

Flourishing / Pleasure as the goal

Post by "Cassius" of June 30, 2026 at 9:03 PM

[Quote from Matteng](#)

3. Following human flourishing means social activities, following Pleasure could lead to unsocial immorality actions, when that (unjust activities) give Pleasure, an Epicurean could not have Objections.

This is one of the most disreputable of all the objections. Who gets to define and ordain that "social activities" are good and "unsocial / immoral activities" are bad? We are supposed to just accept THEIR decrees as to what is good and what is bad?

Nature gives individuals only pleasure and pain by which to decide what to pursue and what to avoid. Nature does not write in the sky what all men at all times and all places are required to do as "moral." Epicurus totally objects abstract and absolute standards of virtue and morality because there is no true and real basis for such absolute standards in nature. There are only particular people living at particular places and particular times, and their feelings of pleasure and pain. As Thomas Jefferson said, "The earth belongs to the living..."

Epicurus states his denial of absolute justice explicitly in the [principal doctrines](#), and Torquatus explains this at great length as to all of the virtues.