

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

Post by "Cassius" of December 6, 2024 at 9:29 AM

"A philosophy which values life, rather than seeks to extinguish it, will seek to intelligently pursue pleasure,"

---- writing that helps me focus on the time issue. I don't think you can value "life" without implying that you also value "the continuation of life over time." Since we only have "the now" and we don't have total control over the future, it seems to me that there is inherently going to be a "desire for time" element in valuing life that is not eliminated by saying "I'm satisfied with what I have already experienced. "

There's got to be a way to articulate a philosophically proper perspective in which you are both (1) satisfied that you have lived well so far, but you also (2) possess a desire for the continuance of that life without that desire for continuance being construed as pain or anything that is negative.

I think we've talked about in the past as well that the issue of "variation" in the sense of unlimited time producing no "greater" pleasure, but only variation, does not imply that variation itself is not valuable or desirable. All of us know by experience that variation IS valuable and desirable. So it's not that variation over time isn't desirable, because it is. The point has to be more the philosophical one that variation cannot make "pure pleasure" (in the sense of total absence of pain) "more pure," and variation cannot make "total absence of pain" more "total."