Beyond the Drowning Child: Rethinking Moral Urgency Through Singer and the Great Leap Forward

Yuchen Wang[1]

[1] Emory University, 201 Dowman Drive, Atlanta, GA 30322, United States
Correspondence: Yuchen Wang, Emory University, 201 Dowman Drive, Atlanta, GA 30322, United States.

Abstract

Moral urgency commands immediate attention, but it can obscure deeper questions about sustainability and structure. This paper examines the logic behind emergency-driven ethics through Peter Singer's argument for alleviating global poverty via individual giving. While persuasive in its clarity, this framework risks narrowing moral focus and creating expectations that are difficult to sustain. Using China's Great Leap Forward as a case study, the paper explores how urgency-centered ethics can produce harm when detached from long-term planning and institutional context. The critique is not of urgency itself, but of its dominance in moral discourse. Drawing on Emerson's reflections on moral integrity and burnout, the paper proposes an alternative model of responsibility—one that holds space for both immediate compassion and enduring systems of care.

Keywords: emergency ethics, Peter Singer, Great Leap Forward, structural inequality, global poverty

1. Introduction

Crises demand action. We do not pause to debate long-term urban planning when a house is on fire; we grab a hose or call the fire department. When a child is drowning, we do not hesitate to pull them from the water. These moments leave no room for deliberation—only an urgent choice between intervention and inaction. But what happens when moral philosophy adopts this same sense of urgency?

Peter Singer argues that death caused by poverty is a moral emergency. In his famous analogy, failing to donate to prevent such death is like walking past a drowning child without stopping to help. If people in affluent nations can prevent immense suffering—and especially premature death—at relatively little personal cost, he claims, then they are morally required to do so. This argument, powerful in its simplicity, has shaped discussions on ethics and philanthropy for decades. But is responding to death from poverty, or any large-scale crisis, the same as rescuing a drowning child?

This paper explores the ethical framework behind emergency-driven ethics, which insists that some moral duties require urgent, almost instinctive action, often prioritizing immediate solutions over careful planning. While this approach can be compelling, it raises four key concerns. First, it tends to oversimplify complex problems, favoring speed over structural understanding. Second, it may result in

ineffective or even harmful outcomes when rushed interventions backfire. Third, it imposes extreme moral demands on individuals, risking burnout or disengagement. And fourth, the logic of urgency can be used to justify overreach, sidelining local knowledge or democratic processes. Using the historic example of China's Great Leap Forward, this paper argues that emergency ethics, though well-intentioned, often obscures long-term consequences. Ultimately, while moral urgency is valuable, ethical decision-making must be grounded in structural analysis and sustainable strategy.

2. Analysis of Emergency Ethics

Emergency ethics is compelling for several reasons. First, it provides a sense of moral clarity by framing choices in urgent, action-oriented terms. The moral logic feels immediate: help or don't. This directness can be persuasive, especially in emotionally charged crises like poverty, war, or humanitarian disasters, where hesitation can mean loss of life. Of course, some thinkers like Peter Singer arrive at this urgency through careful philosophical argument rather than instinct alone. But even in those cases, the framework ultimately aims to strip away complexity and present moral responsibility as a clear, time-sensitive imperative. In this way, emergency ethics still seeks to bypass bureaucratic or procedural delay, even when built from prolonged reflection.

Second, institutions such as governments, charities, and advocacy groups use emergency framing to rally support. Politicians invoke crisis to justify rapid policy responses, nonprofits emphasize urgency to encourage donations, and media outlets highlight dramatic narratives to capture public attention. This can be effective. For example, in the immediate aftermath of the 2010 Haiti earthquake, emergency appeals led to a surge of global donations, with the Red Cross alone raising nearly half a billion dollars. These responses show the emotional and motivational power of framing moral issues as crises.

However, the same framing can obscure the root causes of suffering. By focusing on urgency and immediate relief, such appeals often divert attention from structural problems like colonial legacies, weak governance, or economic dependency. In Haiti's case, critics later noted that while billions were raised in aid, little was done to reform the country's infrastructure or address long-term vulnerabilities. The result

was an influx of short-term support without sustained change. A comparable dynamic followed the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami. While emergency relief was swift, long-term concerns such as land tenure disputes, coordination across aid agencies, and investment in resilient infrastructure received comparatively less attention. In both cases, emergency framing mobilized substantial resources, but often directed them toward immediate needs rather than structural reforms. Emergency ethics can therefore be persuasive in motivating action, but its emphasis on speed can constrain the scope of strategic planning and long-term impact.

