

Does Happiness Require a Non-Epicurean Decision Procedure?

Post by "Hiram" of January 10, 2019 at 4:32 PM

[Quote from Pivot](#)

...

3. Deep relationships and strong ambitions require altruistic sacrifices.

...

Issue 2: Horrible acts are considered permissible under Epicurean thought

Issue 1. I think I remember Philodemus saying that sometimes in order to keep or help a friend or loved one we suffer through many things (sacrifices, in your parlance) because the PAIN of not having the friend with us is much greater than the pain we go through assisting them.

So the key here is that it needs to pass hedonic calculus, and it does but only for people whom we truly love or who are truly worthy of our pain. Bob Marley once said there will always be people who will make you cry, and you have to choose to love the ones who are worth crying for. So two things:

1. You, if you are wise, will make the sacrifices for people who are worthy of your love.
2. You will also set BOUNDARIES with those of lesser worth. And this is JUST as important for your ataraxia. See [what Michel Onfray says about eumetry](#).

Issue 2 - the problem is that this is not only the case for Epicureans. Think of the predator priests in the Catholic Church, THEY'RE not using hedonic calculus or Epicurean ethics but they end up engaging in these acts because they think they can get away with it. Philodemus, I believe, said in one of his scrolls that it is indeed an uneasy question whether people do awful things if they can get away with it. This is a clear and accurate description of the problem we have in front of us. Gods or karma won't fix this problem because they do not exist.

"Justice" is that which produces mutual advantage, and an evil act that is not discovered is still unjust per Epicurean definitions. So if what we are saying is that injustices happen when no one is looking, then yes. That is accurate.