Beispiel für einen Text, der im Philosophiestudium im Bereich Praktische Philosophie behandelt werden kann.

Famine, Affluence, and Morality

Peter Singer


Peter Singer, geboren 1946, ist ein australischer Moralphilosoph. Er vertritt eine Variante des Utilitarismus, die besagt, dass eine Handlung danach bewertet werden sollte, wie gut sie Präferenzen und Interessen der betroffenen Personen erfüllt. Weiterhin gilt Singer als einer der Begründer der modernen Tierethik: Er behauptet, dass Menschen gegenüber Tieren nicht bevorzugt werden dürfen, nur weil erstere der Gattung „Mensch“ angehören.

Der vorliegende Text ist ein klassischer und hochumstrittener Text der jüngeren praktischen Philosophie und untersucht Moral und Ethik im Angesicht katastrophaler Zustände wie Hungersnöten. Singer thematisiert darin die individuelle Verantwortung eines jeden Akteurs, die Forderung nach moralischer Unparteilichkeit über alle Grenzen hinweg und verlangt einen Bezug der Philosophie zu aktuellen Geschehnissen auf der Welt.

*Fragen zum Text:*


2. Stimmen Sie Singers These zu, dass Sie selbst *persönlich* verantwortlich, etwas gegen die Weltarmut zu unternehmen? Falls nicht, wie würden Sie Singer widersprechen?

Ich danke Anh-Quân Nguyen, MA-Student, für seine Mitarbeit bei der Vorbereitung dieses Beispielttexts.
3. Nach Peter Singer macht es keinerlei Unterschied, ob eine notleidende Person sich in Ihrer unmittelbaren Nähe befindet oder aber tausende Meilen entfernt ist und Sie sie nie kennenlernen werden. Wie begründet Singer diese Aussage? Stimmen Sie zu?


5. Singer behauptet, dass die Philosophie nicht nur in der Lage ist, Stellung zum aktuellen Weltgeschehen zu nehmen, sondern auch dazu verpflichtet ist. Wie begründet Singer seine Aussage? Stimmen Sie seiner These zu? Wie könnte die Philosophie Ihrer Meinung nach dazu beitragen, die Welt zu einem besseren Ort zu machen?

***

As I write this, in November 1971, people are dying in East Bengal from lack of food, shelter, and medical care. The suffering and death that are occurring there now are not inevitable, not unavoidable in any fatalistic sense of the term. Constant poverty, a cyclone, and a civil war have turned at least nine million people into destitute refugees; nevertheless, it is not beyond the capacity of the richer nations to give enough assistance to reduce any further suffering to very small proportions. The decisions and actions of human beings can prevent this kind of suffering. Unfortunately, human beings have not made the necessary decisions. At the individual level, people have, with very few exceptions, not responded to the situation in any significant way. Generally speaking, people have not given large sums to relief funds; they have not written to their parliamentary representatives demanding increased government assistance; they have not demonstrated in the streets, held symbolic fasts, or done anything else directed toward providing the refugees with the means to satisfy their essential needs. At the government level, no government has given the sort of massive aid that would enable the refugees to survive for more than a few days. Britain, for instance, has given rather more than most countries. It has, to date, given £14,750,000. For comparative purposes, Britain's share of the nonrecoverable development costs of the Anglo-French Concorde project is already in excess of £275,000,000, and on present estimates will reach £440,000,000. The implication is that the British government values a supersonic transport more than thirty times as 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.
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 manmade 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 that I take, so that anyone who accepts certain assumptions,
to be made explicit, will, I hope, accept my conclusion.
I begin with the assumption that suffering and death from lack of food, shelter, and medical care
are bad. I think most people will agree about this, although one may reach the same view by
different routes. I shall not argue for this view. People can hold all sorts of eccentric positions,
and perhaps from some of them it would not follow that death by starvation is in itself bad. It is
difficult, perhaps impossible, to refute such positions, and so for brevity I will henceforth take
this assumption as accepted. Those who disagree need read no further.
My next point is this: if it is in our power to prevent something bad from happening, without
thereby sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it. By
"without sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance" I mean without causing anything
else comparably bad to happen, or doing something that is wrong in itself, or failing to promote
some moral good, comparable in significance to the bad thing that we can prevent. This
principle seems almost as uncontroversial as the last one. It requires us only to prevent what is
bad, and to promote what is good, and it requires this of us only when we can do it without
sacrificing anything that is, from the moral point of view, comparably important. I could even, as
far as the application of my argument to the Bengal emergency is concerned, qualify the point so as to make it: if it is in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything morally significant, we ought, morally, to do it. An application of this principle would be as follows: if I am walking past a shallow pond and see a child drowning in it, I ought to wade in and pull the child out. This will mean getting my clothes muddy, but this is insignificant, while the death of the child would presumably be a very bad thing.

