

# **New Review of Emily Austin's "Living For Pleasure" - This Time By An Objectivist**

**Post by "Cassius" of June 4, 2023 at 7:49 AM**

Thank you Peter. I don't have nearly the reading background (or processing power) in Rand that you have, but I see that your article is largely based on the widely held premise that Epicurus values katastematic pleasures higher than kinetic ones. If I thought that was correct I would have a major problem with Epicurus, and I would probably have dropped him long ago. I perceive this to be similar to why Nietzsche ultimately backed away.

But for me, this problem is overcome by arguments stated at length by Boris [Nikolsky](#) and Gosling and Taylor, who allege that this widely held premise is not correct, and that Epicurus did not hold katastematic as higher than kinetic, or place "tranquility" at the center of his philosophy rather than pleasure, as is attributed to him.

I doubt this thread is the place to elaborate on that for the moment, but I wanted to note that I think there is a lot to be gained in comparing and contrasting Rand with Epicurus, just as we do the Stoics and the others. It has been so long since I read those Shelton articles that I hardly remember them, but tracing out the reasons why Rand does not ultimately land on "pleasure" but on some version of "reason" (at least in common perception) is to me a fascinating subject.