

Toward A Better Understanding of Epicurean Justice And Injustice (With Examples of "Just" and "Unjust")

Post by "Cassius" of March 21, 2021 at 9:45 PM

[Quote from Don](#)

First, I believe your scenario can be analysed to spring from an "empty" opinion or belief on the part of the one feeling "disgust" and, as such, they are not acting morally, justly, or prudently, and so their action can be said to be not choice-worthy.

oh no - no - no --- I would not take that route at all! (this is why i SO dislike the "empty" word). Let me read the rest.....

But this is VERY good to explore.....

Here are my first thoughts:

[Quote from Don](#)

6. Therefore, I would say the person holding this opinion and getting pleasure from it is not acting justly, wisely, or morally. If they experience momentary pleasure from holding this belief, it is not choice-worthy for the reasons outlined here. The opinion will not lead to a maximally pleasurable life. A person holding that belief cannot consider themselves as following an Epicurean path.

Yes that is "your" view of the situation, but the person holding the other viewpoint is in fact getting pleasure from it (under your scenario) so their pleasure is a canonical "fact" for them which they must analyze along with the fact that you disapprove of their viewpoint and may come down on them with disapproval of all kinds, including force. You may in fact choose to do that, and to force them to back off from their pleasure at pain of punishment, and that would be an example of "how the world works" which Epicurus tells us to take into account. But you would need to realize that it is only your ability to use force to enforce your opinion that "justifies" your substituting your view for theirs. From that point of view you are pursuing your own pleasure, and as Epicurus says that is the way the world works, but I don't think Epicurus would tell you that your particular position takes philosophical precedence over theirs -- it is just a matter that your view of pleasure is in conflict with theirs, and that is where in the PDs as to justice Epicurus points out that there is no natural "justice" -- if you don't agree, then you don't agree, and you can resort to force or persuasion or whatever, but if there is no agreement, then there is no "justice" to appeal to, and in the end the appeal ends up being to "might makes right."

With perhaps the major point being here that this is what makes "feeling" a part of the canon of truth.... that our FEELINGS of pain and pleasure are true to us, regardless of where they come from. We can choose to follow them or not .. and suffer the good or bad results of so doing ... but they are in fact the guide that nature gave to us, so in terms of "justification" our feelings need no justification from gods or from ideal forms -- or from majority or minority or even "Epicurean" viewpoints.

OK I am going to stop editing this post, wait for others to post, and then reply as needed below.