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 ten yards from me or a Bengali whose name I shall never know, ten thousand miles away. Secondly, the principle makes no distinction between cases in which I am the only person who could possibly do anything and cases in which I am just one among millions in the same position.

I do not think I need to say much in defense of the refusal to take proximity and distance into account. The fact that a person is physically near to us, so that we have personal contact with him, may make it more likely that we shall assist him, but this does not show that we ought to help him rather than another who happens to be further away. If we accept any principle of impartiality, universalizability, equality, or whatever, we cannot discriminate against someone merely because he is far away from us (or we are far away from him). Admittedly, it is possible that we are in a better position to judge what needs to be done to help a person near to us than one far away, and perhaps also to provide the assistance we judge to be necessary. If this were the case, it would be a reason for helping those near to us first. This may once have been a justification for being more concerned with the poor in one's town than with famine victims in India. Unfortunately for those who like to keep their moral responsibilities limited, instant communication and swift transportation have changed the situation. From the moral point of view, the development of the world into a "global village" has made an important, though still unrecognized, difference to our moral situation. Expert observers and supervisors, sent out by famine relief organizations or permanently stationed in famine-prone areas, can direct our aid to a refugee in Bengal almost as effectively as we could get it to someone in our own block. There would seem, therefore, to be no possible justification for discriminating on geographical grounds.

There may be a greater need to defend the second implication of my principle - that the fact that there are millions of other people in the same position, in respect to the Bengali refugees, as I am, does not make the situation significantly different from a situation in which I am the only person who can prevent something very bad from occurring. Again, of course, I admit that there is a psychological difference between the cases; one feels less guilty about doing nothing if one can point to others, similarly placed, who have also done nothing. Yet this can make no real
difference to our moral obligations. Should I consider that I am less obliged to pull the drowning child out of the pond if on looking around I see other people, no further away than I am, who have also noticed the child but are doing nothing? One has only to ask this question to see the absurdity of the view that numbers lessen obligation. It is a view that is an ideal excuse for inactivity; unfortunately most of the major evils - poverty, overpopulation, pollution - are problems in which everyone is almost equally involved.

The view that numbers do make a difference can be made plausible if stated in this way: if everyone in circumstances like mine gave £5 to the Bengal Relief Fund, there would be enough to provide food, shelter, and medical care for the refugees; there is no reason why I should give more than anyone else in the same circumstances as I am; therefore I have no obligation to give more than £5. Each premise in this argument is true, and the argument looks sound. It may convince us, unless we notice that it is based on a hypothetical premise, although the conclusion is not stated hypothetically. The argument would be sound if the conclusion were: if everyone in circumstances like mine were to give £5, I would have no obligation to give more than £5. If the conclusion were so stated, however, it would be obvious that the argument has no bearing on a situation in which it is not the case that everyone else gives £5. This, of course, is the actual situation. It is more or less certain that not everyone in circumstances like mine will give £5. So there will not be enough to provide the needed food, shelter, and medical care. Therefore by giving more than £5 I will prevent more suffering than I would if I gave just £5.

It might be thought that this argument has an absurd consequence. Since the situation appears to be that very few people are likely to give substantial amounts, it follows that I and everyone else in similar circumstances ought to give as much as possible, that is, at least up to the point at which by giving more one would begin to cause serious suffering for oneself and one's dependents - perhaps even beyond this point to the point of marginal utility, at which by giving more one would cause oneself and one's dependents as much suffering as one would prevent in Bengal. If everyone does this, however, there will be more than can be used for the benefit of the refugees, and some of the sacrifice will have been unnecessary. Thus, if everyone does what he ought to do, the result will not be as good as it would be if everyone did a little less than he ought to do, or if only some do all that they ought to do.

