

Why Tranquility Should Not Be the Main Goal for an Epicurean

Post by "Cassius" of November 29, 2021 at 10:37 PM

On that last point, about the goal being "peace" I like to dramatize that issue with the closing scene of HG Wells' " Things to Come." The actor who plays the tall guy is the one I [mentioned in the podcast this week to Joshua](#). His name is Raymond Massey and he played John Brown in the movie we discussed. I will post that link in that thread. Massey really knew how to convey "intensity", and this clip sets up the question of choosing between types of pleasure which appear to be more vs less dangerous. In this clip, the two male characters have just launched their two children off to a journey to the moon from which they may never return, and one of the two men is not happy about it at all. The whole movie revolves around such questions but the final scenes brings it home.

"Which shall it be?" 😊

In both of these movies I think a reasonable person would ask at the end: Is Raymond Massey's character crazy? Or is he the sanest person you've ever seen?

PS - In "Santa Fe Trail" Massey is clearly portraying a religious zealot (which may or may not be accurate historically) so I don't think anyone would argue that an Epicurean would endorse that motivation. But someone could act similarly without a religious motivation, and the main reason for bringing up the Brown figure is the reason Joshua gave - to illustrate divergence of opinion on justice. In "Things To Come" we don't have religion as a factor at all, and I think we do have a totally safe illustration on views of feeling and pleasure we can debate in detail.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KRRXtymX50U>