

Discussion of the thread - Against Katastematic Supremacy - Pleasure Is A Unified Whole And Not A House Divided - Forum Editorial Policy

Post by "Cassius" of July 21, 2026 at 9:42 PM

[Quote from wbernys](#)

i want to know if Cassius finds this acceptable or in line with new policy.

I have no problem at all with anything that you wrote as being consistent with the policy. As you state in your last paragraph it is difficult and controversial to decide which pleasures are actually kinetic and katastematic in the first place. On the other hand evaluating the "duration" of a particular pleasure is relatively easy, and that's why I strongly encourage discussion of these issues to be in English.

But the key point is that whatever those two words meant to Epicurus, it's clear that he embraced both of them as part of a happy life, with "a life of happiness being a life of pleasure." The problem comes only when people start qualifying "a life of happiness is a life of pleasure" by modifying it to say "a life of happiness is a life of _____ pleasure" or worse yet - "a life of happiness is a life of tranquility" or "a life of happiness is a life of ataraxia" or any other formulation that implies that some concept other than pleasure is actually the supreme good. The worst aspect of the problem is when people become convinced that a particular activity or condition is "katastematic" and they elevate their interpretation of that particular activity or condition to being what Epicurus "really meant" instead of the broader word pleasure.

Even the experts cannot agree among themselves exactly what function these words are performing, and even using English words to describe them as stable, restful, or enduring doesn't solve the problem. "Studying nature" as Epicurus emphasized as key to his own happiness seems very arguably to be a pleasure of action ("studying"), as are those pleasures that he arrayed against his pains in his last days.

It's true that all this may be more of a "rhetorical" point than anything else. The real objective of all of this is to emphasize the "promotion" and "teaching" function of Epicurean friends. The policy is intended to make sure that the clarity of the objective being pleasure is not lost by substituting something else as the "supreme good." That was the original intent of the "Not NeoEpicurean But Epicurean" statement when we drafted it over ten years ago. We've included that statement somewhere on the front page and in every welcome point to every new member for as far back as I can remember, but it's clear that not everyone is reading it or taking it to heart. That's what the recent postings are intended to help fix.

But in sum William -- to repeat my response to your question -- what you've written seems fine to me.