

PD10 - Interpretations of PD 10 Discussion

Post by "Cassius" of January 18, 2021 at 4:10 PM

[Quote from Elayne](#)

Cassius I'm not using logic.

I see this as the root of our current disagreement and we will resolve it at some point.

I would say that a reasonable person on the street would say that you ARE using logic, in looking at the full context of all the texts, and also comparing to to the feelings that you have and that you can presume Epicurus had.

You don't wish to call that "logic" because you are referring to "formal logic" and saying that what you are doing is not "formal logic."

I'm just going to have to find some place for a definition reference, because I firmly think that the target audience we should be aiming for would be very confused by insisting that "logical" or "reasonable" implies formal logic of the Let $A = B$ and $B=C$; therefore $A=C$ variety.

I was thinking about that this afternoon. I think the target audience (at least the one I am most interested in) would see issues of "logic" vs "feeling" in terms of Spock and McCoy and Kirk.

Spock symbolizes logic and reason - he is data driven to the extreme, but he has no emotion and thus is frequently mistaken because he does not have the human faculty of feeling emotion (he can, presumably, feel pain and pleasure of a type).

McCoy symbolizes the extreme of feeling - he does in fact refer to reason and logic in his medicine, but he is caricature of someone whose emotions clearly run ahead of his reason.

Kirk, is the superior synthesis and combination of both reason and feeling. He is superior to both McCoy and Spock and thus gives the ultimate orders. Within Kirk, it is feeling that ultimately does the decision making, but he does his best to incorporate data-driven logic and reason, because he knows that that is frequently the way to unwind problems. And that is the Epicurean model as I see it.

All of us have our limitations and I am afraid this is mine. I am very aware that you are correct that there is a significant set of people who hear the words "logic" and "reason" and interpret them as you are doing, in formal terms.

The people in my daily world have no clue what "formal logic" is, and any notion they have of it is receding further into the background every day. Yes I want to explain all this to the

academicians who use the formal terms,. but they are not my first concern - they are the ones who have botched Epicurean philosophy (in my eyes) for 2000+years. And I want to give the "regular people" a chance, especially because it is my understanding through Cicero that that is who Epicurus actually played to and were most enthusiastic about him.

This is where we need a division of labor and specialization. Those who move in circles which require the words "logic" and "reason" to be used "formally" will need a presentation of their own. In my view, the best compromise to deal with the largest set of people is to use terms like "abstract logic/reason" or "theoretical logic/reason" or similar words to indicate that the premises being used are not observable or verifiable or reliably repeatable through the senses.