

Epicurus' Hierarchy of Needs

Post by "Don" of June 3, 2025 at 7:14 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

[Quote from Don](#)

I also don't think it's perfect, but I like the idea that the word conveys that there is nothing wrong with enjoying things "above and beyond" what are considered necessities.

You think so? I would have said that "extravagant" carries strong negative connotations.

One of the reasons I'm fine with Dr. Austin's decision is that it takes back or reclaims that "negative connotation" and turns it on its head. That negative connotation of "extravagant" strikes me as potentially Puritanical. IF "extravagant" desires do no harm to the person or anyone else and IF they do not pose an undue burden to acquire or fulfill, why not indulge in them? Extravagant, indulgent, why not? One definition of the word is "excessive, going beyond a *normal* or *acceptable* limit in degree or amount." (my emphasis added) "Acceptable" to whom? Someone else telling you you're living extravagantly? Mind your own business 😊 Now, do I think there's something to the idea of "conspicuous consumption"? "the spending of money on and the acquiring of luxury commodities (goods and services) *specifically as a public display of economic power*—the income and the accumulated wealth—of the buyer." ([Wikipedia](#)) Now, in the Austin context, I would not call that "extravagant." I would call that trying to fulfill an empty desire. But if something brings you pleasure and meets the criteria of no harm/no undue burden to acquire, I don't think Epicurus opposes that "extravagance."