

# All Pleasure Is Desirable, Because It Is Pleasing To Us, But Is All Pleasure \*Equally\* Desirable?

Post by "Cassius" of May 11, 2018 at 4:14 PM

My comments which I will interject - I hope it is clear to what I am responding.

(1) Pivot: "I agree with you that Epicurus was not against *having* much, but I believe he was against actively toiling for more than is necessary for one's freedom from pain." <<< I think in another thread (or maybe this one earlier) we discussed my concerns with the terminology, and this is another example. If we are Epicureans who fully endorse and do not suppress pleasure, then we equate "freedom from pain" with an experience full of active and ordinary and contemplative and mental and physical pleasures - all types, and we all understand that this is the goal. And if we accept that premise, then we don't care for additional pleasures past that point, because indeed our experience is full and anything above that would be simply variation - and not expanding our full experience of pleasure. IF, unfortunately, we don't accept the meaning of "freedom from pain" to be "pleasure" and "complete freedom from pain" to be "full pleasure," or if we are talking to non-Epicureans, then the terminology is probably dangerous and confusing. (And to be honest, even here with the three of us talking, I am not sure whether we are agreed on the fundamental point.) So just as a comment, and not as a criticism, I think we have a real challenge here to decide how to communicate - even among ourselves, with sentences like that. I hate to think we have people who will come to the forum, read "I agree with you that Epicurus was not against *having* much, but I believe he was against actively toiling for more than is necessary for one's freedom from pain," and think that this is an instruction to lie on a cot in a cave with a supply of bread and water. 😊 Tell me what you think of my concern - unnecessary, overblown, or in fact that we don't agree on what is implied with "freedom from pain"?