It is also important to note that despite its strengths, emergency-driven ethics faces significant challenges.

Over-Simplification: Emergency ethics often treats complex social issues as problems with clear, immediate solutions. While this framing can generate action, it risks flattening the structural dimensions of issues like poverty or global inequality. It is important, however, to clarify what "structural" means. In some cases, structural refers to tangible systems like infrastructure, logistics, and public health institutions. Many international aid organizations supported by Singer—including Oxfam and UNICEF—do work within this space, funding vaccine delivery or water systems alongside direct cash transfers. But there is a second meaning of "structural" that Singer largely leaves unaddressed: the legal, political, and economic arrangements that reproduce inequality at the international level, such as trade policies, debt regimes, or state governance capacity. His framework prioritizes measurable interventions with clear individual benefits, rather than broader systemic transformations. This emphasis on targeted aid may lead to underinvestment in long-term change, even when it engages some institutional structures. Singer acknowledges this tension in *The Life You Can Save* (p. 36), but ultimately sustains a moral model that favors immediate impact over deep systemic reform.

Yet this assumes that emergency responses are the most viable option in the absence of revolution, overlooking how they can reinforce existing inequalities and fail to address deeper systemic barriers. Here, it's worth distinguishing between different meanings of "structural." In one sense, structural refers to the social and environmental conditions that shape whether

individuals can translate resources into real freedoms—what the capabilities approach calls "conversion factors" (Shivarajan, S., & Srinivasan, A., 2013). In another sense, structural might mean the broader institutional or legal arrangements that reproduce inequality across societies, such as state governance, trade regimes, or citizenship rights. Singer's framework, and the aid organizations he endorses, do sometimes engage the first kind of structure by investing in education, health infrastructure, or distribution systems. And Singer does acknowledge that aid effectiveness can vary depending on how it is delivered, noting in *The Life You Can Save* that interventions like bed nets or oral rehydration therapy often depend on usage rates and implementation context.

Still, his moral framework continues to prioritize measurable, scalable outcomes as the benchmark for ethical action. That emphasis can marginalize less quantifiable, longer-term efforts to transform underlying institutions or redistribute political power. While some social and structural conditions can be captured through metrics, not all can be addressed through time-sensitive interventions aimed at saving lives. This distinction matters because when quantifiability becomes the moral yardstick, deeper reforms may be seen as impractical or secondary. As a result, poverty alleviation risks becoming a cycle of targeted inventions that relieve symptoms without challenging root causes. Addressing deprivation at its core requires not only providing aid, but confronting the conditions that make such aid necessary in the first place.

Doubtful Effectiveness: while emergency framing creates urgency, it does not guarantee effective solutions. History provides numerous examples of rushed interventions that failed or even made situations worse. Without careful planning and consideration of unintended consequences, well-meaning actions can do harm. China's Great Leap Forward, which will be discussed in detail later, exemplifies how emergency-driven policies aimed at rapid industrialization led to catastrophic unintended consequences, demonstrating the dangers of prioritizing speed over strategy.

No approach guarantees success, but emergency-driven ethics are especially risky because failure can magnify harm by wasting resources, entrenching harmful policies, or diverting attention from sustainable alternatives. Rather than replying solely on high-pressure, short-term solutions, a more resilient approach integrates immediate aid with structural change. For instance, poverty alleviation strategies that combine direct relief with long-term investments in education, healthcare, and economic infrastructure reduce the likelihood of failure by addressing both immediate needs and underlying barriers. While Singer does not oppose such investments in principle—and many aid organizations he supports work in these domains—his moral framework tends to foreground interventions that yield rapid, measurable outcomes. That emphasis on efficiency and scalability can sideline slower, less quantifiable forms of structural change. Strategies that balance short-term impact with long-term transformation may therefore receive less moral urgency, even if they offer greater reliability over time.

