

UNITED WISDOM

Pleasure without compulsory justification through usefulness

The Person and the Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-16-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Pleasure without compulsory justification through usefulness

Epigraph

> *“our first and kindred good.”*

Epicurus, Letter to Menoeceus, a fragment about pleasure, translated by Robert Drew Hicks. This begins an argument about choice rather than demanding that every pleasure be chosen. [S1]

What this article is about

Someone plans to listen to music in the evening and catches themselves searching for an explanation: it will improve attention, help with work tomorrow, expand cultural knowledge. These may all matter if they actually belong to the choice. Sometimes, however, an explanation appears before the listening and replaces a simple answer: I want to hear this music. Pleasure seems to gain a place in life only after submitting a certificate of usefulness.

This article considers a right to pleasure which need not be an instrument of another result. That right does not cancel consequences, agreements, another person's consent, or a limited budget. You can acknowledge pleasantness and separately decide whether to choose a particular action now. Epicurus and Kant provide different, limited philosophical grounds for distinction. The main discussion uses hypothetical scenes of music, walking, a free evening, and shared life. We consider how a wish for joy can stop hiding behind compulsory productivity while retaining adult consideration of circumstances and the possibility of declining without a general prohibition on what is pleasant.

I. An explanation can become an admission condition

Usefulness answers what an action serves. Pleasure can be a ground for choosing without becoming a means towards a further task. If someone listens to a melody because they enjoy its sound, that description already has content. There is no need immediately to add a promise of better sleep or a successful working day. If such outcomes are discussed, they require their own grounds. Pleasantness need not confirm someone else's scientific promise to be available for honest naming.

In the opening scene, someone may actually be interested in music's effect on work. That would be a separate research question. But if every melody is assessed solely through an

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

assumed improvement in tomorrow's efficiency, the evening receives another assignment. Instead of listening, the person starts selecting an optimal tool. You can notice the changed task: you wanted time with music; now you need to prove that time was not wasted. That sequence diagnoses no personality, but allows more precise understanding of one choice.

Imagine a friend asking why someone is returning to a familiar park. An answer may include wanting to see light among the trees. This is not an insufficiently serious version of a walk merely because it contains no measurable achievement. Weather, travel, and available time remain circumstances of the decision. Someone can consider them without inventing additional usefulness. Changing the route does not cancel the original interest in the place or make pleasantness a false ground.

An admission condition differs from a freely offered explanation. You may happily describe what you liked and why you want to repeat it. A problem appears if a particular justification is required for the choice to be permitted at all. Who established that measure? Does it apply to all free time or only certain activities? These questions need not accuse family or work. They make an operative rule visible and allow you to decide which tasks you actually want it to govern.

II. Usefulness and value in itself need not compete

An action can be useful and pleasant simultaneously. A walk may offer conversation, a journey take you somewhere necessary, and music accompany work. The article does not require cleansing pleasure of every additional result. The distinction concerns compulsion: must you always prove further usefulness before permitting something pleasant? You can name several grounds without making one the sole owner of the whole choice's right to exist.

In a hypothetical scene, someone buys a beautiful cup. It suits a drink, fits comfortably in the hand, and has an appealing colour. There is no need to choose between practicality and delight in its appearance. Yet if an existing cup serves the same function, the aesthetic preference does not automatically become a pointless expense. The decision depends on budget, space, and personal significance. The cost remains real even when the purchase promises neither higher income nor an improvement in its owner's character.

The reverse scene shows a limit. Someone likes an object, but money is presently needed for a specific obligation. They can postpone buying it while acknowledging its pleasantness. Declining does not require declaring the item tasteless, the seller unworthy, or the wish a weakness. It is enough to name the condition of today's decision. Budget then limits implementation instead of prohibiting interest itself. A different situation may yield another choice without logically betraying today's responsibility.

