

Epicurean versus deceptive (“modern”) Stoic decision making

Post by “Julia” of August 12, 2024 at 11:27 AM

When one considers pleasure to be a sin or at least a dangerous temptation (such as Aristotle, Plato and the Stoics did) then if even a steady state of homeostasis is identified as a pleasure, there remains no more escape from sin/temptation except in pain. This might be a more honest reason for why the backlash Epicurus received was such a "persistent and vigorous condemnation" and yet remained "really superficial and captious".

The argument that he was conflating two distinct states under one label is, to me, null and void, because he simply wasn't doing that: Babies, toddlers and animals all *enjoy* their share of normal, neutral, static states, and with a look at primates, so should adult humans. As a matter of fact, few humans are more miserable than those haunted to the degree where they can no longer find pleasure in what should, ordinarily, be a neutral state...

Do we all agree that "to desire sth" is an "atom of experience" just like "feels warm" is, too, meaning both are indivisible and not made up of smaller, lower-level, more fine-grained units of experience?