

# Is Every Breach of Every Agreement "Unjust"?

Post by "Elayne" of October 19, 2019 at 7:00 PM

I see all of the agreement statements as \_descriptions\_ of what conditions trigger our innate sense of justice.

I can't imagine Epicurus defining justice two different ways-- a prolepsis AND a definition for what counts as justice and what doesn't.

This is the same way he treats pain and pleasure. He describes conditions that trigger them but those aren't the definition.

When I say our sense of justice is not rational, like seeing blue is not rational, it's not a criticism, just an observation. It's an interaction with reality.

But we always additionally use our reasoning to decide what to DO. Not what to feel or sense, because those things are determined by reality.

So you will see people arguing about what's unjust, and they are arguing over their subjective reactions, which leads nowhere. They can of course negotiate rules and agreements, which is a rational process. They can negotiate whether they ultimately have the same rules, based on mutual pleasure. But they should be aware of the types of actions that will trigger each other to sense injustice.

If justice were rational it would not be in the prolepses which are part of the Canon. None of the Canon is reason-based. It's how we know reality, not what we decide to do.