

Consequentialism & Moral Relativism within the context of Pleasure-filled Philosophy

Post by "Cassius" of March 11, 2020 at 2:22 PM

Just for the record, Hiram, I continue to disagree strongly with that essay, (I would have to reread before i can remember HOW strongly, but i know we have discussed this several times before), and **in particular disagree** I strongly disagree with the statement that "**mutual advantage is the key concept in Epicurean social ethics.**"

There is nothing whatsoever that would lead to that "mutual benefit" conclusion. Yes we have to observe that generally we have to expect that people to whom we do harm will inflict harm back on us. But causing others harm, up to and including killing them) is an entirely appropriate thing to do in some circumstances (such as killing an enemy in war, or killing a criminal before he kills us, just for two examples.)

You are reading a very broad "mutual" into the equation **presumably** for reasons that we have discussed in great detail before -- humanism -- but there is no way to substantiate that through a thorough reading of the texts.

The texts are clear that it is our own pleasure, combined with the pleasure of our friends (in whom we take pleasure), and not some generic pleasure of all, or "mutual benefit" of a wider group beyond ourselves and our friends. The welfare or benefit of others who are not our friends is going to be a contextual secondary consideration that will vary entirely with circumstance -- not "the key concept in Epicurean social ethics." So it is never "mutual benefit" as an abstraction without discussing who is involved in the equation. Friendship going dancing around the world proclaiming to all the benefits of pleasure does not mean that all are going to respond to our proclamation, or that we are going to reach agreements for the mutual benefit of those who don't.