

# **New Christos Yapijakis Article: "The Philosophical Management of Stress"**

**Post by "Little Rocker" of January 8, 2023 at 11:16 AM**

Cassius, I suspect we agree about more than we disagree about. We agree that justice does not 'exist' in a Platonic sense and that it can vary by circumstance. We also agree that you simply can't get everyone to acknowledge or conform to a reasonable contract that involves, for example, not murdering your fellow citizens.

I think we might disagree about whether Epicurus thinks there's a fact of the matter about whether particular political arrangements are just or unjust. I think there's a core to justice that Epicurus takes to be objective, and he would not mind if most people disagreed because he often thinks most people are confused about what follows from basic grasps (see most people's ideas about piety). I think he would be fine saying, 'they think that's just, but they're mistaken.'

That said, I have a feeling that he thinks the objective elements of justice are pretty thin (exhausted perhaps by securing 'confidence' from your neighbors) and that many of the political matters that tie people in knots are of little interest to Epicurus because he thinks you shouldn't get emotionally invested in things that are not necessary for fundamental security. So he might very well say, 'They think that's a question of justice, but they're mistaken.' But again, we have so little textual evidence.