

# Revisiting Issues of The Use of AI in Epicurean Philosophy

Post by "Cassius" of April 1, 2026 at 8:11 AM

## [Quote from Don](#)

If the goal is Epicurean evangelism and the argument is that those ends justify any means, that path leads down eventually (and admittedly hyperbolically) to Epicurean-prompted bots posting endlessly to FB, X, Instagram, etc., and replying algorithmically to human generated questions and comments, just to get the message out.

From my perspective, Epicurean philosophy is a human-centered philosophy based in human senses and human feelings and human reason in response to the natural, material world as humans experience it. Generative AI removes the human element from creative work, and the human element is what gives authenticity to what's expressed in those creations.

I think this does a pretty good job of identifying the issues I am currently considering.

And it immediately evokes in my mind the hypothetical of the "experience machine" and the issues involved in [PD10](#).

The world is currently going through changes that probably are going to exceed that of the industrial revolution. It's commonplace to see movies and articles talking about AI leading to mass population reduction and worse.

## Quote

Generative AI removes the human element from creative work, and the human element is what gives authenticity to what's expressed in those creations.

This is the question that is often posed and while I am still thinking it through I don't think I actually or can afford to agree. As to actuality, it doesn't "remove" the human element - it's a tool. And as for practicality, the forces arrayed against "us" - meaning against those who support living according to Epicurean philosophy - are too great to unilaterally disarm and give up this tool, which at the moment I see likely to become necessary for self-preservation.

## [Quote from Don](#)

that path leads down eventually (and admittedly hyperbolically) to Epicurean-prompted bots posting endlessly to FB, X, Instagram, etc., and replying algorithmically to human generated questions and comments, just to get the message out.

And would that *necessarily* be a bad thing? Once again the considerations of [PD10](#) apply - if there are methods by which we actually succeed in establishing and preserving an actual community of living Epicureans. would we say "Nah that's not worth the use of AI to do so because I find it makes me uneasy / is despicable"?

The question keeps asking itself over and over in different ways. As I see it, there's no way to get around asking "What is the ACTUAL result of the use of any tool or method - including AI?"

At least at the moment my personal answer is that it doesn't make any difference who or what or how a presentation that is accurate, well-expressed, and persuasive is produced. If it meets those tests then it is useful no matter who or how produced. if it doesn't meet those test, then it makes no difference who produced it or how. The only ultimate test is "What happens if we pursue this course of action vs what happens if we don't?"

No doubt different people are going to make different predictions about that result, but I don't think it is justifiable to draw a red line because as we all agree in Epicurean philosophy there is no "fate," and I doubt anyone can justify concluding that every aspect of AI is one of "necessity."