

Summarizing Epicurean Philosophy vs Objectivism

Post by "Cassius" of July 6, 2019 at 9:54 AM

I can see that exact issue being a major reason why Epicurus seems to have rejected "argument or discussion" on the nature of pleasure or its desirability. Pleasure and pain are givens of Nature and we can't adequately summarize it in words. Pleasure and pain are things that we feel, and Nature is the judge of pleasure and pain, not our logical abstractions.

Hence Epicurus refuses to admit any necessity for argument or discussion to prove that pleasure is desirable and pain to be avoided. These facts, he thinks, are perceived by the senses, as that fire is hot, snow white, honey sweet, none of which things need be proved by elaborate argument: it is enough merely to draw attention to them. (For there is a difference, he holds, between formal syllogistic proof of a thing and a mere notice or reminder: the former is the method for discovering abstruse and recondite truths, the latter for indicating facts that are obvious and evident.) Strip mankind of sensation, and nothing remains; it follows that Nature herself is the judge of that which is in accordance with or contrary to nature.

(from [On Ends](#))