

CAN A COHERENT MORAL THEORY BE FOUNDED ON ALTRUISM?

Altruism poses as the servant of compassion, love and justice etc. So it sees itself as being morality. But moral codes are a different matter and are like laws that try to apply the principles of love and mercy and compassion etc. Can a coherent ethic then a set of rules be built on altruism?

Be cautioned that some ethical systems that lack coherence may do so on purpose. It can be a sign of corruption rather than mistaken thinking.

What does altruism say about truth?

To say truth does not matter or is just opinion is by default to say that compassion and love and justice are unimportant.

Altruism puts principles before persons. So altruism will put truth first for there can be no valid principles unless they are true so truth must come first all the time for altruism comes first. This means that not the slightest risk must be taken of anybody erring or being deceived. The wife has to be told if her husband has cheated on her even if he will never do it again. The egoists also believe that truth comes first but since the egoists put the truth that they know they exist first the ones that are not as provable can be left alone for the sake of a peaceful life. Altruism is worse when it is coupled with the doctrine of a truthful God who hates all error and lies for he will be the person that will have to come first.

What is the justification for altruism?

Altruism claims to be real love.

Altruism claims that I am not here to be happy but I am here to deserve happiness or become worthy of it by doing good. In other words, its not unimportant if you never get the happiness. All that counts is deserving it. And altruism says that to love others for myself is not to love them at all so love is sacrifice. To love others instead of myself is to love lots of people instead of loving one. The more love the better. And also, if I am not selfless then I do not love others. If love is good and altruism really is love then altruism has to be the law for there is no love of others without it. Altruism says that loving others and not myself is loving myself in the sense that I am doing what should be done with myself. Altruism also says that if I don't make helping others my chief aim then I will inevitably become cruel and uncaring.

What happens if altruism is irrational or cannot be defended?

Then it is exposed as an evil selfish lie that slanders those who disapprove of it or don't practice it. It is slander to accuse people of doing wrong with a measuring rod that has not been proved. Altruism would imply that reason is evil. If reason is evil and wrong then why care if somebody tortures us all to death?

What will altruists do without rational evidence for even they admit that they cannot give a reason for why we should be altruistic?

They will say that God commands altruism and gave us free will to practice it and that is evidence enough. But even God has no right to order something so basic and give no proof for it. But still altruism will lead to the worrying and degrading idea that he has.

What about altruism and justice?

Some say that you should be altruistic only towards those who have done good for you first and then to others next. But that is not altruism for it is giving them a benefit for the good they have done and so they should not accept it. It is putting value on their function more than on their personhood. It values yourself more than them for you are rewarding and blessing them for being good to you. Altruism is not about strict justice - you help the stranger who owes you nothing.

What about feeling sorry for those who do not deserve it?

Altruism would agree with this provided you help the person not because of the feeling but because of selflessness. The feeling is allowed because it is not pleasant. This permitting the feeling proves that altruism encourages unreasonable sacrifices. It degrades the person who it is for because they do not deserve it and justice is better than love for love can't exist if it despises justice. Egoism avoids these problems. Egoism requires compassion for all because compassion leads to the pleasure of doing good for them and makes the world a better place. It says the bad deserve help too for goodness melts

hard hearts.

Are the altruists inconsistent about suicide?

They say that suicide is sinful for it is selfish. To say that deliberately and freely ending your own existence is selfish is totally absurd for you lose everything in death. They are the selfish ones for saying something so vicious and untrue. Egoists believe that suicide is an egoistic act but it is not deliberate and free for there is something seriously wrong mentally or emotionally. Suicides want to kill the pain not themselves which appears to support this view. A moral theory that cannot discourage suicide the biggest question of all is not a moral theory.

What about altruism and moral neutrality?

Moral neutrality is when something is as good as it is evil. It is not immoral or moral but neutral.

Altruism admits that I should put being altruistic before anybody else. I should put it before my future. If I am altruistic now, I am surer of being altruistic now than I am of anything to do with the future. I might not even be around in five minutes time. Altruistic action comes before everything else. This shows leanings towards recklessness.

