

Why Minimizing All Desire Is Incorrect (And What To Do Instead)

Post by “Don” of December 7, 2024 at 1:53 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

This exchange may seem pedantic but I think there is a lot more going on here than just the two of us talking shop so I think it's very useful!



Oh, I can be guilty of being pedantic. Case in point: I'll disagree with people who don't see the need for the Oxford comma! But I digress...

[Quote from Cassius](#)

I would see that as an uncontroversial point and therefore unlikely to be the reason for its inclusion , and especially for its inclusion in the manner it is written.

See, here's a crux of our polite disagreement. And this goes way back and I don't think either of us have budged 😊 I see [PD10](#) as Epicurus planting a flag against the Cyrenaics specifically and other "pleasure seekers" of his day in general. I don't think it's an uncontroversial point. And the point I see him making in [PD10/11/12](#) with all those If... Then's... is that if all these cases were, in fact, the case; we'd have no reason to study nature or learn the limits of pains and desires or even study philosophy. However, those if's, in fact, don't give us what we need to live a pleasurable life and so we then DO need to study nature and learn the limits of pain and desires.

I've always and continue to think you and others have tried to make this/these PDs do more philosophical heavy lifting than they need to.