

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Culpit, Geoffrey. "How Requests (and Promises) Create Obligations." *Philosophical Quarterly* 44.177 (1994) 439-455. [Culpit's aim in this paper is to show that we have an obligation based on the avoidance of degradation of persons. If we make a promise and fail to fulfill the promise, we are degrading. If we are presented with a request and fail to honor the request, again we degrade the requestor. Useful in showing implications of Kantian duties to avoid using another as a means merely, could have some difficulty in social implication.]
- Feinberg, Joel. "Collective Responsibility" *Doing and Deserving: Essays in the Theory of Responsibility*. Princeton: Princeton University Press 1980 (222-251). [Feinberg provides an outline of different types of group responsibility and how they are applicable in holding a group of persons rather than a specific individual responsible. While his aim is at corporate responsibility, the theory does allow us to hold groups responsible for negligence on the part of individuals. In the case of suffering, his article could be used to argue that as a member of a group, by ignoring the suffering of a person, the group is negligent in not protecting that person from such suffering.]
- Hardin, Garrett. "Lifeboat Ethics: The Case against Helping the Poor." *Psychology Today* 8:38-43, (1974) 123-6. [Hardin argues that because environmentalists use the analogy of the earth being much like a space ship, we should regard the affluent nations as the lifeboat for which poor nations and starving persons would like to jump onto. He claims that we have a duty to do nothing in the cases of poor nations, and to avoid creation of a world food bank due to the possibility of multiplication of future generations. This is an argument any duty on alleviating suffering must address and argue strongly against]
- James, Susan. "The Duty to Relieve Suffering" *Ethics* October 1992. 4-21. [James poses a critique of Singer's cry for assistance to those persons whom are starving in other nations. She states that there is a duty of social groups rather than individuals to eradicate suffering. This duty places blame upon groups that do not act upon their duty to alleviate suffering in other nations and suffering that they have directly or indirectly caused. James provides a critique of Singer, and a call for a policy regarding suffering.]
- May, Larry. "Collective Inaction and Responsibility." *Sharing Responsibility* Chicago: University of Chicago Press 1992. [May's chapter on inaction and responsibility states that we should not hold individuals culpable for not joining in on a collaborative effort because it is the group as a whole with the responsibility. In order for there to be action on the part of a group of strangers, they must somehow communicate and organize themselves to get the job done. The group members should feel the appropriate level of shame if they do not work in a

- group, and bystanders have an obligation to form groups. May's argument seems to fall short of what one would hope for as an argument for group responsibility, but it does offer an alternative to Feinberg's theory of group responsibility.]
- Mayerfeld, Jamie. *Suffering and Moral Responsibility*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1999. [Mayerfeld offers a definition of suffering, discusses the moral weight suffering holds over us, and the utilitarian responsibility each person has towards the others in the group. However, his theory might convince some individual persons as to the weight that suffering carries, but Mayerfeld is "preaching to the choir" and does not provide a convincing reason for those not committed to a utilitarian stance. He does, however have the most current work and he provides a good starting point for one way of getting to the responsibility to provide contrast to in the writing of the paper]
- McKinsey, Michael. "Obligations to the Starving" *Nous* 3 (September 1981) 309-323. [McKinsey argues that by being a member of a group we are better able to assist those people who are starving. We have no individual obligations due to the notion that as an individual I am not particularly obligated to do anything because "what can I do?" He states that it is groups of people that offer the benefit to suffering by being able to make a difference. However, it could be objected that it takes individuals to take up groups and that the earlier motivation of the individual is not necessarily fulfilled solely by being a member of a group. Thus it is not clear as to whether McKinsey's paper offers anything to the conversation, however it could pose an interesting counter argument to Singer and a less well stated version of James' argument.]
- O'Neill, Onora. "Kantian Approaches to Some Famine Problems." in *Matters of Life and Death*. Ed. Tom Regan. Philadelphia: Temple University Press. 1980. [O'Neill's article on Kantian duties and famine provides a good motive and foundation for my argument. She argues that there are stronger and weaker forms of beneficence to be found in Kantian's imperfect duties. This is because we are allowing for people to have "ends" who wouldn't otherwise have any access to those higher ends. In their lives.]
- Otsuka, Michael. "The Paradox of Group Beneficence" *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 20.2 (Spring 1991) 132-149. [Otsuka presents a perceived paradox when there is involvement of members of a group acting upon a duty of beneficence. He states that the paradox arises from a dilemma similar to that of the Prisoner's Dilemma and argues that group beneficence only offers "imperceptible" differences. He proposes the "Whole is No Greater" argument and the "Restricted Principle" however, the problem created is that it allows persons to get out of their duties by claiming "imperceptible differences. Also, the case could be made that a problem is created in the whole idea of an "imperceptible" difference on the grounds that it is not a difference if it is not perceptible. This provides an argument one must defend against in defending a theory of group beneficence.]
- Singer, Peter. "Famine, Affluence, and Morality." *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1.3

(Spring 1973) 229-243 [Peter Singer offers a compelling argument for assisting those who are starving in foreign countries. Singer believes that we should assist those in other countries because it will increase the utility of our help. The problem with the argument however, lies in just the critiques of McKinsey and James, "it is not in any individual's power to help". Thus, it is important that we note the two problems with Singer's argument in justifying an obligation of societies to their citizenry.]

Waldron, Jeremy. "Social citizenship and the defense of welfare provision" *Liberal Rights: Collected Papers 1981-1991*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 1993. [Waldron takes the stance that welfare rights are the integral part of modern citizenship and that we cannot get rid of these rights. He takes a historical look at the theories presented by other philosophers as to how it is that these rights should stay within our communities. He offers a Rawlsian account of justice and argues that we should strive to bridge the gap between affluent and those who are starving. A good argument for social duties.]

Ronda Lee Lewis