

Ben's personal outline of Epicurean philosophy

Post by “Mousikos” of May 16, 2019 at 1:47 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

I just noticed this part. It's good and i would not suggest changing it. But when reading it , it occurs to me that it's possible that it might not be clear what the "nature of knowledge" means in this context. [...] I say this largely because I am always on guard against the implication that "knowledge" is something that exists in the air as part of some network of ideal forms, or something that comes from gods, or even something that we are born with (in our anticipation discussion). I think it's more proper to think of "knowledge" as opinions formed in our minds that we are confident are true.

I am pondering if there is a better way to phrase this. I certainly wouldn't want to suggest a Platonic understanding of disembodied ideas that exist in an ideal world. But what I am trying to get at in my statement #12, is that while there is no absolute morality, that doesn't mean every moral choice is equally valid, and that we cannot make any valid statements about morality (the typical "if you're an atheist and don't believe there is a god stopping you, why don't you go around raping and killing?" argument).

Because of what we know about reality, and our naturalist understanding of it, we can formulate certain guidelines that will be generally true for all humans, even if the details vary per individual. Things like: self-delusion is bad, an exclusive focus on short-term pleasure without considering the consequences is bad, only considering your own pleasure regardless of the happiness of other people is bad, etc.