

# Episode 242 - Cicero's OTNOTG 17 - Is Truth A Matter Of Logic?

Post by "Cassius" of August 21, 2024 at 12:49 PM

1. I like that chart very much! But given the "difficulty" of the issue (that so many of us are ingrained by orthodoxy to think of *perceptions* or *sensations* as being true or false) I wonder if the "it" in that chart needs to be replaced by "opinion" for clarity's sake. Either a header that states clearly that what is being discussed is opinion, and not perception or sensation, or in each case substitute "opinion" for "it", or maybe even both might be necessary to drive the point home hard enough 😊

2.

## [Quote from Bryan](#)

Opinions about perceptions can be false, but the perceptions themselves are not false - they must be real because they physically affect us. However, we must think about and judge these "honest" reports of our sensations to figure out the extent that they do, in fact, accurately correspond to external objects and circumstances.

That brings up another point I may have stumbled over in the podcast. I too am tempted to emphasize that it is important to separate "external objects and circumstances" from "those that are not external." And I do think that's a significant point for many decisions in life, especially as to "what to do" about the thing that is moving or physically affecting us.

But for purposes of the current discussion, I think Epicurus is telling us to consider as "true and real" *anything* that moves us - *external OR internal* . It would be easy to argue that Epicurus would choose to do that as part of emphasizing a standard of reality very different from what Democritus was focusing on when Democritus said something to the effect that only atoms and void "really exist." Seems to me that Epicurus is telling us to regard as "real" anything whatever, inside us or outside us, that can "touch" or "move" us.

The theory of "images" pretty clearly describes a way that we can be "moved" by the mind being impacted by images of things that have real existence (horses and men) or even by things that don't have real existence, but which come to us through images (centaurs). But I am less clear on what Epicurus would say about "ideas" like "capitalism" or "communism" or whatever. Would it be proper to conclude that a vision of a centaur is "real" because it comes to us in the form of an image, but "capitalism" is not real because it is purely an idea. I can see people saying that "ideas" can "move" us, but unless the particular idea is embodied in some kind of "image," I am not sure Epicurus would consider that it has the same reality as the image

of a Centaur.

I think it's very likely to be shocking (and therefore good to talk about) that Epicurus would say that "*centaurs*" or "*the dreams of madmen* are real" but that "*capitalism* is not real."

Agree or disagree on any of this?