

Opening Discussion of Kelly Arenson's "Health And Happiness In Plato And Epicurus"

Post by "Cassius" of July 31, 2026 at 6:57 AM

[Quote from Matteng](#)

I would decide against it precisely because one loses one's freedom and connection to the real world; returning is difficult to impossible, and one sacrifices everything.

It is very interesting to see how individual people either deal with or refuse to deal with hypotheticals. It's certainly very important to evaluate whether the hypothetical is possible in reality or not.

But the purpose of a logical possibility is to exactly test the premise by abstracting out what are current realities. "But it's not possible" is essential to real life and it's why we choose real life over fantasy --- but some people are going to say that it is avoiding the question, and I do not think that they should be faulted to say that.

In this case the part I quoted above does not grapple with the question at hand.

Because in logical terms the answer to what is quoted above is clear --- why would you care about "freedom" or "connection to the real world" unless they bring pleasure?

That's why Kelly Arenson made the statement she did -- NOTHING -- even "reality" or "being human" or anything else -- is desirable in itself unless it brings pleasure. Exempting ANYTHING from that test -- does it bring pleasure? -- is not good logic from the standpoint of logic alone.

If one chooses to play logic games, then rather than step outside of the philosophic position that pleasure is the supreme good, it would probably be better to say more like:

Logic is not truly useful unless its premises are grounded in reality, Your hypothetical is not grounded in reality, so I refuse to waste my time with it, just like Epicurus refused to entertain a hypothetical about necessity as to whether Hermarchus must be alive or dead tomorrow.