

Pleasure as a guide

Post by “Cassius” of March 3, 2025 at 3:40 PM

[Quote from EyalA](#)

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.

Yes i think that's correct, and epicurus would say that it's wrong to put the cart before the horse by elevating the means to the end.

I would say Epicurus is being more consistent by defining happiness as the goal and remaining consistent that all tools are subservient to the goal.

Where we won't find much help from Nietzsche or Epicurus' detractors, and where we have to look to the Epicurean texts, is in seeing that pleasure and happiness are in no way an equivalent to passivity and inaction, as Epicurus' detractors claim. Cassius Longinus and Torquatus and other Epicureans of Cicero's period (and I cite those only because we have the best records of them) would have labored under no illusion that Epicurean philosophy is necessarily "soft." Epicurean philosophy has always been recognized as morally revolutionary, and "soft" people don't launch revolutions - they go along to get along.