

What If Anything Has Changed About Human Nature In the Last 2000 Years?

Post by "BrainToBeing" of January 7, 2024 at 1:25 PM

[Godfrey](#) Yes, I do get the satisfaction that I did the right thing; yet, it feels incomplete. The dilemmas of psychosocial "hidden" agendas in medicine drove me to leave neurology. I then decided I would try to approach the topic with - hopefully - the "cards on the table". So, I went on to get board certification in addiction. Then I found other problems. The surprising one was the difficulty of getting on to insurance panels as a doctor board certified in neurology and addiction. The insurance companies couldn't understand it. They could understand a psychiatrist or family practitioner practicing addiction treatment, but they couldn't understand that addiction is run by the brain. So, I entered a prolonged thrash trying to get onto insurance company panels. Further, the addiction treatment arena was afraid of the neurological mindset. They were afraid of a focus on gathering truly objective data of function and illness. They wanted to wash around in the bathwater of opinion and symptoms. They seemed to be satisfied saying "we did great" in treatment even when the patient immediately relapsed after a month of inpatient treatment. To me, as a neurologist, such immediate relapse may have been an understandable derivative of the nature of the illness; but, it doesn't translate to "we did great", in my opinion.

The relevance of this "venting" in EpicureanFriends is the commentary on objectivity, particularly in reference to [Don](#) "*The Canon* Epicurus affirms that our **sensations and preconceptions and our feelings are the standards of truth**". Are they really? 2000 years ago it made perfect sense to argue as Epicurus did on this point. There was no other objective tool for assessment. Yet, is that still true? Are these still to be presumed as the standards of truth? At least in my experience I don't think so. They may be a method of assessment for a personal view of truth. However, I hold that as different from "Truth" (with a capital "T", a universal truth). And the reason for that disparity is information processing in the human brain - which is not evolved to discover Truth, but rather to discover a personalized response for future actions. At least, this is how I see it (and how objective neurobiology sees it).

Yet, the discussion can go on with other views!