The paradox here arises only if we assume that the actions in question - sending money to the relief funds - are performed more or less simultaneously, and are also unexpected. For if it is to be expected that everyone is going to contribute something, then clearly each is not obliged to give as much as he would have been obliged to had others not been giving too. And if everyone is not acting more or less simultaneously, then those giving later will know how much more is needed, and will have no obligation to give more than is necessary to reach this amount. To say this is not to deny the principle that people in the same circumstances have the same obligations, but to point out that the fact that others have given, or may be expected to give, is a
relevant circumstance: those giving after it has become known that many others are giving and those giving before are not in the same circumstances. So the seemingly absurd consequence of the principle I have put forward can occur only if people are in error about the actual circumstances - that is, if they think they are giving when others are not, but in fact they are giving when others are. The result of everyone doing what he really ought to do cannot be worse than the result of everyone doing less than he ought to do, although the result of everyone doing what he reasonably believes he ought to do could be.

If my argument so far has been sound, neither our distance from a preventable evil nor the number of other people who, in respect to that evil, are in the same situation as we are, lessens our obligation to mitigate or prevent that evil. I shall therefore take as established the principle I asserted earlier. As I have already said, I need to assert it only in its qualified form: if it is in our power to prevent something very bad from happening, without thereby sacrificing anything else morally significant, we ought, morally, to do it.

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. The bodies which collect money are known as "charities." These organizations see themselves in this way - if you send them a check, you will be thanked for your "generosity." Because giving money is regarded as an act of charity, it is not thought that there is anything wrong with not giving. The charitable man may be praised, but the man who is not charitable is not condemned. People do not feel in any way ashamed or guilty about spending money on new clothes or a new car instead of giving it to famine relief. (Indeed, the alternative does not occur to them.) This way of looking at the matter cannot be justified. When we buy new clothes not to keep ourselves warm but to look "welldressed" we are not providing for any important need. We would not be sacrificing anything significant if we were to continue to wear our old clothes, and give the money to famine relief. By doing so, we would be preventing another person from starving. It follows from what I have said earlier that we ought to give money away, rather than spend it on clothes which we do not need to keep us warm. To do so is not charitable, or generous. Nor is it the kind of act which philosophers and theologians have called "supererogatory" - an act which it would be good to do, but not wrong not to do. On the contrary, we ought to give the money away, and it is wrong not to do so.

I am not maintaining that there are no acts which are charitable, or that there are no acts which it would be good to do but not wrong not to do. It may be possible to redraw the distinction between duty and charity in some other place. 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 else from starvation, cannot be supported. It is beyond the scope of my argument to consider whether the
distinction should be redrawn or abolished altogether. There would be many other possible ways of drawing the distinction - for instance, one might decide that it is good to make other people as happy as possible, but not wrong not to do so.

[...]

It is sometimes said, though less often now than it used to be, that philosophers have no special role to play in public affairs, since most public issues depend primarily on an assessment of facts. On questions of fact, it is said, philosophers as such have no special expertise, and so it has been possible to engage in philosophy without committing oneself to any position on major public issues. No doubt there are some issues of social policy and foreign policy about which it can truly be said that a really expert assessment of the facts is required before taking sides or acting, but the issue of famine is surely not one of these. The facts about the existence of suffering are beyond dispute. Nor, I think, is it disputed that we can do something about it, either through orthodox methods of famine relief or through population control or both. This is therefore an issue on which philosophers are competent to take a position. The issue is one which faces everyone who has more money than he needs to support himself and his dependents, or who is in a position to take some sort of political action. These categories must include practically every teacher and student of philosophy in the universities of the Western world. If philosophy is to deal with matters that are relevant to both teachers and students, this is an issue that philosophers should discuss.

Discussion, though, is not enough. What is the point of relating philosophy to public (and personal) affairs if we do not take our conclusions seriously? In this instance, taking our conclusion seriously means acting upon it. The philosopher will not find it any easier than anyone else to alter his attitudes and way of life to the extent that, if I am right, is involved in doing everything that we ought to be doing. At the very least, though, one can make a start. The philosopher who does so will have to sacrifice some of the benefits of the consumer society, but he can find compensation in the satisfaction of a way of life in which theory and practice, if not yet in harmony, are at least coming together.