

MY VALUES EXPRESS WHO AND WHAT I AM SO TO SERVE MY VALUES IS SELF-INTERESTED

Love, compassion, mercy and justice are principles independent of what anybody wants them to be. It is impossible for anybody who signs up to these values to mean exactly the same thing by them. For some it is just to lock up a murderer for twenty years and the next person wants them locked up for life. Justice and love go together which adds to the problems.

The words, love, compassion, mercy and justice cover the confusion up. They give a false impression.

For that reason, love in John's life is not the same as love in Jane's life.

So your values say something about what you are as a person and who you are. You are your understanding of the values. Thus when you serve your values you really serve yourself. You interpret values that in themselves are not up for interpretation so following and promoting your values is self-interest.

If you truly knew what love was 99% and would not accept to live by it unless 1% had to be your version then love is clearly not as important to you as you are.

This refutes altruism the notion that we can love good for good's sake. It is a vindication of egoism. Egoism means I do what I do to honour myself. It means I make others happy for it fulfils me to do so. It differs from egotism which abuses and steals from others. The egoist can do good at passing for an altruist.

The egoists do not think about and work for their own happiness. They forget that and help others and then they find they are happy. They use an indirect method. Altruists do that too and pretend it is self-sacrifice.

Egoism is to be a blessing to others because with it I look after others for myself. This is really just loving myself. I may not look for a reward but doing things for them is the reward. That is the only reward I want. Loving others and not myself as in altruism is evil. The egoist can do exactly what the professed altruist does but the egoist drops all the pretending and so the egoist should be better at good than the altruist. People don't want altruists helping them for the altruist does the good without seeking any joy in it. They want egoists.

If I am honest, I do everything I do because I feel like it. I can do what I want but I cannot help what I want so I am by definition getting some benefit from doing something. Acting is its own reward like scratching an itch. If I help others, it is because I wish to. It is about my wish and not them. Those who disagree are confusing the benefit for others with the wish to commit the act of benefiting others. The two are separate.

If I value money my act is to value. The money is incidental. How do I know? Because if I value people my act is to value. In both I value, my action is to value. It is exactly the same act but it is only what is valued that is different. If I throw a snowball my act is to throw. The exact same act will throw a javelin. The act is the same – it is only what is thrown that is different. So it makes no sense to say that to value money is selfish and that it is unselfish to value people. The act is exactly the same, the valuing is exactly the same but it is only the focus of the valuing that is different. It would make as much sense to say that tasting wine was good but tasting milk was bad. Or that tasting wine was unselfish and tasting milk was selfish. Tasting is just tasting just as valuing is just valuing. If tasting something in particular has good results or if valuing something in particular has good results, if they help people better than not doing them would, that is a by-product of the tasting or valuing. People will value what they want or are pre-determined by their psyche to value. It is the valuing that is important – not what is valued. Therefore if I am selfish for valuing money I am just as selfish for valuing people.

There is no sacrifice for what I do I want to do under the circumstances. My will is just about me meaning that if I do wrong it is a mistake and not a sin or crime. The will is about gratifying desire not about evil and good which are the consequences of the intent but not the intent itself. Life is easier when we remember that what we do, we do for ourselves even if we are not keen on it and it gives us a sense of comfort. The doctrine of free will takes that away from us. People never do wrong because they deny their responsibility – they do it because they fail to see how useless and unattractive wrong is. The doctrine of free will suggests otherwise which is why the doctrine is a slander against us that we will not stand for. You are not really free if evil is based on misunderstanding. You need to understand what you are doing to be truly free. Religion hates the sinner by accusing her of a freedom and wickedness she does not have.

Psychological egoism claims that human nature is never pure other centred - ever. Somehow it is about you,

If psychological egoism is wrong then why do we need extreme examples to refute it such as a soldier blowing himself up

to save the life of another person? The examples are sledgehammers - believe he was a hero and not seeking something for himself or you are bad person and a cynic and slandering a good man. That such bullying is present says the refuters have something to hide.

If the soldier is playing God by adopting values because he wants them and not because they are right and/or has in some sense his own meaning of justice and love then he is serving himself. He is dying for his values yes but ones he has misappropriated.

THE KIDNEY

We all need not a motive but motives to act. One motive will be "I want to satisfy myself and help others in a way that makes me feel fulfilled". Here is an example, "I want to donate my kidney to save that little girl whoever she is." You are not giving the kidney because of an obligation but because you want to. But we are saying here there is an obligation - a self-made one. You make giving an obligation not because it is but because you want it to be. See the point?

GOD

You are in a bad situation. A baby is in the burning house. You can risk life and limb to rescue the baby.

Two instincts are compelling you to act.

The self-preservation instinct wants you to protect yourself.

The compassion one wants you to sacrifice yourself to help the baby.

Some say that is an example of how moral values are above and beyond you and sometimes above and beyond each other. They are said to point to a transcendent God who creates moral value.

That is an odd argument.

The error is in assuming that if I make my values in a sense bigger than me I am reaching out to God. Maths is bigger than me and I don't have a maths god. And who says valuing my preservation means I am making the value bigger than me? I only need it to equal me not rule me.

I can make the value part of me so it is not bigger than me.

I may want to preserve myself but not see it as a moral value. Just because I have a value does not mean it is a moral value.

It could be that if you value self-preservation you are treating it as a moral value even if you do not intend to or think of it that way.

Nobody says that you need to choose the right moral value all the time to honour moral value. So what if I go with self-preservation then instead of compassion? Yet they will condemn you. Morality is not as helpful as they want it to be. They want it to overrule selfishness but it is not obvious that it can.

FINALLY

I make all values my own whether they are love or anything else. To serve my values is to serve myself. I am an egoist.