

"The rich should be obliged to give to the poor because they don't deserve what they have."

Israa Khan

We are told from birth that we can own things and when we do, they are ours. Whether it is a cuddly toy that is our cuddly toy, or financial assets, the principle remains that people can hold private property. Systems try to claim that private property is actually public property - and so the state can "take it back" can arbitrarily offend against a more abiding sense of fairness than the superficial fairness of no one having more than anyone else.

Humans live in a fundamentally parasitic system of economics- the "Parasite Class." In this system, it is crucial to maintain face by avoiding conflict and remaining neutral in a situation of such extreme economic and social injustice. The Parasite Class have ruled under Capitalism and Communism for the same self-interested reasons. As a result, a booming global economy is maintained at the expense of those exploited- the poor. It is easy to envisage a large dinner table around which sit a few who have more food than they could eat. The excess of food is kept to themselves, selling some of it to a few who have money. A few who have money lend some of it to those who don't, with interest added. But the vast majority who sit much, much too far from said table have nothing but their time and energy, and they compete for scraps that fall on the floor.

This is exactly what is happening in the world. Greed economy is the scheme of things. We are born into a world where there is more than enough for every human being- the problem is unequal distribution as some receive more than others. This Parasite Class creates an artificial culture of scarcity in the world as the greedy hold control of resources, the means of processing, producing and manufacturing and a monetary system that controls the flow of resources in exchange for labour. Developing countries suffer food and waste loss during early stages of production, and these issues stem from financial, managerial and technical constraints in harvesting techniques as well as storage and cooling facilities. Strengthening the supply chain through the direct support of farmers and investments in infrastructure, transportation, as well as in an expansion of the food and packaging industry could help to reduce the amount of food loss and waste- and this stems from the wealthy who own these corporate industries.

But the rich see this as choice not obligation- and believe they deserve every ounce they have.

Man should whole-heartedly embrace the prospect of giving to those in poverty. Charity has been developed by society as an act of kindness- not obligation. Singer describes charity not as supererogatory as it has been perceived in society- but obligatory. This is based upon the Principle of Sacrifice- if we as humans have the power to prevent something bad from happening, without sacrificing anything of comparable moral importance, we ought, morally, to do it. A representation of this situation is as follows, as described in 'Living High and Letting Die,' by Peter Unger.

In essence, the situation outlined by Unger uses the generic character of Bob as a metaphor for man. Bob has spent most of his life investing his savings into a Bugatti- and because of his tight budget he has been unable to have it insured. Because of the rising market value of said Bugatti- Bob lives happily as he is completely aware that one day, he can sell it and live well. One day Bob comes across a runaway train, and a child clambering on the tracks. It is likely that the train is capable of killing the child- but if he flips a switch, the carriage will divert from the child's direction- into his precious Bugatti. As a result, it will not cost a life, but due to his own thoughts of financial security he avoids pulling the switch and the child is killed.

The Principle of Sacrifice is built upon the idea that like Bob, if Person A has the capacity to prevent a negative effect on Person B, without sacrificing moral competence- then it is by obligation, necessary to prevent the negative effect. This situation can be extrapolated onto the moral dilemma of whether those living in excess should give to the poor out of obligation: by donating, man can relieve suffering- the loss they face is insignificant.

It is facile to say the rich are obligated to give to the poor- but deserve all the wealth they have accumulated. In society, it is understandable to say that the rich deserve what they have- but it is also understandable to say they don't deserve their wealth because they have the capability to help those in need- and choose not to. The rich do not deserve their wealth. What they do deserve- as well as every human on the planet is to survive itself. Secondly, they deserve to flourish- not through wealth- but through values such as rationality, community bonding, pleasure, freedom, and introspection or meditation that ultimately define flourishing. According to Plato, Jewish, Muslim and Christian scriptures, all human beings have the inherent right to have their basic human needs met before any economic surplus is distributed to others. The basic needs of the poor transcend the superfluous desires of the rich in moral importance- alas, this has not been the case. As articulated in Plato's *Laws*, *every human being should be limited in his or her consumption of income and wealth by the principle of sufficiency.*

The question is not whether the rich should be obliged to give to the poor, it is why humanity has made it an option to give to those in need. The question is not whether the rich deserve what they have- or what they have earned- but whether they truly need what they possess- and whether they are able to sacrifice luxuries they are not desperate for.