

## SOE20 - On mutual advantage

Post by "Cassius" of December 31, 2019 at 11:07 AM

### [Quote from Hiram](#)

If the people in the community AGREE to protect a species, then this is their agreement and it's THEIR posited justice, not because they owe a duty to the rabbits but because they owe an agreement to each other. (

OK then we may not be so far apart on this, but I think the issue here is that the Epicurean terminology of justice is so different from non-Epicurean usage, just like it is with "gods," that discussing "justice" without making the Epicurean context very clear ends up being more confusing than helpful.

Let's take the example you give, that a certain set of people agree among themselves to protect animals, and then presumably one person violates the agreement and kills a rabbit. In what sense does it help anything to describe the result as "unjust"? And I am not sure that Epicurus would describe that result as "unjust" either.

I think we have had this discussion before and I have the same issue. Is every breach of every agreement "unjust?" I don't think that is likely that Epicurus was suggesting that, at least not in any sense of the word "unjust" that is in common usage today. Would you suggest another definition of "unjust" that you think Epicurus would apply to that situation (of killing the rabbit despite the agreement not to)?