

# Not all research is scientific, or involves critical thinking.

Post by "Cassius" of August 5, 2021 at 11:26 AM

The following note was posted today to the thread for this video on the facebook page. I thought it was particularly good and wanted to record it and my response:

[Poster PB:](#)

Every time I deal with criticism of Epicurean philosophy it's always by people who misrepresent Epicurus' position saying things such as "I know he wasn't a glutton but pleasure is unlimited and modern studies have shown people simply don't limit their desires."

It's almost as if they don't understand his core position on pleasure, it has a natural limit, or the whole point of philosophy which is to train ourselves methodically, if we weren't already prudent, to live the good life. Epicurus was all about limits and boundaries, we bind ourselves to nature in order to relieve unnecessary suffering about the unknown.

Eclectics will never be secure and at peace. They've chosen and avoided according to their own constitution like the crowd does at a buffet with no method other than their own immediate gratification. And they have the nerve to call Epicurus a pig.

Cassius:

**"We bind ourselves to nature in order to relieve unnecessary suffering about the unknown"** I think that's a particularly good turn of phrase there. It's not to religion that we bind ourselves but to Nature, and we ultimately follow nature where nature leads, not to where \*we\* think through "virtue" that we "ought" to go.

The Stoics talk a good line about nature, but then (as Nietzsche accuses them) they turn around and dictate to Nature what they think Nature should do. Epicurus consistently follows nature all the way through and does not presume to overrule Nature's leadership.