Different questions often help more than a general trial of usefulness. Do I like it? What does the chosen form require? Which obligation will it affect? Could I choose another scale? The answers may diverge: I like it, it is expensive, now is inconvenient, a smaller option is available. This record is unheroic but gives a decision an object. It makes neither pleasure defeat every other value nor another value first devalue pleasure before becoming sufficient grounds to decline.

III. Acknowledging pleasantness does not mean choosing everything pleasant

In the Letter to Menoeceus, Epicurus distinguishes pleasure from choice: not everything pleasant should be chosen without considering consequences. [S1] This is a philosophical normative position rather than an experiment about contemporary behaviour. We use a narrow point of reference to distinguish feeling and decision. His teaching is neither reconstructed in full nor assigned as a compulsory way of life; the editorial scenes have their own conditions.

In an everyday scene, someone wants to stay for another musical number, but has agreed to meet another person at the exit at a particular time. The next song's pleasantness is real. The agreement also remains a fact. They can leave without proving that the song is bad or no longer interesting. They can agree on another time beforehand if both are willing. Distinguishing these allows a wish to remain without demanding immediate implementation at any cost or denying it to act in accordance with a promise.

Notice a concealed extreme here: once a right to pleasure has been acknowledged, declining may seem forbidden. The former prohibition then becomes a new obligation to follow what is pleasant. Choice disappears again. You can want something and not do it now; want it and choose a smaller form; act and stop. These decisions require their own circumstances. The existence of a wish does not make refusal cowardice, while acknowledging a possible consequence does not make joy a suspicious source which cannot be trusted at all.

Consequences should not be invented for moral seriousness. If an evening is actually free and an action fits the available conditions, you need not invent harm to preserve a familiar struggle. If a specific limitation exists, name it without an attractive story of sacrifice. An adult decision examines facts rather than assigning pleasure and responsibility to opposing camps. Sometimes a clear endpoint to an activity preserves its place in life without making it a test of the whole personality.

IV. Different ways of evaluating do not merge into one ranking

In the opening sections of the Critique of Judgement, Kant distinguishes the pleasant, the beautiful, and the good; free disinterested satisfaction belongs to his analysis of taste. [S2] This is not universal permission for sensual actions. We compare only the distinction between grounds of evaluation, retaining his separate philosophical task. Our editorial point is that pleasure cannot be presented with all the criteria of another activity without explanation.

Imagine someone enjoying an uncomplicated song. They regard it neither as a great work nor a moral guide. Another listener wants to discuss composition and cultural importance. Both conversations are possible, but answer different questions. Pleasant sound need not win an expert assessment to remain pleasant for this listener. Personal interest does not prevent someone else from investigating form, historical context, or performance quality when those constitute their task.

Confusion appears when a remark about quality becomes a prohibition on experience: if the work is not outstanding, I should not enjoy it. You can agree with an assessment of form without erasing the fact of pleasure. The opposite error is possible too: if I enjoy it, the work must be flawless and every criticism hostile. Feeling is then appointed to answer a question it did not resolve. Distinguishing these allows discussion of a work without a trial of the listener's right to spend part of an evening with it.

For an ordinary choice, naming the area is sufficient. You want to enjoy a melody now; performance can be examined later. A promise matters now, so the activity ends. An object is selected for its purpose, with aesthetic preference alongside other information. These answers need not be combined into an overall ranking of correctness. Interest, criticism, and responsibility can remain different parts of life. This reduces the need to defend every pleasure through a grand assertion of objective value.

V. Rest need not promise a subsequent increase in output

A free evening may contain rest, play, or an activity serving no further purpose in the decision made. If it is chosen solely to prepare for new effort, rest receives a measurable assignment. That may be a deliberate task, but need not be the only one. You can want to spend time pleasantly and consider the possibility in actual circumstances. The article promises neither medical recovery nor increased productivity from a particular way of resting.

