From Riches to Responsibility: The Ethics of Billionaire Philanthropy

Kai Oszlai

HZB3M1-02

December 9, 2024

A Moral Dilemma for the Ultra-Rich

The question of whether billionaires have a moral obligation to use their wealth for the public good is rooted in debates about wealth distribution, ethics, and social responsibility. A *billionaire* is an individual with a net worth of at least one billion units of currency. Their wealth, as a result, grants them significant influence over societal, economic, and political systems. *Moral obligation* refers to a perceived ethical duty to act for the benefit of others, especially in addressing social inequalities like poverty and world hunger.

Examples of billionaires who have used their wealth for public good include *The Giving Pledge*, initiated by Warren Buffett and Bill and Melinda Gates in 2010. This represents a voluntary commitment by billionaires to donate the majority of their wealth to humanitarian causes. While over 40 global billionaires have signed on[1], critics highlight that such philanthropy often benefits the donors through tax breaks or social capital[2] rather than addressing systemic issues.

Philanthropy can be controversial because it reflects the donor's priorities rather than society's needs. For example, donations to private foundations or donor-advised funds (DAFs) often delay funds from reaching active charities, with minimal requirements for annual distribution (only 5% of private foundation assets are required to be donated annually)[3]. The power imbalance in billionaire philanthropy allows individuals to influence public agendas disproportionately, often bypassing democratic processes and undermining systemic solutions[4].

Those in favour of the moral obligation argue that billionaires have the resources to address urgent global challenges, such as climate change, health crises, and extreme poverty. Advocates of effective altruism emphasize that billionaire giving should focus on maximising impact, such as funding essential health and education programs in developing nations[5]. Ethical frameworks like utilitarianism suggest that those with the means to alleviate suffering are morally obliged to do so, given their unique capacity to enact change. Additionally, public philanthropic acts can inspire broader societal giving and draw attention to critical inequalities that require action.

On the other hand, critics argue that billionaire philanthropy often prioritizes personal interests over societal needs, with donations directed toward legacy projects instead of systemic reforms to address poverty or inequality. According to them, wealth redistribution should happen through fair taxation and inclusive policies rather than relying on charity,

---

[1] "Home - the Giving Pledge." Giving Pledge, 2010. https://givingpledge.org/.
[2] Vallely, Paul. "How Philanthropy Benefits the Super-Rich." The Guardian, September 8, 2020. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/sep/08/how-philanthropy-benefits-the-super-rich.
[3] Collins, Chuck, Helen Flannery, and Bella DeVaan. "Revealing the True Cost of Billionaire Philanthropy." Inequality.org, April 3, 2024. https://inequality.org/great-divide/true-cost-of-billionaire-philanthropy/.
[4] Kramer, Mark, and Steve Phillips. "Where Strategic Philanthropy Went Wrong (SSIR)." Stanford Social Innovation Review: Informing and Inspiring Leaders of Social Change, Summer 2024. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/strategic-philanthropy-went-wrong.
[5] Singer, Peter. "What Should a Billionaire Give – and What Should You?" The New York Times, December 17, 2006. https://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/17/magazine/17charity.t.html.

which can sometimes result in power imbalances and delay necessary reforms. Furthermore, the myth of the "self-made billionaire" overlooks the public systems, infrastructure, and collective labour that contributed to their wealth. Critics suggest that the ultra-wealthy should be subject to systemic regulations that address inequality at its roots, rather than simply being praised for charitable giving.

This debate has profound implications for a world marked by growing wealth inequality. According to the UN, inequality harms social cohesion and economic growth, disproportionately impacting marginalised communities[6]. Billionaire's actions—whether philanthropic or self-serving—affect public trust in systems of governance and resource distribution.

Additionally, income inequality correlates with societal challenges, including mental health issues like depression[7], reduced economic opportunity, and diminished social cohesion. Addressing this question encourages discussions on equity, justice, and accountability, as well as how societies should balance individual freedoms with collective wealth.

[6] "Inequality – Bridging the Divide." United Nations. Accessed November 21, 2024. https://www.un.org/en/un75/inequality-bridging-divide#:~:text=High%20levels%20of%20inequality%20of,%2C%20consequently%2C%20depress%20economic%20growth.

[7] Patel, Vikram, Jonathan K Burns, Monisha Dhingra, Leslie Tarver, Brandon A Kohrt, and Crick Lund. "Income Inequality and Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Association and a Scoping Review of Mechanisms." World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA), February 2018. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5775138/#:~:text=Not%20surprisingly%2C%20there%20is%20also,or%20wealth%20in%20a%20population.

