

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

**Post by "Todd" of December 20, 2022 at 5:07 PM**

Hmm...well, I see that Epicurus is solidly in favor of the cradle non-argument.

And since he refuses to even allow it to be an argument, I guess I can only say I disagree.

I guess I could even go further and say that since it isn't an "argument", and no reasoning was used to arrive at it, then it can't possibly have any other implications. That addresses my original concern with the cradle argument. It's not an argument. Solved.

Seems like it would make it difficult to engage with others though. Not sure? Want to discuss? Nah. Come back when you agree.

And I'm not even saying I disagree with the conclusion. I just think there is a better way of getting to it. Or should be - not to say I have one ready to go.

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

So how would you restate your concern Todd, that looking to examples of people who have not had the time or exposure to ground their actions on "abstract reasoning" is a poor idea for getting at examples of the calling of Nature?

Why is that a poor way of looking at the question? Because they are not "educated" in some goal other than the one they were born with?

I would state my concern more or less the way I did above. Looking to a supposedly uncorrupted state of nature is problematic.

If you want to be more specific about what is corrupted and why, as you seem to be with the idea of "uneducated", I would be on board with that, although I personally don't think the solution is in that direction, because the reasoning is going to be even more involved. That is a very different thing than just pointing at babies though.