

tradition of **ἄθεοι(h)ārvāka** as "atheists", even though some of the contextual nuances of **Cārvāka** will be lost in translation. For that matter, many of our friends who have adopted the term "**atheist**" may misinterpret ancient Greek philosophers who were not using **ἄθεος**, which, at the time, would not have been explicitly used to refute the idea of "God" as we understand it (being framed in a Christian world).

In our effort to identify **FRESH** expressions from - what I mentioned *Heidegger* called - **originally language**, all **-isms** will necessarily be removed from the context of the language in which they first arose. They will **ALWAYS** be rooted in the the Modern European tradition of **Ismism**, the tradition of categorizing *other peoples'* cultural traditions from the "*enlightened*" perspective of "*objective*" academics. Therefor, referring to **any** wisdom tradition around the globe (whether it be the offensive "**Mohammedanism**" or the much more neutral "**Buddhism**"), will *usually* be seen, in one way or another, as being derogatory to practitioners of that religion, adherents to that tradition, or philosophers of that position.

So, like Josh mentions, my analysis can also - quite reasonably, **and responsibly** - be applied to the other **-isms**, especially if we're trying to analyze our misinterpretations using linguistic *deconstruction*. That being said, for the purposes of using Reddit as a forum to introduce others to *our pleasure-based tradition*, I still think it would be good practice to avoid using **Epicureanism** whenever possible, as a means of confronting the fact that *the study of nature using our feelings, senses, and anticipations* is **far-removed** from the **idealism** of every other tradition. In this case, I think we can argue without seeming derogatory to others, that our tradition is **NOT** an ideology, just like the enterprise of science is not an ideology; whereas *Abrahamic, Dharmic, and Platonic* traditions require a sense of *faith* that an eternal, identity exists that is separate from the world of physics, only accessible to us **NOW** as an idea contained within our minds.

Hiram has used this critique before, but I'll re-iterate, that a succinct way to condense the lengthy points I've explored is simply to say that "*we reject ideology*" (defined as "*systems of the ideal*"). In this case, if you'll excuse my continued **isming**, "**Idealism**" can be seen as the prototypical **-ism** amongst all other **-isms**.