

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

Post by "Cassius" of April 7, 2021 at 8:43 AM

I think Bryan has really encapsulated the whole issue here, which is the key to unwinding it:

[Quote from Bryan](#)

As we know, justice must be created, it does not just float around and therefore without us fabricating it by mutual agreement it will not be around at all.

And I think that the issue of killing all red-haired people has to be analyzed in that context. Were the red-haired people formerly part of an agreement not to harm or be harmed? Are the circumstances that gave rise to the agreement still present?

If (1) the red-hairs were not part of an agreement in the first place, a law to kill them would not be "unjust" in this viewpoint.

If (2) the red-hairs WERE part of an agreement previously, but the circumstances under which the agreement was entered into have changed, and the parties no longer mutually agree that killing red-hairs is improper, then a law to kill them would not be unjust after those circumstances change.

That's why this would not be a factor:

[Quote from Don](#)

because a red-haired person would constantly live in fear of harm.

You would expect that the people you have determined to be your enemies, and whom you think it appropriate to kill, would constantly live in fear of harm. For whatever reason you've not agreed not to kill them, and "justice" must be founded on agreement, so it's either "not unjust" or "neither just nor unjust" to kill them, because you're not violating a present agreement.

The bigger issue I have is distinguishing use of the term "unjust" from what Epicurus is apparently implying is "outside justice" (neither just nor unjust). I don't think we're yet clear on the difference between those two (unjust vs neither just nor unjust).