawn, or at least, not in the place we normally draw it. Giving money to the Bengal Relief Fund is regarded as an act of charity in our society… Because giving money is regarded as an act of charity, it is not thought that there is anything wrong with not giving… This way of looking at the matter cannot be justified… All I am arguing here is that the present way of drawing the distinction, which makes it an act of charity for a man living at the level of affluence which most people in the ‘developed nations’ enjoy to give money to save someone from starvation, cannot be supported.” (Singer)