

# Modern Neuroscience And The Katastematic / Kinetic Debate

Post by "Cassius" of June 29, 2023 at 2:15 PM

As an aside, it is not the "within ourselves" aspect of such an interpretation that would bother me. Nothing wrong with the idea that we generate some of our pleasures internally rather than receiving it from outside our own bodies.

The issue I have is with the modern implications of "tranquility" as being "at rest" or "inactive" or similar words circling the drain of "nothingness."

I don't consider a mind actively exploring the depths of any part of nature to be "inactive" or in any way a negative concept. It is the Buddhist/(apparently Vedantic)/nihilist /Stoic view that tranquility implies detachment and being totally inactive mentally and physically, implicitly frozen in time, that I believe needs to be positively expelled from the interpretation of Epicurus. It is clear that many under the influence of other views are drawn to such an interpretation, and when we open the door to acceptance of that perspective, such a viewpoint undermines and distorts the rest of the philosophy. Why pursue pleasure when it is tranquility in the form of "detachment" that these people are arguing to be the goal?

If we take Epicurus as an example of his own paradigm, I consider Epicurus to be among the most "active" and energetic leaders in history. While much of that activity may have been mental rather than as a soldier or other "physical" way, his mind was not devoted to "rest" or "nothingness," and tranquility in the sense of a status quo unchanging passivity was the furthest thing from his mind.