

Mako's Epicurean Outline

Post by "Cassius" of January 20, 2018 at 1:47 PM

Mako that is an OUTSTANDING first draft. on the issue of the absence of pain, did you get a chance to read the [Nikolsky article yet?](#) Every time I read it I realize that I picked up its argument and just say it in a different way. Also, I realize that I have internalized some material from Gosling & Taylor too. Now THAT is a book that is not so easy to find, and better access to it would help a lot. Although I say it this way all the time, I am not sure that this phrase is really all that helpful "The highest state of pleasure" --- I think that implies (to me, when I say it) that there is some single type of pleasure which is mysterious and needs to be found. I think rather the truth is exactly as stated in PD3 - the LIMIT OF QUANTITY OF PLEASURE..... meaning that the pleasure contained in the vessel can be a mixture of any type just so long as the vessel is full and pain has been crowded out.

Which is not to say that that is easy or even possible to do (effort from breathing?) but that seems to be the way the goal is defined. [Nikolsky](#) describes this response to the Academics in a somewhat different way than I do, but I think the result is the same. And the bottom line is that we have a philosophically defensible position in which we rely on nature for our goal and have no need to resort to gods or to false standards for something higher.

A lot of what we are doing here is trying to break free of the Stoic/Academic framework of false goals, and we have to rethink even the terminology to make sure we are not boxed in.

As you say it takes time to put these things together and time to analyze them, and over time you and I and others can come back here and comment on new things that jump out at us.

Nothing else really jumps out at me but I have a comment on this - this too is true "Justice is a contract not to cause pain to one another." I've been in some private conversations lately about how controversial this is - the implication being that "injustice" is nothing but breach of an express or implied agreement. There are plenty of things that are horrible in the world that we can and should want to take action to attack and to change, but unless there was a prior agreement between the parties which was breached, no matter how horrible we consider the problem, it's not a problem of "justice/injustice." It's a problem of "I personally find that intolerable and I am not going to put up with it, and I don't need a god or a false standard of virtue or "justice in the air" to tell me it's ok before i do it!" 😊