

---

Subject: Re: Debate on Altruism.

Posted by [cheesesoda](#) on Thu, 12 Feb 2009 20:20:47 GMT

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

---

reborn wrote on Thu, 12 February 2009 15:08 The definition of altruism states that the act or concern has to be selfless. Whilst the action has good meaning, it is not done without a self serving purpose.

I'm going back-and-forth allot on this, I was tempted to suggest that both statements are correct depending on your interpretation of any example at all; If you view it from an egoistic point of view or not.

However, this is a weak flim-flam arguement. Probably not as bad as what I was previously thinking of suggesting, which then starts to redefine the question by trying to challenge the very meaning and definition of altruism.

Certainly is a tricky one. I am going to give it some further contemplation through meditation.

Jball, come on dude, animal kingdom was a nice example I thought. Any thoughts on it? Sorry, I was going to respond to that question, but then I noticed ma1kel's responses, and thus forgot about yours.

I think with less intellect, animals are less prone to be selfish in the way we consider selfishness, but if I'm not sure there's altruism still. There's still some goal, some desire. Maybe.

Even though I'm arguing in favor of psychological egoism, I'm still not entirely convinced. I once thought that as an evolutionary process, we have moved beyond psychological egoism and into the realm of being altruistic, but I can't shake the idea that we control our thoughts and actions, and even biological instincts are geared towards self-preservation which are clearly in self-interest.

---