

# Give Us an Example of God!

Post by “Julia” of July 9, 2024 at 9:00 PM

## [Quote from Twentier](#)

not just directionless experimenting (usually unethical) for the sake of experimenting.

I think they're seeking to enhance themselves (artificial senses, nootropics, ...), in the same way that I'm using tools (car, knife, ...) – so I don't see it as directionless, I don't see it as experimenting for the sake of experimenting, and I don't think it can be unethical what one does to one's own body (unless whatever that is inevitably causes a considerable burden to others; such as a parent burdening a child by being an addict or by wilfully disabling their body). My basic rule would be: My body, my choice.

*However*, I think they're (almost always) misguided in their longing for such enhancements, because they seem to be (almost always) driven by limitless desires (vain & empty) *or* their underlying desire is natural-but-unnecessary and they got the risks wrong, skewing the results of their hedonic calculation (which, to me, doesn't make it unethical, it just makes it stupid 😊).

## [Quote from Twentier](#)

- Similar to Charvaka and Yangism in their hedonist ethics and naturalistic physics. But they are atheistic and non-theistic traditions, so they reject any images of God as having validity.

Thank you for mentioning those! I found it interesting to read a short summary about them. To me, it is nice to know Epicurean philosophy isn't entirely a one-off after all.

## [Quote from Root304](#)

I also have fortunately known, congregated and am among many poor and frugal folk who understand the true value of a friend. You can make so much happen in terms of material and moral enrichment even with meager means if you indeed hold your friends close and your enemies afar. Living one's life receiving and repaying wiselike, in excess and in kind is a most gratifying way to live under the present conditions.

Reading that, I couldn't help but instinctively reject the notion of friends, which then told me I have some more healing to do – and when I thought I have some more healing to do, I rejected that in turn, as an expression of assimilationism into the social construct of normalcy, as an internalised norm contrary to my own ways of being. It shall be interesting to see where I land on that subject a decade or so down the road, when the experience of friendship might be safe,

affordable and attainable.

#### [Quote from Root304](#)

The "immortality" of Epicurean friendship surely extends to who and what I am in the world as I appear to others as well. My Father, who has past, was to me not his mind but the way he was received to me through the senses and emotions; smells, feelings, touch, voice, etc. The Epicurean soul must surely include the biochemical, mental and bodily memories between people as well.

To me, the members of family (who all have passed), are concepts, interaction models, "software", disembodied (which is probably both bizarre and unhealthy...). Either way, I don't perceive the world as physical as you do. To me, *experientially*, the world is just the medium in which patterns interact - the patterns being selves, conscious concepts, "brain software", or whatever you would want to call it. To me, this is the difference between a person (the entity inside a body) and a human (the animal). The soul, to me, is the mind *of the body*, as opposed to the mind which hosts the person. I suppose this distinction is hard to explain, let alone make visceral, to anyone who hasn't seen or experienced a body alive and well, yet devoid of a person inside. It's...like an abandoned care with the engine running, like a house with the lights on when nobody's home. Most people then just sit and stare, other's go through very basic motions cued in by their environment (eg they drink when presented with water, but their overall actions are utterly unplanned and directionless, like opening and closing doors for no apparent reason, taking objects then replacing them, just doing the habit-/instinct-based actions of whatever they find in their surroundings). Such a body, however, still has primitive feelings of active/tired, warm/cold, hunger/thirst, and pain/pleasure. Not sure if I explained that well...? 😊

Anyways, this is why some parts of the interaction patterns which to me mean my family are alive as long as I will be: I absorbed those aspects of them and continue to repeat them (in modified ways), which metaphorically is sort of like replicating an inherited DNA of behaviour.

#### [Quote from Twentier](#)

Here's (above) an image that depicts (to me) the gods

Off topic, just curious: Did ancient Epicureans use mind-altering substances (other than alcohol), as the painting suggests?

#### [Quote from Twentier](#)

the gods primarily as mental concepts, rather than as physical object to which mental concepts corresponds.

If the gods were merely a special type of concept they would not be subject to the laws of nature.

#### [Quote from Cassius](#)

I suppose it's not inconceivable that individual gods might conclude after eons that variety really does not add to complete pleasure, and decide voluntarily to go out of existence.

That is why I cannot imagine the gods as self-aware and conscious, as [indicated above](#). If the gods are more like fancy jellyfish, like reptile minds, bundles of instinct, then they can be eternally happy without being bored by the passage of time or the constant repetition. The question, of course, is whether something that has no self-awareness and isn't conscious in the way we understand it can be "happy" to begin with, but I'd say that every self-regulating system has a state which is "pleasing" to the system because it is within all the tolerance and reference ranges for its operating conditions: not too warm, not too cold, not too hungry, ...