Extreme Demands: The idea that people must sacrifice for others, even at great personal cost, raises ethical concerns. While Singer does not explicitly call for extreme self-sacrifice, his framework encourages individuals to consistently prioritize alleviating suffering over personal goals, often in ways that feel open-ended. For example, he writes that we cannot live a morally good life unless we give "a great deal more than most of us would think it realistic to expect" (Singer, 2009). Although he later proposes a practical standard—5 percent of income for most, with higher rates for the very wealthy—he acknowledges that this recommendation is a strategic compromise rather than a reflection of the full moral argument. The core principle remains: if we can prevent suffering at relatively little cost to ourselves, we ought to do so, again and again.

This creates the kind of psychological pressure that Bernard Williams critiques in his demandingness objection. Williams argues that moral theories which make continual altruism an expectation risk alienating individuals from the projects and relationships that give their lives meaning. Even when Singer's specific proposals seem moderate, the underlying expectation can feel indefinite, producing a quiet moral fatigue. When moral obligation is framed as constant, ethical agency becomes less about thoughtful judgment and more about managing guilt. In that sense, Singer's model may not demand unceasing altruism in numerical terms,

but it often does in emotional experience.

Justification for Overreach: Urgency can be used to justify policies that sideline individual rights, public deliberation, or local knowledge. Governments have historically invoked crisis framing to push through sweeping measures that bypass ethical or democratic safeguards. For example, in the United States after the 9/11 attacks, the Patriot Act was passed with minimal debate, dramatically expanding government surveillance powers. While some viewed these measures as necessary for national security, others criticized them for undermining civil liberties and weakening legal protections. This kind of response raises a key tension in emergency-driven ethics: it often produces structural change, but not necessarily the kind that promotes justice or long-term resilience.

Structural does not simply mean institutional or enduring. It also refers to the quality of engagement with deeper sources of vulnerability—whether political, economic, or social. The Patriot Act was structural in form, but its logic prioritized security over deliberation, and control over capacity-building. It illustrates how emergency framing can generate policy shifts that are lasting but misaligned with the broader goals of democratic accountability and equitable reform. In this sense, the critique is not against structure itself, but against structural change that emerges from urgency rather than careful design. Without that distinction, the language of crisis can legitimize overreach under the appearance of reform.

Understanding these strengths and weaknesses helps clarify when emergency ethics may be appropriate and when it risks causing harm. The next section turns to a historical case in China's Great Leap Forward to examine what happens when moral urgency overrides deliberation on a large scale. This example illustrates how the logic of emergency can shape not only ethical ideals but institutional behavior, often with far-reaching consequences. Later, the paper will return to Singer's model of individual obligation to consider how similar tensions emerge in less authoritarian but still morally urgent settings.

3. Case Study: The Great Leap Forward and Emergency-Driven Ethics

In the mid-1950s, China's leadership faced two pressing structural challenges: caring for the rural poor and accumulating enough capital to industrialize the nation (Mobo, 2019). The leadership, influenced by the belief that rapid development was necessary to secure China's place among global powers, redefined these challenges as a national emergency. This was not an emergency in the traditional sense. There was no natural disaster or armed conflict. Yet it was framed as one through repeated appeals to wartime sacrifice, revolutionary willpower, and moral urgency. Slogans like "a steel furnace on every commune" and campaigns like the "Three Red Flags" movement cast development as a matter of national survival, demanding immediate, collective mobilization. Mao Zedong, inspired by Soviet industrial models and impatient to surpass Western economies, proposed the radical goal of overtaking Great Britain's industrial output within 15 years. At the November 1957 Moscow meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Mao's declaration that China could leapfrog stages of industrialization intensified this sense of national urgency (Peng, 1987).

The Great Leap Forward (GLF) was launched in March 1958 as a sweeping attempt to reorganize the peasantry into massive communes and to mobilize the population for an industrial and agricultural revolution. The leadership viewed the situation as dire: industrial incompetence threatened China's global standing, and rural poverty symbolized the failure of socialist ideals. The GLF embodied emergency-driven ethics by treating industrial underdevelopment and economic inequality as crises demanding immediate, large-scale solutions. The state believed that by utilizing the collective will of the people and pooling their resources, they could leapfrog traditional developmental stages and achieve swift industrial growth. The creation of people's communes was lauded as a "golden bridge" to communism—a way to eliminate class disparities, centralize resource distribution, and mobilize rural labor for massive infrastructure projects like irrigation, steel production, and collectivized farming (Peng, 1987).

