

# Updated FAQ Entry: Why Should I Care About Epicurean Physics When So Much Science Has Changed In The Last 2000 Years?

Post by "Don" of June 18, 2026 at 7:21 AM

## [Quote from Peter Konstans](#)

First, we have to explore what motivates people to try to influence other people in general.

1. The answer is: to extract a desired reaction from them. In the case of influencers the desired reaction is likes, views, subscriptions etc.
2. Why are those reactions desired?
  1. Because those reactions bring them money.
3. And why do people want money?
  1. For the same reason they want energy. Money is effectively a form of energy as it can be converted to actual material goods and services.
4. And why do people seek energy?
  1. Well, they have evolved to aggressively seek it.
5. Why did they evolve to seek it?
  1. Because natural selection in humans favored strongly acquisitive behavior.
6. Why is natural selection the way life works?
  1. Eventually the answers will lead us to see reality for what it is: arrangements of quantum fields, everything else being an illusion that reflects our cognitive limitations as human beings.

[Etc...]

This whole digression into online "influencers" misses my point. I was using "influence" in the broad sense of simply getting people to do what you'd like them to do, from changing one's trivial opinions on where they'd like to go to supper to more serious matters like how they live their life.

The money issue seems to also be a tangent and one I'm not entirely sold on (pun intended). The only reason money can be exchanged for material goods is that we as a society have agreed to this shared social construct. "Money" is also a way that people try to signify their importance by concepts such as millionaire and billionaire. That money will never be able to purchase all possible material goods. It serves as a symbolic social status identifier. It also doesn't confer security as one has to be anxious about keeping it safe and other concerns.

There are a number of leaps in those bullet points and the rest of the post that I'm not willing to concede. I also don't see thatn last post resolving the contradiction about which I inquired. This has also taken this thread far afield from the pertinent discussion on determinism, fatalism, and Epicurean philosophy.

I'll agree that our choices are not *entirely* free of all constraints. We have general tendencies, dispositions, self-imposed and externally-imposed social constraints, etc. Even Epicurus states "some things happen by necessity, some by chance, and some by our own power." Some will argue fervently that it can only be necessity OR chance, that there is nothing we do that's "by our own power." I'm open to having my opinion influenced, but I'm not willing to entirely concede to not having anything determined "by my own power" for now.