

## IS EGOISM ARBITRARY?

Putting myself first is called egoism which is option one. Putting others first is called altruism and it is option two. The third and last option is egotism which is the view that I should put myself first in such a way that I walk over others.

If you will not help John who is suffering unless you find even 1% of a benefit in it for yourself then you are still more for yourself than him. Otherwise you would just help. Self-concern however small gets the balance scales to work so that you will act. That shows much much value you put on self-interest and yourself.

Some objectors to egoism say that egoism is a theory so to obey it is to be arbitrary. But altruism and egotism are theories too! Also, if we have no real option only egoism then it is not a theory anymore but a truth. And it is truth not theory.

Is choosing to be egoist arbitrary? Altruists say it and you should be altruistic. Some egotists say it is arbitrary for there is no difference between helping John so that you may see how good you are and doing it for his money. It is not arbitrary for altruism is degrading yourself as if you are not as important as the next person and egotism is just for the sociopath.

Even if you did not know what to choose egoism is the happy medium so it is not arbitrary.

What I am most sure of in my life comes first. I come first for I am most sure of my own existence. I know that everything else could be an illusion. But I cannot believe that my existence could be an illusion for there has to be something to have the illusion. This tells me that I should put myself first in accordance with egoism.

It follows that anything I do should be done for my own pleasure and I should train myself to enjoy simple and easy-to-do things like helping others for that guarantees happiness. I can't feel safe in the world unless I am a very safe person to know. What kind of person I am determines how I see the world. If I can't do good that proves I am a good person I will not be very confident in the goodness of others. I will suffer. The more good I do for others the more I am a blessing for myself. I may not get rewards and I may meet with much ingratitude. But my power to be happy despite it all will be my reward.

This is the answer to the silly idea that if I put myself first I am being arbitrary. They say, "Why should you come first rather than your neighbour?" You are not being arbitrary. In fact, the best way to love yourself is by doing all you can for others. If you believe you must only work and live for the sake of others that means you don't think much of them for you must expect each of them to believe the same.

Altruism is based on treating the question of why I should come first rather than my neighbour as demanding the answer: "I shouldn't but my neighbour should." This makes no sense. It is far more arbitrary to heed altruism.

Egoism believes in the right of each person to be happy and to be their own person. Rand and some ethical egoists seem to think that being happy yourself puts you in conflict with the happiness of others. This view makes working for the happiness of others seem self-destructive. That is a mistake for while certain things that make me happy might have to make another unhappy in general I cannot be happy unless the people around me are sufficiently happy. In most cases, my happiness is taking from nobody else's or theirs mine. It does not follow that if each person works for their own happiness that they cannot all be happy.

I cannot help everybody and help every group. If I really see no benefit to me in helping some people or some groups then I should leave them to the wolves. This thought leaves the theory open to the accusation of being arbitrary. The answer is that the best for me is to like everybody as much as I can for liking is good for me. It feels good. This is not another example of instrumental egoism. It is about what my nature prefers not what preferences I work up.

I need good so if it is not there I have to make it. Making not serving is what matters. If I serve others I am really trying to make good. My purpose is not to serve but to make. Giving to others does not mean giving is your purpose. It means it is not your purpose.

It is said that if we are inherently motivated by concern for others or concern for ourselves then there are two contradictory theories and only a coin flip can make you choose which one to go with. It is said that if we CAN BE motivated by concern for others or concern for ourselves then there are two contradictory theories and only a coin flip can make you choose which one to go with.

It is said that if you need your coin to choose which one then there is a problem with either or both of them. But that does

not follow. Both theories could be possible and that does not mean anybody knows which one is possible. Having to choose randomly between two strong theories does not mean that either of them is unsound.

There is no use in me having a good motive if I cannot show it. Are we acting nice to show our motives? Probably! That puts a limit on the alleged arbitrariness.

Egoists do not behave in an arbitrary way and there are so many egoists in society and who govern it and the sky has not fallen in.