In a hypothetical scene, someone plays with a child and quietly turns every episode into a developmental activity. A rule must be explained, a skill checked, a useful result obtained. Sometimes both child and adult are interested in this aim. Sometimes they want to invent a funny story which leads nowhere. The chosen game and imposed assignment can be

distinguished. Shared laughter need not be justified by development, although an agreement about time and the child's participation continue to matter.

Another scene concerns an evening alone. Someone chooses a film but mentally fills in a report: what they learned, how much more cultured they became, which decision the viewing will produce. These questions can remain if they are interesting. If they obstruct the task itself, the person can try one viewing without a final examination. This is no proven technique for changing a condition. It is a small editorial way to examine which rule you activate and whether you actually want it to govern every free choice.

The result need not include compulsory delight. The film may be unappealing, the game boring, the music unsuited to the mood. You can then stop or choose differently. There is no need to supply usefulness to justify a pleasure that did not occur. The time has already passed; the available question concerns what became known about preference and conditions. Declining an examination of usefulness does not make every choice successful, but allows its actual outcome to be named without an additional trial of the correctness of your whole life.

VI. Mixed grounds do not make pleasure dishonest

A wish rarely emerges entirely alone. Someone enjoys an activity, wants company, hopes to see an acquaintance, or values contributing to conversation. That does not mean their pleasantness is invented. Several grounds can be named and their contributions considered. The article does not suggest searching for a wish completely free of culture and relationships. Such a search may itself become another admission condition: until I prove independence, I have no right to enjoy the chosen thing.

In a hypothetical scene, someone attends a concert with a friend. They enjoy the music but equally want time together. Afterwards they describe a pleasant evening, although certain performances did not impress them. This is a definite report about several results. The musical interest need not be declared false, or the gathering merely a social duty. You can clarify what you want to repeat: the company, place, performer, or combination, which may differ another time.

Mixture also matters in advertising. An offer promises both an object's pleasantness and the image of a successful person. A reader can notice both interests without supposing they must immediately cleanse the choice of every wish to belong. They can ask which part of the promise is actually available through purchase. An item offers a particular experience of use; overall status does not follow automatically. This distinction examines a specific offer instead of declaring a consumer weak merely for having a social interest.

A decision needs clarity at a particular scale. You know you like the sound and want the gathering; you do not know whether you will enjoy a new programme. You can accept that limit and choose an available option. After the event, grounds may become clearer. Every pleasure need not become a final testimony to your true character. It can be part of experience, have several causes, and change while retaining a right to honest description without defending complete purity from others' influence.

VII. Guilt and an actual obligation require different consideration

Guilt may appear during free time, but does not by itself identify a breached obligation. For precision, name an object: a promise, deadline, another person's participation, shared money. If one exists, consider it. If there is only a rule forbidding joy without work, that is another question. The article determines no origin of the feeling and does not suggest ignoring it; it helps prevent an experience from becoming an automatically ready verdict.

Imagine someone sitting with a book and remembering a promised call. There is a specific agreement which pleasure does not cancel. They can call, agree on a postponement, or clarify circumstances. In another scene, nobody expected a call and the day is free, but the book seems too easy and therefore unworthy of time. These cases do not require identical decisions. The first concerns a promise; the second concerns a measure admitting an activity only after confirmed intellectual usefulness.

We cannot declare in advance that distinguishing these will remove the second feeling. Someone may understand the situation and continue to experience tension. A small choice should not become a test of successful inner work. You can read for a while and then examine actual conditions, retaining the unpleasant feeling as part of experience. You can choose another form for now. The fact of tension should become neither proof of prohibition nor a demand for immediate joy to demonstrate sufficient freedom.

Self-punishment after something pleasant also has a cost. Someone doubles tomorrow's workload to pay for a quiet evening although nobody required such payment. In a hypothetical scene, ask which obligation that extra labour actually fulfils. If it serves only as payment for the right to rest, examine the measure itself. This is an editorial question rather than a theory of every form of overwork. It restores the action's object, distinguishing responsibility for a specific task from an indefinite debt for experienced joy.