The ethics framework underlying the GLF was rooted in sacrificial collectivism. Leaders assumed that if every family melted down their cooking pots, farm tools, and household items to produce steel, the nation could generate enough raw materials to fuel steel production growth. This moral calculus mirrored emergency ethics: just as one might sacrifice their coat to save a drowning child, Chinese citizens were expected

to sacrifice their personal property for the collective good. The moral appeal was extremely direct and emotionally charged — by contributing personal belongings, each citizen could, supposedly, play a tangible role in the nation's industrial leap forward.

Similarly, the communal living arrangements were seen as a method to exponentially increase productivity. By concentrating labor into communes, the government believed it could scale up agricultural and industrial efforts, assuming that collective work would naturally yield greater output. This approach treated the problem of underdevelopment as a singular emergency that could be resolved through mass mobilization and unwavering moral commitment. The assumption was that human willpower alone could overcome material limitations—if enough people worked hard enough, the nation would industrialize rapidly.

However, this optimistic faith in mobilization oversimplified the complex nature of economic development. Just as emergency ethics assumes that direct, immediate action will solve pressing moral issues, the GLF assumed that pooling resources and maximizing labor would automatically translate into production triumph. For example, to generate power and improve agricultural productivity, gigantic dams were built throughout the country, displacing millions of people from their homes. In Henan province alone, more than 1.3 million peasants were drafted into water-conservation or fertilizer-making projects under the radical provincial Party head Wu Zhipu. By the autumn of 1958, reports claimed that Henan's countryside had been fully irrigated. However, this so-called achievement quickly developed into an environmental disaster. Excessive irrigation made large swaths of land alkaline and barren. Waterlogged soil destroyed crops and even damaged the foundations of homes, causing many to collapse. Similar disasters struck nearby provinces like Shandong, Anhui, and Jiangsu, where poorly planned irrigation not only ruined farmland but also led to catastrophic flooding in 1960 and 1961, with villages left isolated — "like small islands in an ocean" (Xun, 2012).

These tragedies were not isolated incidents — they were symptoms of a broader ethical miscalculation. The GLF's emergency-driven approach prioritized rapid, visible results over sustainable development, reinforcing the dangers of relying on moral urgency to address complex socioeconomic problems. The logic was simple: if the nation worked harder and faster, success would follow. Yet, as the ecological fallout and human displacement revealed, moral fervor without technical expertise and long-term strategy often exacerbates the very problems it seeks to solve.

This flawed ethical framework extended even beyond While backyard furnaces produced impressive-looking heaps of metal, much of it was unusable pig iron. The fixation on meeting—and continuously raising—production quotas led to the fabrication of agricultural statistics (Duara, 1974). Local officials, eager to display their loyalty and success, reported inflated grain yields, prompting the state to procure more food than was available.

This excessive grain procurement, coupled with the urban-biased policy of diverting food to industrial centers, worsened rural food shortages. Provincial variations in death rates during the famine can be traced back to these policies, as some regions were stripped of their grain reserves to meet unrealistic state demands (Kung, J. K.-s., & Lin, J. Y., 2003). Furthermore, communal farming practices undermined individual incentives to work hard. The free-rider problem emerged: some commune members, realizing that their individual efforts had little impact on overall output, became disillusioned and withdrew effort. When everyone is responsible for collective success, individual responsibility can dissolve, weakening the very productivity the communes were meant to enhance.

The forced collectivization extended beyond labor and agricultural production—it seeped into personal property and daily life. In some areas, even private furniture, clothes, quilts, and mosquito nets were "collectivized" and became the property of the people's commune. Families, like one in Liuyang county's Hongqi commune, found themselves stripped of necessities. A family of five with only three quilts was forced to contribute one to the commune, leaving them with inadequate protection from the cold (Xun, 2012). Such extreme collectivization practices not only imposed material hardship but also deepened public resentment and further eroded morale, compounding the already disastrous economic policies.

