This paper critically examines a prominent and perennial strategy -- found in thinkers as diverse as Kant and Shamik Dasgupta -- of simultaneously embracing the Principle of Sufficient Reason (PSR) and also limiting it so as to avoid certain apparently negative consequences of an unrestricted PSR. I will argue that this strategy of taming the PSR faces significant challenges and may even be incoherent. I will develop these criticisms through detailed, direct engagement with both Kant and Dasgupta. And for my (nefarious) purposes, I will enlist a generally derided argument by Leibniz for the PSR which will help us to see the connections between the PSR and a radical form of monism.