

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

Post by “Hiram” of March 11, 2020 at 4:30 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

There is nothing whatsoever that would lead to that "mutual benefit" conclusion.

That's a very categorical rejection of several of the [Principal Doctrines](#) on your part.

The last ten [Principal Doctrines](#) make frequent references to mutual advantage as the defining feature of justice.

36. Taken generally, **justice is** the same for all, to wit, **something found useful in mutual association**; but in its application to particular cases of locality or conditions of whatever kind, it varies under different circumstances.

37. Among the things accounted just by conventional law, **whatever in the needs of mutual association is attested to be useful, is thereby stamped as just**, whether or not it be the same for all; and in case any law is made and does not prove suitable to the usefulness of mutual association, then this is no longer just. And should the usefulness which is expressed by the law vary and only for a time correspond with the prior conception, nevertheless for the time being it was just, so long as we do not trouble ourselves about empty words, but look simply at the facts.

38. Where without any change in circumstances the conventional laws, when judged by their consequences, were seen not to correspond with the notion of justice, such laws were not really just; but wherever the laws have ceased to be useful in consequence of a change in circumstances, in that case **the laws were for the time being just when they were useful for the mutual association of the citizens**, and subsequently ceased to be just when they ceased to be useful.