

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

Post by "TauPhi" of April 3, 2026 at 8:54 AM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

After 2000 years of Judeo-Christianity and all sorts of philosophical regression, and over 500 years of Pythagoreanism and Platonism and Academic Skepticism and even Democriteanism before that, what has happened is essentially the same thing as a "mind virus at the kernel level" which has destroyed any progress that Epicurus made with his canonic.

If that's the case, Epicurus was the One. Every philosopher before and after him was and is infected with a "mind virus"? I'm pretty sure this attitude will not get you far in promoting Epicurean philosophy.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

The virus is the idea that "proof" or "proving something" requires omniscience, omniscience, and omnipresence -- an unhuman an inhuman level of "certainty" that is impossible by definition for a human to reach. This mind virus has destroyed the ability of many people to think that anything can be "proven" or anything can be "known" or that anything can be "real" if it fails to meet such an impossible standard.

In that case I think almost all of us are safe. I literally don't know anyone who thinks that proving something requires omniscience, omniscience, and omnipresence. Proofs, knowledge and reality are very much within a grasp and abilities of most people.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

This is why I think philosophy has regressed so far since the Epicurean period. Rather than accept Epicurus' position that there is a reasonable standard of proof grounded in the senses in which the mind IS and SHOULD BE ACKNOWLEDGED to be able to prove things in human terms, such a position is denounced as the ultimate sin. Some will say "sin against god" but the majority of modern philosophers and intelligentsia will consider it a "sin against humanism" in a "good-without-god" kind of way.

Nope. What you described here is not the ultimate sin. In science it's called five sigma and it's a statistical significance which scientists agreed on to call a phenomenon proved to be true. No omniscience, omniscience nor omnipresence is required. In day to day life people are much less

strict than that. We only need to recognize a pattern to call something proven. If I hit my finger with a hammer it hurts. If I do it once more it hurts again. I established a pattern and I've proven that hitting fingers with hammers hurts. No-one goes ad infinitum hitting themselves with a hammer because they think it wasn't proven enough that the activity brings pain every time. That's human knowledge. It may be limited but it's ours and our limitations don't mean no knowledge is possible.

I find it really weird that you constantly try to claim that there's only 'Epicurus' truth' or 'nothing can be proven at all' as the alternative. And narrative where you accuse many people over millenia to be infected with "mind virus" and philosophers other than Epicurus to be regressive doesn't promote Epicurean philosophy at all. It makes it sound insane.