

Another Article Insisting On The Importance of the Kinetic / Katestematic Distinction, Despite Citing Nikolsky

Post by “Cassius” of July 2, 2022 at 8:19 AM

I see my links have disappeared. Will try to reconstruct them.

OK Did the best I could. I will now add the conclusion statement. Does this help anything at all? We are now supposed to consider katastematic pleasures as all pleasures concerned with removal of pain and therefore "necessary" pleasures and kinetic all other pleasures and therefore "unnecessary"? I don't think that makes any sense at all.

5. Summary

The “Process-Result Interpretation” for explaining the classification of pleasures into katastematic and kinetic pleasures should be abandoned⁶⁸. The criterion for distinguishing and classifying katastematic and kinetic pleasures is the removal of pain. Katastematic pleasure is concerned with the removal of pain, making no categorical distinction between the process of removing pain and the end of this process, the absence of pain. Kinetic pleasure has nothing to do with the removal of pain, and hence is wholly concerned with the motion itself. As removing

pain is necessary and pleasures which have nothing to do with removing pain are unnecessary, katastematic and kinetic pleasures are different kinds of pleasures and are to be identified with necessary and unnecessary pleasures respectively.

Bar-Ilan University

Yosef.Liebersohn@biu.ac.il
