Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by Scythar on Tue, 05 Sep 2006 12:32:28 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hydra wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 01:00

I was speaking more generally. What evolutionary purpose does compassion for the impoverished and sympathy for the sick serve? Wouldn't it better serve the greater good of the species if our weakest members were simply removed from the gene pool?

But where would you draw the line? By "weakest members", do you mean "everyone but the strongest"? That would mean everyone but one would be removed by natural selection (or the instinct of survival, if you will), and would result in the end of human race. There has to be a balance.

Isn't compassion more or less part of empathy? It's the opposite of instinct of survival. Too much instinct of survival would mean that a race would destroy itself, when individuals would attack each others. Compassion for the weak works in the opposite way, no? Too much causes everyone to sacrifice themselves for the others, resulting in extinction. Too little of it causes everyone to attack each others, resulting in the same extinction. It's like the immune system in our body. Too good immune system causes allergies when your own body acts violently against itself and things benefical to it. Too weak immune system causes your body to die to sicknesses. Also, we obviously don't like being alone. It makes us sad, perhaps unsafe too, when people close to us die. Sadness in turn can result in depression and suicidal behavior, which is not good for any race.

In our modern everyday lives compassion(empathy) is very strong. We're safe. But all it takes is some major threatening event like war and the emount of compassion decreases massively, and the instinct of survival increases. It's easy to say "Oh I'd never hurt anyone" now when you're sitting there by the PC, but if you had to choose between your life and the other's in a real situation...well, that's where many people really pick a side.