From 1959 to 1961, foodgrain production

plummeted, and millions starved during what came to be known as the Great Leap Famine. Estimates suggest that between 15 to 45 million people died—one of the deadliest famines in human history. The "three bitter years" marked a tragic illustration of how emergency-driven ethics, when blindly applied to complex socioeconomic issues, can backfire.

The catastrophic consequences of the Great Leap Forward reveal the risks of applying emergency-driven ethics to large-scale problems without sustained attention to long-term outcomes. The rush to industrialize, framed as a moral imperative, bypassed both technical expertise and social complexity, leading to policies that were not only ineffective but deeply damaging. This case illustrates the need for a more grounded ethical framework—one that does not reject urgency but integrates it with attention to structural conditions, including governance capacity, institutional learning, and feedback mechanisms. Without that depth, moral clarity can devolve into moral overreach, with consequences far more lasting than the crisis that prompted them.

While the GLF represents an extreme example of state-imposed urgency, Peter Singer's *The Life You Can Save* presents an ethical framework that calls for individual action to alleviate global poverty, grounded in the principle of preventing suffering at relatively minimal personal cost. Unlike the GLF, Singer's approach is voluntary and decentralized. Yet both share a core assumption: that moral action must be taken urgently, with little room for hesitation. Singer does discuss long-term goals such as the Millennium Development Goals (Singer, 2009) and acknowledges that sustainable solutions involve more than handing out cash. Still, his emphasis on scalable, quantifiable interventions tends to favor immediate impact over deeper structural transformation. This raises critical questions about how best to address urgent moral problems: how do we balance the imperative to act now with the need for solutions that are both sustainable and effective in the long term?

4. The Pitfalls of Moral Urgency: Singer and Emergency Ethics

Singer's ethical framework is deeply rooted in the principle that failing to prevent suffering when one has the means to do so – without sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance – is ethically indefensible. His famous drowning child analogy encapsulates this claim: if a child is drowning in a pond, and one can save them at the cost of ruining their shoes or being late for work, failing to act would be morally reprehensible. By extension, if donating a small percentage of one's income can save a child from malnutrition or preventable disease, refusing to donate is equally indefensible.

Singer's argument is compelling in its clarity, but it builds on several assumptions: that moral obligation should be urgent, direct, and centered on individual action. Each of these is distinct. Urgency, in itself, is not necessarily a problem—it can rightly call attention to preventable suffering. The deeper concern lies in how urgency pairs with directness and individualism, often bypassing broader questions of coordination, structure, and long-term reform. Large-scale problems like poverty demand more than immediate intervention. When moral action is framed in narrowly individual terms, even with good intentions, it can obscure the political and institutional work required for lasting change. In this way, Singer's framework echoes some of the risks seen in the GLF: a drive to act now that underestimates the systems through which action must operate.

That said, Singer's argument differs significantly from the GLF in both scope and implementation. The GLF was a state-led campaign that enforced radical policies on an entire population, often through coercion and ideological discipline. Singer's framework, by contrast, relies on voluntary action and moral reasoning, encouraging individuals to give based on what they can sustainably contribute. While both approaches treat moral urgency as a call to action, Singer channels that urgency through persuasion and gradualism, not mass mobilization. He also acknowledges the limits of his own proposal, offering a scaled-down standard of giving in recognition of what people are likely to accept. The contrast lies not only in the scale of implementation, but in the ethical assumptions about how change should happen.

On the surface, then, Singer's model appears much less demanding: it lacks coercion, allows for personal choice, and explicitly accommodates human limitations. Yet the moral pressure it generates can still be intense. Singer frames giving as an ongoing moral imperative,

one that persists regardless of how much one has already sacrificed. While he proposes a percentage-based guideline (five percent for most, increasing with income), this is presented as a practical starting point rather than a moral endpoint. The deeper logic remains: if further giving would prevent harm at relatively little personal cost, it is still morally required. As a result, individuals may feel that no level of giving ever fully discharges their ethical duty. The internal demands can become unrelenting, even without external enforcement. In this sense, while Singer's model is far less authoritarian than the GLF, it may not be meaningfully less demanding in terms of the psychological burden it places on individuals. The moral cost is privatized rather than collectivized, but the sense of continual moral responsibility remains.