My Position

Billionaires do have a moral obligation to use their wealth for the public good, but the current philanthropic model requires significant reform to ensure it effectively addresses systemic inequalities and societal needs. While the immense amount of resources controlled by the ultra-wealthy allow them to address global challenges, unchecked philanthropy can cause inequality rather than actually dismantle it.

Billionaire philanthropy has the potential to alleviate extreme poverty and support vital initiatives. Peter Singer's ethical framework emphasizes that wealthy individuals should donate proportionally to their means, focusing on interventions that save the most lives or provide the greatest benefit per dollar spent. Singer's advocacy of effective altruism highlights how funding essential health and education programs in developing nations can make measurable impacts[8]. However, even initiatives like *The Giving Pledge* have fallen short. A significant portion of the wealth pledged has not been distributed to charities, with the net worth of participants in fact growing instead[9]. This emphasises the importance of holding billionaires accountable to their promises and ensuring their donations have a real and timely impact.

Moreover, philanthropy often serves the interests of the wealthy more than society at large. Many charitable donations result in tax benefits for donors (such as getting buildings/programs named after them), reducing their financial contributions to public systems while allowing them to control how their wealth is used. Foundation and DAFs, which dominate billionaire giving, prevent or delay funds from reaching active charities, with only a small percentage required to be distributed annually. While philanthropy has the potential to create positive change, it can sometimes reinforce the power and influence of the wealthy rather than addressing society's most pressing concerns.

Critically, systemic change is essential to address the root causes of inequality. As some critics argue, wealth redistribution, fair taxation, and investment in universal education and healthcare can achieve far more sustainable results than traditional philanthropy. Programs like Brazil's *Bolsa Familia* and Mexico's *Prospera* demonstrate how conditional cash transfers funded by progressive taxation can directly reduce poverty and foster long-term opportunities[10]. The focus should shift from charity, which often addresses symptoms, to structural reforms that confront underlying economic inequalities.

While billionaires' contribution can provide immediate relief to pressing issues, their role in perpetuating economic inequality cannot be ignored. True societal progress will require not only ethical giving but also systemic changes that distribute resources more equitably and empower marginalised communities. Until philanthropy prioritises collaboration with these communities and relinquishes power imbalances, it risks being a tool for maintaining the status quo rather than a force for meaningful change.

---

[8] Singer, Peter. "What Should a Billionaire Give – and What Should You?" The New York Times, December 17, 2006. https://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/17/magazine/17charity.t.html.
[9] Collins, Chuck, Helen Flannery, and Bella DeVaan. "Revealing the True Cost of Billionaire Philanthropy." Inequality.org, April 3, 2024.
[10] Bourguignon, François. "Redistribution of Income and Reducing Economic Inequality - IMF F&D Magazine." IMF, March 2018. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/2018/03/bourguignon.

<u>**A Philosophical Response**</u>

To further show that billionaires indeed do have a moral obligation to use their wealth for the public good, I will apply utilitarianism and moral absolutism—two contrasting ethical frameworks that both support this position.

Utilitarian Perspective

From a utilitarian perspective, billionaires undoubtedly have a moral obligation to use their wealth to maximise the greatest good for the greatest number of individuals. This framework, based around the philosophy of John Stuart Mill, emphasises the moral responsibility to reduce suffering and promote happiness for people in need. Given the vast resources that billionaires control, their wealth provides them with the ability to address large-scale societal issues, such as extreme poverty, lack of healthcare, and access to education. Even a small fraction of their wealth, when used effectively, could drastically improve the lives of millions.

Utilitarian thinkers would argue that billionaires should prioritise their charitable actions based on the impact and outcomes they can achieve. For instance, philanthropic efforts directed toward programs like conditional cash transfers, have reduced poverty, created economic opportunities, and improved overall happiness[11]. The key challenge, however, is ensuring that the philanthropy of billionaires is directed toward addressing the most pressing societal needs, rather than personal interests or visibility. In the utilitarian view, philanthropy should not be about prestige or power, but rather about optimising benefits for society as a whole.

Moral Absolutism Perspective

From a moral absolutism standpoint, billionaires have a predetermined moral obligation to use their wealth for the public good. This framework asserts that moral principles are objective, regardless of personal circumstances or societal preferences. An action is either always morally just or unjust. Accordingly, the duty to assist those in extreme poverty and mitigate suffering is non-negotiable, according to moral absolutism. This extreme wealth accumulated by billionaires places them in a unique position to make a significant impact on the world. Therefore, it is morally wrong for them to hoard wealth when so many others struggle to survive.