VIII. Shared life retains consent and resource limits

A right to pleasure does not grant disposal of another person's participation. One wants loud music while another wants sleep; one enjoys an unexpected visit while another is not ready for guests. Both feelings can be acknowledged. The decision concerns the form of shared life: timing, place, an agreement. Neither preference need be declared more developed. Your wish differs from access to another's time, space, or body, which the fact of your interest does not provide.

In a hypothetical scene, neighbours agree on quiet hours. The music lover can choose headphones or another time. These changes do not acknowledge that pleasure is wrong. They concern implementation in a shared environment. If an option does not suit, another can be sought while retaining the other's right to decline. A compromise need not give both identical experiences. Its subject is an agreed form with understood limits rather than a general certificate of conflict-free harmony.

Shared money requires similar precision. Someone has a personal wish and an agreed couple's or family's budget. An amount and timing can be discussed without presenting a purchase as useful for everyone. But personal pleasantness does not cancel an existing allocation. Changing it requires a separate conversation. Secret spending does not become a transparent decision merely because someone finally acknowledged a right to joy. Equally, discussing budget gives others no right to mock the preference itself.

A resource limit helps preserve pleasure in another form. A small budget might permit familiar music, an accessible walk, or an object already owned. This does not demand that everyone always be content with little. Unavailability of some activities does not prove a personal defect. The article cannot create equal opportunities through an exhortation. It distinguishes a right to interest, the possibility of a specific implementation, and shared conditions which must be named before the choice gains a realistic size.

IX. Pleasure cannot be assigned as a duty

A right to what is pleasant can readily become a new command: someone living correctly must enjoy every free moment. The evening becomes an examination again. If joy does not emerge, someone blames themselves for insufficient openness. You can choose an activity and fail to obtain the desired feeling. This is an ordinary limit between action and a result not completely assigned by intention. The article derives neither a diagnosis nor a rating of inner maturity from absent pleasure.

Imagine someone at a celebration where everyone is urged to relax immediately. They notice tiredness, enjoy one conversation, and want to leave early. Participation need not match a

shared script of complete merriment. You can thank others for the gathering and name your limit. The party need not be proved bad to choose another scale of presence. Delight need not be performed to justify the organisers' work, although respectful treatment of participants remains a separate subject.

Another person may prefer a quiet activity to a bright event. This is neither automatically avoiding life nor proof of a quiet taste's superiority. Compare options in your own conditions: wanting to hear a story, enjoying cooking, finding a walk interesting. Every joy need not be publicly visible or produce a persuasive photograph. The article does not appoint solitude as everyone's proper form either. Pleasure's content remains available for consideration without requiring a single cultural image of implementation.

Retain room to change your mind. A chosen book is unengaging, the company no longer suits, or you want to spend the free hour differently. Change does not require immediately finding a productive replacement. You can finish and leave space without a guaranteed outcome. Such a pause need not become a spiritual achievement. It simply preserves a right not to fulfil another obligation to extract maximum enjoyment when an activity no longer answers your interest or today's circumstances.

A similar boundary appears with a gift. A friend chose a ticket with good intentions, but the recipient dislikes the proposed genre. Gratitude for attention and enjoyment of an event are different responses. You can thank them, discuss use of the ticket, and promise no delight which is absent. The giver may feel disappointed, but that feeling does not create another's ability to enjoy on command. Respect remains in conversation and a specific decision; it does not require performing pleasantness as compulsory payment for care received or declaring the gift proof of poor knowledge of the person.

X. An honest choice can be small

The person in the opening scene puts on music without promising to do more tomorrow because of it. They chose some listening time, know the available conditions, and breach no agreement. Perhaps it is pleasant. Perhaps they want to stop. In either case, the activity has its destination and limit. It need not become proof of complete freedom or a compulsory part of a personality improvement programme for the choice to be adult and available for discussion.