These distinctions between GLF and Singer's proposal, though important, do not erase a shared underlying logic: both rely on a sense of moral urgency that risks overlooking long-term, systemic solutions. Just as the GLF prioritized speed over sustainability, Singer's framework prioritizes immediate financial contributions over broader structural interventions. The question, then, is not whether we should reject moral responsibility but how we can ensure that our ethical commitments are effective, sustainable, and attuned to the complexities of real-world problems.

Singer acknowledges that his original argument, which calls on individuals to give until they reach the point of significant personal sacrifice, may be too demanding for most people. To make this more practical, he proposes a donation guideline of five percent for the financially comfortable, and more for the very wealthy (Singer, 2009). But this recommendation does not replace his deeper moral standard. Singer continues to argue that we are obligated to prevent suffering whenever we can do so without sacrificing something of comparable moral importance. That principle does not disappear just because a threshold has been set. As a result, even those who meet the guideline may still feel morally compelled to give more. The standard remains open-ended, not because Singer demands more explicitly, but because his moral logic continues to imply it. This can create a sense of lingering responsibility, making it harder for individuals to feel that they have ever fully met their obligation.

5. Rethinking Moral Obligation: Beyond Emergency-Driven Ethics

If Singer's framework risks overwhelming individuals, what would a more sustainable model of ethical responsibility look like? One answer lies in rethinking the structure of aid itself. Instead of prioritizing short-term relief, ethical frameworks could emphasize long-term strategies that strengthen institutions, reduce dependency, and address the deeper conditions that make emergency intervention necessary. At the same time, moral obligation could be redefined in a way that allows for psychological sustainability. Rather than treating ethical duty as limitless, a model that sets clear boundaries and recognizes when a person has done enough would be more likely to foster continued moral engagement. These two shifts toward durable interventions and bounded responsibility work together to support ethical action that is both principled and sustainable over time.

A more sustainable ethical framework would first acknowledge that individuals have multiple moral obligations, not only to distant strangers but also to their families, communities, and personal well-being. Singer's framework, though compelling, risks demanding a level of self-sacrifice that could lead to disengagement rather than participation. Ethical responsibility should not be framed as an impossible standard that individuals can never fully achieve but as an attainable, ongoing commitment that allows people to integrate moral action into their lives without feeling paralyzed by guilt. This framing shift would encourage consistent, meaningful engagement rather than short-term, emotionally driven giving.

Moral responsibility should take structural solutions seriously rather than focusing only on short-term relief. While direct aid, such as charitable donations, can save lives in the present, it does not address the institutional conditions that produce poverty in the first place. Problems like economic inequality, limited healthcare access, and weak labor protections require sustained engagement through policy reform, movement building, and institutional change. This is not only a matter of time horizon but also of scale and coordination. Individual action can be meaningful, but structural transformation depends on collective and institutional efforts.

Singer acknowledges that long-term work and

immediate aid are not mutually exclusive. He writes that we would not ignore a drowning child just because we are also building a fence around the pond. This image captures the urgency of preventable harm, but it also illustrates the limits of rescue as a moral framework. When ethical focus remains centered on visible suffering, structural work may be seen as secondary. The task is not to reject Singer's call for action but to expand its scope. Moral urgency should include not only immediate harm but the systems that make that harm inevitable.

Encouraging sustainable moral engagement is also crucial. Instead of urging individuals to give as much as possible indefinitely, ethical discourse should promote a diverse set of moral actions beyond financial contributions. Volunteering, ethical consumerism, political advocacy, and local community work all provide ways for individuals to contribute to meaningful change without experiencing moral burnout. A robust ethical framework should offer multiple entry points for engagement, allowing individuals to participate in ways that align with their circumstances rather than imposing an overwhelming moral demand that could discourage action.

6. Rethinking About the Drowning Child

Instead of focusing solely on the act of rescuing a child in distress, a better approach would be to ask: why are so many children falling into the pond in the first place?

