

Anti-Natalism: The Opposite of Epicureanism

Post by “Don” of August 20, 2025 at 11:20 PM

[Quote from Rolf](#)

antinatalists want to minimise pain

I interpreted it that they want to minimize existence. A non-existent thing/entity/person cannot be said to "not experience pain." The "being" that is not born doesn't exist. Less beings in the world doesn't alleviate the pain experienced by the already existing beings.

[Quote from Rolf](#)

“throw the baby out with the bathwater”



I found your choice of metaphor directly on point. Well played!

[Quote from Rolf](#)

Besides, it's not like Epicureanism is an inherently pro-natalist philosophy. Epicurus never told us to “be fruitful and multiply”. As far as I'm aware, it's fairly neutral on the question of whether or not we should procreate.

Generally true. The philosophy doesn't take a pro or anti stance other than to value existence over non-existence and to evaluate whether to have children in light of acknowledgement of the pleasure and pain involved. It's a very subjective decision.

Not directly relevant to the natalist question, but at least Epicurus was genuinely concerned with the continued well-being of Metrodorus' children, enough to specifically address their care in his will.