

Discussion of Blog Article - "Reality Does Not Require Being Eternally The Same"

Post by "Cassius" of April 2, 2026 at 11:35 AM

[Quote from DaveT](#)

I'd enjoy reading relevant comparisons between E and Kant (and other more modern philosophers) that shows how they are similarly focused. Can it be done without avoiding the differences yet at the same time avoiding disputation?

I definitely think it can be done, and that it would be helpful to do exactly that.

Differences can be sharpened in an unbiased unemotional way. Once we have a sharp view of the differences, then we can pretty easily find the line where we cross into advocacy of anti-Epicurean positions. Those who want to advocate core positions that are clearly anti-Epicurean can receive our best wishes and proceed to do that elsewhere for as long and passionately as they want. And those who conclude that an Epicurean framework allows for the best living can do so here.

For example it seems to me that it should be relatively easy to articulate positions on such core Epicurean views as "error is not in the senses but in the mind. "

Likewise it ought to be possible to articulate what it means to "prove" something.

On that last point I'm see the issue arise regularly: "Epicurus can't *prove* that the universe is infinite in size or eternal in time."

In my view, Epicurus had very sound reasoning as to why the universe as a whole cannot be otherwise. Obviously there are many local phenomena with specific circumstances which scientists are exploring. In Epicurus' time the question was the size of the sun, how magnets appear to generate action at a distance, and other poorly understood issues such as are listed in Book 6 of Lucretius.

Epicurus was very familiar that there are real-world issues like those for which we currently don't have adequate physical explanations.

But that didn't stop Epicurus from concluding that at the "ultimate" level of the universe as a whole, the javelin argument and similar hypotheticals are sufficient to conclude that we can be certain that no matter how far we go in space there's either "something" there or it not. Epicurus makes no claim to itemize what the various "somethings" might be, but he's say that from our human perspective it makes sense to categorize those things that affect us as

"something" and those things that don't affect us as "nothing to us."

That is a kind of working real-world perspective that will take us through life with a practical frame of analysis. It doesn't exclude the possibility that there are in fact advanced civilizations that can create and destroy solar systems and living beings like we can only do in movies. I think Frances Wright was correct to include that possibility in her book. But such beings are not "supernatural" from the "universe as a whole" perspective. The possibility that such beings exist does not therefore negate the "universe as a whole" being eternal or infinite in size.

But getting back to what it means to "prove" something: Suggesting that Epicurus' framework is not "proven" seems to me to be missing Epicurus' point entirely. It's rejecting his combined logic-human experience perspective and suggesting that we require a level of proof that is clearly impossible for a human to possess. It's ultimately "otherworldly" in nature, highly damaging to human happiness, and exists mainly to sneak in a form of absolute morality or Judeo-Christianity-lite just as Nietzsche was suggesting as to Kant. (*There's no god to justify my viewpoint, but I still think everyone should reach the same moral decisions - I'll just call it "categorical imperative"!)*

Not everyone is going to agree *completely* with how to analyze these basic issues, but I firmly think that a forum that is dedicated to promoting Epicurean philosophy is going to at largely end up in the same place on the general outline.

It appears to me that the ancient Epicureans thought it makes no sense whatsoever to allow such people to argue such things without pushback, as if they occupy some kind of Stoic / moralist high ground.

So I do think it's important to dispassionately clarify where the issues really are found. *After that* we can passionately take sides as to the implications of those issues - after we are clear on what they really are.