

Is Every Breach of Every Agreement "Unjust"?

Post by "Cassius" of October 19, 2019 at 6:51 PM

Yes, absolutely, but everything we do to accomplish that when we work with other people by agreement doesn't necessarily fall under "justice" does it? Actually that is pretty much the original question I posted.

And this relates to much of the rest discussed above -- I try to read Epicurus strictly according to his words, and so when he refers to justice as involving agreements not to harm or be harm, I take him as meaning exactly that, no more, no less.

[Quote from Todd](#)

Wait...didn't Epicurus say exactly that in PD 31-33??? I'm not sure how to even respond to this statement.

I guess this is Bailey: 31. The justice which arises from nature is a pledge of mutual advantage, to restrain men from harming one another, and save them from being harmed.

Epicurus.net: 31. Natural justice is a pledge of reciprocal benefit, to prevent one man from harming or being harmed by another.

So I am reading that all together that it is not just any pledge of mutual advantage, but a specific pledge, to avoid harm, so that Justice has two components that are not independent, but inseparable in order to constitute justice.

Now that may be too strict a reading; that's why discussion is good! 😊

Otherwise every breach of every agreement is "unjust:" even though Epicurus explicitly states that when conditions change, so does whether a thing is just or unjust.