

---

Subject: Re: Jesus

Posted by [Carrierll](#) on Wed, 06 Sep 2006 13:16:49 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hydra wrote on Mon, 04 September 2006 00:00Crimson wrote on Sun, 03 September 2006 18:39No, for the reasons I stated. Human babies are weak and helpless and need protection from their parents in order to survive the first decade or so of their lives. Without the instinctual feeling of love for a child, the baby is left to its own devices and quickly dies, ensuring the human race stops.

My mistake for not being more clear; I was not referring simply to the love, compassion, and sympathy a parent feels for its defenseless child--an easy case can be made there for those specific emotions.

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?

You want to start deciding who goes? You'll be killing people's family etc etc. And the moment you say "You're weak" and shoot someone, everyone would like to see the back of you.

That idea (I forget it's name) used to be widely accepted in America. That was before WWII. It was quietly dropped when the Nazis started committing acts of genocide, showing them how the idea would have to be implemented.

---