

Pleasure as a guide

Post by “EyalA” of March 3, 2025 at 3:32 PM

I will summarize the continuation, since it's relevant to your points.

Obviously i pushed from the Epicurean side, but i think the conclusion is fair.

How would nietzsche react to a fairly calculated epicurean rejection of a certain course

Ultimately, Nietzsche would challenge an Epicurean to ask: “Are you rejecting this path because it truly leads to a lesser life, or because you are avoiding discomfort and risk?” If it's the latter, he'd see it as a failure to fully affirm life.

I guess an epicurean could reply that these factors are legitimate and necessary. They are based on self knowledge, and also - all pleasures are good. For him given that he elaborated, his decision is well based.

Yes, an Epicurean could push back with a strong argument. They might say:

1..

2..

3. Pleasure isn't passive – Epicureanism isn't just about simple, bodily pleasures but also includes intellectual and creative joys. If a person carefully crafts their life around meaningful pleasures, that's a sign of wisdom, not mediocrity.

Essentially, the Epicurean would argue that **selective rejection of struggle isn't life-denying but life-enhancing**. The key difference is that Nietzsche sees **the act of struggling itself** as inherently valuable, while Epicurus sees struggle as **a tool to be used wisely, only when it serves greater happiness**.