

Perspectives On "Proving" That Pleasure is "The Good"

Post by "Todd" of December 20, 2022 at 11:01 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

I don't think that's a corrosive desire at all -- at least it's not corrosive to consider the question and try to come to a resting place on what is possible and what is not.

That remark was an attempt at humor, mostly. Not entirely. 😊

I didn't really expect this to lead to a major discussion. Not that I mind, but I'll need to try to collect my thoughts a bit more to keep this from becoming a rambling stream-of-consciousness on my end.

[Quote from Don](#)

This is an interesting way to phrase that (and I'm meaning that as a positive thing not a criticism).

Could you share what you think of when you say "theory"? Would you have an example from another philosophy or religion (not that you necessarily agree with; just an example)? Or what you'd want the theory to be in Epicurean philosophy.

Thanks for the kind reply, [Don](#). To answer briefly, I've believe a theory is required to make sense of facts. Facts don't interpret themselves. A theory needs to come first, in some sense. This is not Epicurean exactly, but it seems logically sound.

In the empirical sciences, for example, you don't just start collecting facts and see what you come up with. (Well, some might, but I would say that is not good science.) You start with an idea, and then go looking for facts that would contradict it.

So when Epicureans say to look at nature to see that pleasure is the aim. I wonder if there are useful things we could say prior to looking at nature. So when we do turn our attention to nature, we have a more solid case, than something like, "if you don't see it, I can't explain it to you". Not that we would say it like that, but that's the kind of unsatisfying feeling I get with the "babies" argument.