What if you say it is altruistic to think of the future? Then I can do something evil and harmful to others as long as I am sure the interests of altruism will be served later.

Neutrality or perceived neutrality provide you with a justification for doing things whether present orientated or future orientated that will be as bad as they are good.

I can inject babies with AIDS and worry about how to make this a neutral thing later.

Making people become altruistic is a priority so if I think poisoning the water will do that then I may and can call it neutral. I cannot be called immoral.

The neutrality problem can arise whether you are altruist or not.

Altruism has a dangerous side like egotism does. It has a painful side. That is why anything like that will bring up moral neutrality issues a lot. If morality is risky it is part of the question, how good is this action when there is so much pain in this goodness? It is like fighting evil with bad things such as sacrifice and pain and suffering.

To avoid one taking advantage of moral neutrality what must altruism do? It cannot abolish the concept of neutrality. That would be a lie and an injustice. It may as well allow people to live like egoists or villains.

If neutrality is adopted then if it is accepted that it is as good for me to eat my pie as it is to do without and give it to a mate then it follows that I am not to be condemned for eating it myself. From this, it would follow that the harder it is to help somebody the less obligation I have to help or I should do nothing. But altruism denies this. Altruism rejects neutrality. All the traditional religions of the world see things in terms of holiness or sin with no neutrality because they feed off judgmentalism though it is sometimes well hidden.

Altruism is totally incoherent. Hypocrites like that incoherence for it makes it easier to pose as altruistic.

Can altruism be used to create a valid moral theory?

No. For example, if A commits murder A deserves to be murdered. If B murders A it would not be altruistic to punish B. Killing A is hardly the same as killing a good person so even if it is wrong it is not very wrong. A deserved it.

This problem is not limited to altruism. We struggle with it on the practical level. We will treat B as the killer of a good person. Altruism however wants us to love the sinner and treat the sin as a disease so A is actually innocent. This is pure hypocrisy for what if A is found guilty and has to go to jail? There is a difference between treating B as the killer of an innocent and thinking of him or her as being really the killer of an innocent.

Altruism believes that the most important thing you can do for justice is to be fair to yourself by sacrificing yourself for if sacrificing is good then you should be sacrificing all the time. It is unjust to deprive yourself of sacrifice. That is how it is able to justify letting your enemies walk all over you. They may do so out of a bad motive but their motive is their problem and not yours and you can do nothing about it and it would be good of them to trample on you if they were doing it for disciplining you. You have the most hope of changing their motive by taking it as discipline for then they are getting nothing from their bad motive.

When you do wrong to a person there is a sense in which you ask for anything they do to you in return. You deserve it. You know that when you insult A that A could put you in hospital for the rest of your life. Altruism would incoherently say that any good A then does for you is over and beyond the call of duty. This is incoherent for we have all done wrong and so there would be no such thing as a duty to anybody.

Altruism implies that it is a duty to be altruistic which is ridiculous. The concept of deserving therefore makes it perfectly okay never to do anything for anybody. It and altruism are in conflict. So altruism is incoherent. It is ridiculous to say that A is right to suffer for the greater good of others even if it is not his duty to. When it is not his duty they can do without it so he is inflicting unnecessary suffering on himself. Altruism implies that unnecessary suffering is good and therefore that extreme suffering that is not needed is good. It is wrong to say that X evil is allowed for it is not too bad and Y evil is banned for it is worse.

When you believe that doing the best is not always a duty you are forced to make an arbitrary list of what acts are duties and what are not. For example, saving your father's life would be seen as a duty but doing the same for a stranger in the street might not be.

If a coherent moral theory is hard to put together altruism is one of the reasons it is so hard. Its influence is everywhere.

Its appeal needs explaining. It is best seen as a pretense for nobody who knows that not aiming for happiness and doing good makes you happy and that this paradoxically should be your method to be happy is going to be attracted by it.

Altruism is really about acting without love for yourself and without compassion for yourself in the name of love and compassion. This shows the real motive is self-abuse.