A more holistic ethical framework would ask whether systemic issues, such as lack of fencing, poor infrastructure, or inadequate supervision, make drowning a recurring problem. Would it be more effective to pull children out one by one, or to build barriers that prevent them from falling in at all? Would it be better to train lifeguards, implement safety programs, or educate the community on prevention? Singer might agree that both rescue and prevention are necessary, and so would I. The difference lies in where moral attention tends to settle. When urgency becomes the dominant lens, immediate rescue often feels more ethically compelling than institutional reform. Over time, this can lead to underinvestment in structural solutions, not because they are unimportant, but because they are less emotionally immediate. A sustainable ethical response must hold both forms of action in view, even when one is less visible or satisfying in the moment.

Translated to real-world moral obligations, this suggests that while charitable giving has value, it should be complemented by efforts that address the broader systems that create and maintain inequality. The most effective way to prevent suffering is not only through direct aid but through changes in legal, economic, and institutional structures that make such aid less necessary over time. These include labor protections, healthcare access, education policy, and public investment—interventions that reduce the need for rescue by shifting the conditions under which harm occurs. Instead of framing moral duty as a series of urgent responses, a more sustainable ethical framework would prioritize long-term solutions that allow communities to build resilience and sustain themselves.

7. Conclusion

Singer's emergency-driven ethics offers a compelling call to action, but history warns against prioritizing urgency over strategy. The Great Leap Forward, though vastly different in scope and context, illustrates how moral imperatives pursued without structural awareness can lead to catastrophic results. Just as forced collectivization failed to account for economic and institutional realities, the idea that individual donations alone can solve global poverty risks overlooking deeper systemic causes.

Singer acknowledges this tension by proposing practical donation guidelines. Yet the underlying principle remains that we are always obligated to act whenever we can prevent suffering at relatively little cost. That underlying standard remains in place, leaving individuals with a sense that their moral obligation continues even after meeting the recommended benchmark. Ethical responsibility must remain grounded in what is sustainable—not only in terms of economic systems, but in terms of moral psychology. We need institutions that make generosity less reactive and more embedded in the way societies function.

This need for sustainable engagement echoes Ralph Waldo Emerson's reflections on self-reliance and moral responsibility. Emerson, while deeply committed to abolition, believed that meaningful moral action must arise from within a person's sense of integrity rather than from external pressure alone. He warned that

constantly reacting to the world's demands without internal grounding could lead to moral exhaustion. This lens helps us reconsider Singer's critique of Anousheh Ansari, who spent millions to fulfill a personal dream of space travel. While Singer's concern is understandable, Emerson would ask whether enduring ethical engagement can thrive in a framework that leaves so little space for individual aspiration. Ethical responsibility is not about turning away from suffering, but about ensuring that our response to it is authentic and lasting.

Ultimately, the lesson that emerges from Singer, the Great Leap Forward, and Emerson is not that urgency is misguided, but that urgency must be held in balance. Moral responsibility should not simply ask us to give more, but to give wisely, and to build systems that reduce the need for rescue in the first place. The goal is not only to pull drowning children from the water. It is to make a world in which fewer children fall in.

References

Duara, Prasenjit. (1974). The Great Leap Forward in China: An Analysis of the Nature of Socialist Transformation. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *9*(32/34), pp. 1365-90. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/4363914.

Kung, James Kai-sing, and Justin Yifu Lin. (Oct. 2003). The Causes of China's Great Leap Famine, 1959–1961. *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, *52*(1), pp. 51-73. https://doi.org/10.1086/380584.

Mobo, Gao. (2019). "Collectivism." *Afterlives of Chinese Communism: Political Concepts from Mao to Xi*, edited by Christian Sorace et al., ANU Press, pp. 37-42. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctvk3gng9.8.

Peng, Xizhe. (Dec. 1987). Demographic Consequences of the Great Leap Forward in China's Provinces. *Population and Development Review*, *13*(4), pp. 639-70. https://doi.org/10.2307/1973026.

Shivarajan, Sridevi, and Aravind Srinivasan. (June 2013). The Poor as Suppliers of Intellectual Property: A Social Network Approach to Sustainable Poverty Alleviation. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *23*(3), pp. 381–406. https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201323326.

Singer, Peter. (2009). *The Life You Can Save: Acting Now to End World Poverty*. Random House.

Xun, Zhou, editor. (2012). "Devastation in the Countryside (1958-1961)." *The Great Famine in China, 1958-1962: A Documentary History*. Yale University Press, pp. 72-90. *JSTOR*, http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1nq1qr.11