

Isonomia

Post by "Cassius" of August 23, 2021 at 6:47 AM

I am in agreement with some of the last several posts and not in agreement with some, but I think mainly the answer to concern that this is Platonic is that it appears to me we have ample justification for projecting higher and lower forms of life based on what we see here on earth, so I think that is fully sufficient ties the full theory to reality and observation. Based on observing worms and below all the way up to humans and elephants and so many others, it seems to me very empirically reasonable to extend the attributes we do see to a wider scope of varieties that would exist if there are an infinite number of Earth's in the universe.

I absolutely see that as rigorously empirical and not Platonic, and I feel sure that they would have argued that NOT to take that position would be a Platonic rejection of the variety we see here.

I think that a lot of what is missing here is that we have never undertaken a study of the "epicurean reasoning" theory and the best place to focus on that is probably Philodemus' "Methods of Inference" material.

So we need to figure how to devote some time to that.

The entire philosophy is ultimately based on things we cannot see or touch or sense (atoms) so we have to get comfortable with "true reason" and I don't think we're there yet.

And that's not unexpected because so little attention is paid to it. DeWitt can maybe get carried away but I think many of his points are highly insightful and one of them is (to my reading) that DeWitt was both an "empiricist" *and* a master logician and that these are not necessarily in conflict if you understand and apply those correctly.