Moral absolutism has no room for the justification that billionaires have earned their wealth through hard work alone, or that they should be free to decide how they allocate their resources. This perspective challenges the individualistic justifications for hoarding wealth: that extreme inequality is inherently immoral. In a world where basic human rights—such as access to food, healthcare, and education—are not equally available to all, the wealthy have a duty to redistribute their resources to address these fundamental disparities. Therefore, in this view, failing to give away their wealth is an ethical violation.

---

[11] Bourguignon, François. "Redistribution of Income and Reducing Economic Inequality - IMF F&D Magazine." IMF, March 2018. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/2018/03/bourguignon.

Both the utilitarian and moral absolutist perspectives argue that billionaires have a clear moral obligation to use their wealth for the greater good. For utilitarians, this obligation is grounded in the desire to maximise happiness and reduce suffering through effective giving, while moral absolutism dictates that the very act of hoarding extreme wealth is morally indefensible in a world full of suffering and inequality. Using these ethical frameworks provides a strong reason to show why billionaires must prioritize philanthropy and redistribute their wealth to benefit society.

Bibliography

Bourguignon, François. “Redistribution of Income and Reducing Economic Inequality - IMF F&D Magazine.” IMF, March 2018. https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/fandd/issues/2018/03/bourguignon.

Collins, Chuck, Helen Flannery, and Bella DeVaan. “Revealing the True Cost of Billionaire Philanthropy.” Inequality.org, April 3, 2024. https://inequality.org/great-divide/true-cost-of-billionaire-philanthropy/.

Duderstadt, Chris. “6 Things the Wealthy Do with Their Money (That Most People Don’t).” Modern Wealth Management, September 30, 2024. https://www.modwm.com/things-the-wealthy-do-with-their-money/.

Flanigan, Jessica, and Christopher Freiman. “Wealth without Limits: In Defense of Billionaires.” Ethical theory and moral practice : an international forum, 2022. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9684899/.

Gupta, Medhavi. “Do Billionaires Donating to Charity Deserve Our Gratitude, or Is It Their Duty?” Medium, August 5, 2019. https://medium.com/@medhavigupta/do-billionaires-donating-to-charity-deserve-our-gratitude-or-is-it-their-duty-ef56ee3c80e5.

Hayes, Adam. “What Are the Most Important Aspects of a Capitalist System?” Investopedia. Accessed November 21, 2024. https://www.investopedia.com/ask/answers/040715/what-are-most-important-aspects-capitalist-system.asp.

“Home - the Giving Pledge.” Giving Pledge, 2010. https://givingpledge.org/.

“Inequality – Bridging the Divide.” United Nations. Accessed November 21, 2024. https://www.un.org/en/un75/inequality-bridging-divide#:~:text=High%20levels%20of%20inequality%20of,%2C%20consequently%2C%20depress%20economic%20growth.

Kramer, Mark, and Steve Phillips. “Where Strategic Philanthropy Went Wrong (SSIR).” Stanford Social Innovation Review: Informing and Inspiring Leaders of Social Change, Summer 2024. https://ssir.org/articles/entry/strategic-philanthropy-went-wrong.

Patel, Vikram, Jonathan K Burns, Monisha Dhingra, Leslie Tarver, Brandon A Kohrt, and Crick Lund. “Income Inequality and Depression: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Association and a Scoping Review of Mechanisms.” World psychiatry : official journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA), February 2018. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5775138/#:~:text=Not%20surprisingly%2C%20there%20is%20also,or%20wealth%20in%20a%20population.

Robeyns, Ingrid. “There’s No Such Thing as a Self-Made Billionaire.” The Correspondent, September 25, 2020. https://thecorrespondent.com/712/theres-no-such-thing-as-a-self-made-billionaire.

Sampson, Candace. “Are Billionaires Good for Society? No, and Here’s Why.” What She Said, August 13, 2024. https://www.whatshesaidtalk.com/are-billionaires-good-for-society/.

Singer, Peter. “What Should a Billionaire Give – and What Should You?” The New York Times, December 17, 2006. https://www.nytimes.com/2006/12/17/magazine/17charity.t.html.

Suttie, Jill. “Are Rich People Really Less Ethical?” Greater Good, March 14, 2023. https://greatergood.berkeley.edu/article/item/are_rich_people_really_less_ethical.

Trautmann, Stefan T, Xianghong Wang, Yijie Wang, and Yilong Xu. “High-Status Individuals Are Held to Higher Ethical Standards.” Scientific reports, September 13, 2023. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10499905/.

Vallely, Paul. “How Philanthropy Benefits the Super-Rich.” The Guardian, September 8, 2020. https://www.theguardian.com/society/2020/sep/08/how-philanthropy-benefits-the-super-rich.