

Is Every Breach of Every Agreement "Unjust"?

Post by "Cassius" of October 19, 2019 at 5:02 PM

And in going back to Elayne's most recent post:

[Quote from Elayne](#)

A lot of the confusion is arising in the world re justice is from trying to treat the sense of injustice like a rational function.

I am not sure whether "Rational" is the right word, or "absolute" ! Epicurus was being "rational" in telling us (seemingly) that "justice" has no absolute meaning and exists only in the context of agreements not to be harmed. So in other words he is telling us the true basis of "justice" to the extent we even want to use the word at all is that it cannot be analyzed apart from the feelings of pain of and pleasure of the people actually involved.

I think Todd may be attempting to do what all of us moderns would first attempt to do - to rescue some vestige of absolute justice by tying it to "agreement" as if agreement alone is all that is necessary to establish "justice." Maybe it is enough to establish "civil justice" or "justice under the law of the United States" but I think we all agree that is not what we are talking about.

So the question that prompted the thread's title is still something like "How radical was Epicurus being?" "Was he essentially telling us that our "justice" is just as nonsensical as our "gods"?"