

Epicurean Views On Hierarchy In Social Structures

Post by "DavidN" of March 13, 2024 at 3:53 PM

[Quote from Peter Konstans](#)

[Quote from DavidN](#)

[Quote from Peter Konstans](#)

I don't think centralized hierarchical structures are compatible with Epicureanism. Self-sufficiency, being an epicurean virtue, is increasingly stifled the more centralized and top heavy power structures becomes. I also don't agree with your analysis of the decline of epicureanism in late antiquity, from what I've read most scholars think that in the face of environmental and societal changes the appeal of Epicureanism to the general populis declined.

It's not that they were destined to fail, it's just that civilization does everything in its power to destroy such communities and it invariably succeeds because it is resourceful, aggressive and ruthless. It is no accident that resourcefulness, aggression and competition have always been civilizational virtues. It is precisely those traits that civilization needs to sustain itself.

Your concept of civilization, though likely accurate, isn't sustainable in a finite universe. It's faults are the same as modern "Growth Economics." (hard to find a good link for this one sorry). Eventually aggressive competitive civilizations, though efficient at subduing wildlands, eventually burn thru exploitable resources in a finite system. Where as egalitarian and cooperative systems may not be competitive against more aggressive systems. However as lower maintenance systems, they are more competitive when set against entropy in a finite system. As such they would outperform in the long run, and may be necessary as a social evolutionary change. But again I'm getting out into the political weeds here so Ima just leave it at that.