

Should Epicurean Philosophy Be Made More Accessible?

Post by "Cassius" of December 30, 2021 at 2:53 PM

[Quote from Scott](#)

(How are our finances? Do we have enough to engage a top tier marketing/promotions firm to develop and deploy the content?)

Ha! We can pay the server bills but hard to say we have many resources beyond that!

[Quote from Scott](#)

I doubt this philosophy was so wildly successful for 7 centuries without being able to be presented in simpler form, easy to understand and remember

Yes I agree with that too. Trying to help people with that was and is also a part of the reason for this section of the forum: [Personal Outlines of Epicurean Philosophy](#)

I think we found it pretty useful and we had a number of people participate when we first put it up, but over time and after the first rush it hasn't been as well used. It would be fun if some of the newer people who haven't yet tried it also take a stab at it.

I can't remember where at the moment, but in terms of Epicurean philosophy being relatively easy and straightforward, Cicero made that point a number of times. This graphic isn't exactly it, but I think his exact quote on it being easy is somewhere nearby:



And really, truthfully it IS easy, and it DOES all follow from the basic principles of physics and epistemology, as Lucretius observes several times. From the 12 fundamentals of physics it is directly derivable that there is nothing eternal except matter and void, and when you apply that directly to "Is there an eternal soul?" "Is there a supernatural god?" "Are there eternal standards of absolute virtue?" even a child could deduce NO! NO! NO!

I know that I am terribly unfair to the dead horse but I keep beating him anyway because it's so important. The main complexity in Epicurus is more the upside-down perspective on ethics that the Stoicizers from Cicero to Okeefe keep arguing. They've confused everybody into thinking:

"Epicurus didn't mean what he said about pleasure" and thereby into thinking that:

"We can ignore issues of consistency; Epicurus may have preached Pleasure over and over and over, but when it comes down to it, Epicurus adopted a totally inconsistent viewpoint on the place of active pleasure in life!"

And even worse, they talk and act as if the Epicurean physics was nothing but a novelty not worth spending time on today, when in truth the basic principles of atomism and eternal in time / infinite in space universe were the direct supports for the argument that supernatural gods and fate do not exist.

They rip the heart out of the ethics and make it neo-Stoicism, and rip the heart of the physics and make it irrelevant -- little wonder that people today find it confusing to read Epicurus! But the fault is ours, not Epicurus's.