

# Revisiting Issues of The Use of AI in Epicurean Philosophy

Post by "Don" of April 1, 2026 at 9:09 AM

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

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.

And therein lies the rub. In my scenario of bots posting and responding algorithmically, there is no "actual community of living Epicureans." There may be unlimited "Epicurean" content online in this scenario, but there is no community, no real Epicureans, just AI bots posting, responding, commenting. One person could program a bot or bots to do all this. A community can't be one person sitting in a Garden with a laptop.

If one wants an "actual community of living Epicureans," you need actual living humans interacting with each other, online and in-person. Increasing content posted everywhere created by generative AI doesn't get humans to have meaningful interactions with other humans.

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

the hypothetical of the "experience machine" and the issues involved in [PD10](#).

LOL That's a whole other kettle of fish for (yet) another thread. *Come at me, bro! I'll throw down on [PD10](#), dude!* (I'm doing my best to channel some trash-talking WWE wrestler here. I'll take my Oscar now 😁)

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

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.

Sure, I'll concede generative AI is a tool. And I'm consciously using generative AI to get away from using "AI" as some generic acronym. Tools are great. The Internet is a tool. A wrench is a tool. One can use the Internet to post misinformation and harassment. One can use a wrench to change your car battery or to bludgeon someone. If one uses an AI application to analyze a

huge dataset to help research cancer cures, that's a great use of a tool. If an AI application is used to model weather data to predict severe weather and to save lives, 👍. If someone uses generative AI to create computer code and something goes wrong, you can't ask the coder "Why did you write this line this way instead of that way?" Software engineers can be asked. Generative AI has no idea, that was just the prediction of what came next in their LLM modeling data. I use this same analogy about articles. If an AI-generated article has a turn of phrase or a point is made, and someone asks "That's clever. Could you tell me where that came from? Could you expand on that point?" there's no there *there*. Generative AI is a black box. If a human writes an article, we can ask the human to expand on a point. We can disagree with a human. We can have a discussion with a human. There is NO opportunity to "have a discussion" with an AI bot. There's the verisimilitude of a conversation, but conversations happen between people.

So, how we use any tool - or use the right tool for the right job - needs to be a conscious human decision. Does the tool enhance human abilities or does it *replace* uniquely human abilities.