Examination concerns a specific outcome. Was time available? Was a shared agreement kept? Was the sound appealing, or did another preference emerge? These questions need not measure the evening's overall usefulness. Sometimes the result is naming pleasantness without an invented promise. Sometimes a limit is discovered and another scale chosen. Neither guarantees an enduring relationship with every pleasure, but each gives precise knowledge about one action.

Usefulness can remain in conversation where it is actually needed. In treatment, work, learning, or a shared obligation, criteria for results have their own objects. A free activity cancels none of them and need not automatically submit to them simply because it uses the same person's time. Distinguishing allows you to decide which question is central now. It does not build an ideal life without limitations. It preserves different grounds within actual life instead of requiring everything pleasant first to prove its instrumental value.

Pleasure without compulsory justification through usefulness means room for an honest answer: I like this, and am considering which form to choose. That answer is compatible with consequences, resources, and another person's consent. It demands neither choosing every pleasant thing nor abandoning what is useful. Adult joy can be modest, mixed, brief, and unreported. It need not promise future output to receive a place beside a person's other actual tasks, which retain their own grounds and limits.

What this means in practice

Choose an ordinary pleasant activity with small, reversible consequences. Name what you want to experience: sound, play, colour, conversation, or time in a particular place. Record assumed usefulness separately. Ask whether it belongs to your actual interest or serves as a compulsory admission certificate. Promise no scientific, medical, or productive result where there are no grounds for it.

Examine specific conditions: available time, money, a shared agreement, and another participant's consent. If a limit exists, name its subject and choose a scale. Implementation can be postponed while the wish remains. A smaller form may be found. Declining does not require declaring the pleasant bad, and permission does not cancel others' boundaries. The practice assesses no substantial risks and is not intended to justify dangerous action.

Try the chosen form without a compulsory examination of usefulness. If tension appears, appoint it neither proof of an incorrect decision nor a requirement for immediate joy. You can stop and clarify conditions. This is an editorial exercise in distinction whose clinical effectiveness is not established. It confirms no philosophical doctrine and measures no independence through the success of one evening.

Afterwards, note the actual result: you liked it, disliked it, wanted a different form, kept an agreement, or need clarification. Retain unknowns and add no usefulness retrospectively for justification. The available outcome is a more precise choice. You know what attracted you, which conditions participated, and why implementation, postponement, or refusal had specific grounds, preserving pleasantness as an independent part of your life.

Key quotation

> *“disinterested and free satisfaction.”*

Kant, Critique of Judgement, §5; J. H. Bernard translation, second edition,1914. A fragment characterising satisfaction in taste for the beautiful, not every sensual pleasure. [S2]

Connections between traditions

Comparison	Similarity	Boundary
Epicurus and the editorial decision scene	Acknowledging pleasantness and choosing an action are distinguished.	Normative philosophy is no contemporary empirical model; the doctrine is not adopted in full.
Kant and different questions of assessment	Grounds of judgement retain their separate character.	Analysis of taste permits neither every pleasure nor proof of an action's safety.

Comparison does not remove differences between the two philosophical tasks. The editorial practice remains independent and is not declared a consequence of universal agreement among traditions.

Primary sources

• S1. Epicurus. Letter to Menoeceus. Robert Drew Hicks, Internet Classics Archive; the whole presented letter was read. The page's print edition date was not established.

• S2. Immanuel Kant. Critique of Judgement. J. H. Bernard, second edition revised, Macmillan,1914, Project Gutenberg48433. Whole selected §§1–5 and available neighbouring context were read; not the entire work.

Tags

Pleasure, usefulness, joy, choice, rest, music, play, aesthetics, pleasant, beautiful, good, value in itself, productivity, consequences, budget, time, consent, agreement, guilt, boundaries, mixed grounds, free evening, preference, philosophy, Epicurus, Kant, reversible action, United Wisdom.

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, the unity of traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to examine these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.