

# Unfortunate New Film: "The Story Of Everything" (Pushes Intelligent Design)

**Post by "Cassius" of April 26, 2026 at 8:40 PM**

The new film referenced below has just come to my attention, and as part of my ongoing campaign to make sure that we engage forcefully with the intelligent design argument, I'll work on addressing it in several ways. First, this thread can be used to discuss this new film to be released on April 30. No doubt it will get some amount of social media play and it would be good to develop a set of links that could be used to post in response.

Not in direct response, but I've also been working on two articles I will be posting separately over the coming days which relate to intelligent design and similar issues.

Apparently a lot of money has been poured into this particular film project. These guys never let up and we need to keep our game sharp too.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S34XfCx6N2s&list=PLIBtb\\_NuIJ1z\\_YMwzURpyE6etbnx9VSL6](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=S34XfCx6N2s&list=PLIBtb_NuIJ1z_YMwzURpyE6etbnx9VSL6)

[The Story of Everything | Documentary Film on Cosmic Design in Theaters April 30th](#)

Discover evidence of intentional design across the cosmos in The Story of Everything. In theaters April 30th  
thestoryofeverything.film

---

**Post by "TauPhi" of April 26, 2026 at 9:23 PM**

## [Quote from Cassius](#)

The new film referenced below has just come to my attention, and as part of my ongoing campaign to make sure that we engage forcefully with the intelligent design argument, I'll work on addressing it in several ways.

Why do you think we should forcefully engage with the intelligent design argument? We may as well start discussing the shape of our planet with flat earthers. What's the point? You can change intelligent design worldview in people as much as they can change your worldview to intelligent design. You can't. They can't. Forceful engagement on both sides seems to me to be

<http://www.epicureanfriends.com/thread/5060-unfortunate-new-film-the-story-of-everything-pushes-intelligent-design/>

a complete waste of time.

---

### **Post by “Cassius” of April 26, 2026 at 10:38 PM**

#### [Quote from TauPhi](#)

Why do you think we should forcefully engage with the intelligent design argument? We may as well start discussing the shape of our planet with flat earthers. What's the point? You can change intelligent design worldview in people as much as they can change your worldview to intelligent design. You can't. They can't. Forceful engagement on both sides seems to me to be a complete waste of time.

I think that because the point of this forum is to study and promote Epicurean philosophy, just as Epicurus and Lucretius and Diogenes of Oinoanda and every other well known Epicurean did in the ancient world. Large portions of Lucretius' poem and other Epicurean writings were devoted explicitly to this topic, because back then - a now - the intelligent design argument is a pivotal aspect of Stoicism and most religions. Education of those who don't already know about the faults of religious reasoning starts with Principal Doctrine 1 and runs throughout the philosophy.

I recognize that not everyone here is interested in the "educational" aspect of communicating Epicurus to others. Just as with everything here, everyone does not have to participate in every aspect of the forum activities.

---

### **Post by “TauPhi” of April 26, 2026 at 10:54 PM**

Education and promotion of Epicurean philosophy and forceful engagement are two different things. Education and promotion gives people choice to decide what works for them. Forceful engagement is a lost cause. No-one wants to be forced to deal with someone else arguments.

---

### **Post by “Cassius” of April 27, 2026 at 4:24 AM**

"Forceful engagement" does not mean forcing anything on anybody. It means engaging in the public debate clearly and strongly and making one's views open to those who are willing to listen and are interested, just as the ancient Epicureans did.

I don't think many people here are likely to misinterpret my terminology, but I do observe that some are apt to push back against the idea of "outreach." Therefore I am adding the following to the FAQ:

Thread

### **[New FAQ Entry - Is Epicurean Philosophy Purely a Matter of Personal Self-Improvement, or Does It Have a Missionary / Outreach Aspect?](#)**

#### **Is Epicurean Philosophy Purely a Matter of Personal Self-Improvement, or Does It Have a Missionary / Outreach Aspect?**

The short answer is emphatically the latter: Epicurean philosophy has a strong and explicit outreach mission built into it from the very beginning. The common modern image of the Epicurean as a quietly self-satisfied person who has retired from the world to cultivate private pleasures is a serious distortion -- one rooted largely in centuries of hostile characterization by Stoic...



Cassius

April 27, 2026 at 4:19 AM

---

#### **Post by "Don" of April 27, 2026 at 11:13 PM**

OH GODS! The "interview" is from *PRAGER U*?? Please don't bother engaging with [Prager U](#) propaganda!

And the "film" is one of those propaganda films that will end up getting shown in megachurches and fawned over by the faithful. [The Story of Everything](#) seems to be one of those "Case for Christ" "documentaries" it appears to me.

<https://sypher.studio/> evidently also has a "film" entitled "After Death" as in "a captivating and thought-provoking documentary that delves into the enigmatic question that has fascinated humanity for centuries: What happens when we die? Through a combination of personal accounts, scientific research, philosophical discussions, and exploration of best-selling stories of

near-death experiences, the film takes viewers on a profound journey of discovery. " Will you want to forcefully engage with that one, too?

The never-ending slop out there that could potentially be countered and engaged with is infinite!


From my perspective, putting out pro-Epicurean quality materials is better than trying to engage with this kind of propaganda.

Engaging in the public debate, unfortunately, nowadays, probably means engaging on social media: posting rebuttal links, etc. The BIG/HUGE/GINORMOUS problem with engaging in that forum is that the majority of commenters and social media posts are from chatbots or worse. One is arguing against a machine trying to get people to become engaged for clicks and eyeballs.

I was literally engaging with the "intelligent design" debate as far back as high school when I wrote a scathing (to my teenage mind) rebuttal to a pro-intelligent design speaker who came to our high school and spoke to an auditorium full of us impressionable youths. I don't think their arguments have gotten any better, only slicker.

I don't have a good answer to all this, but the Prager U tag on that interview video makes my head explode. They are dangerous and trying to inculcate young students and school in conservative areas are using THEIR materials to teach history, economics, science, etc. THAT'S where the real danger lies in my opinion:


Image not found or type unknown



[‘Masquerading as a university’: inside the brazen rightwing plan to conquer American schools](#)

As teachers eagerly adopt its free lesson plans and the White House boosts its videos, PragerU is intent on one goal: attracting young people to conservatism  
www.theguardian.com

Image not found or type unknown




[Why critics are alarmed about the influence of PragerU's educational videos](#)

The rise of edutainment, the integration of entertainment with educational content, has become a billion-dollar industry. The conservative PragerU has...

[www.pbs.org](http://www.pbs.org)

Image not found or type unknown



### [Inside PragerU's conservative push into American classrooms](#)

PragerU is a conservative video giant. It's produced more than 2,000 videos that it says promote American and Judeo-Christian values. Now its content is...

[www.wbur.org](http://www.wbur.org)

...and not some film that will have a short shelf life other than for Christian congregations film night.

*PS If this post is too political feel free to delete. You've evidently hit a nerve in me.*

---

**Post by "Cassius" of April 28, 2026 at 12:11 AM**

<http://www.epicureanfriends.com/thread/5060-unfortunate-new-film-the-story-of-everything-pushes-intelligent-design/>

Yes I completely agree about Prager U, and it definitely looks like they are associated with production of the film as well.

---

## Post by “Joshua” of April 28, 2026 at 1:22 AM

### Quote

The second part of metaphysics, is the inquiry of final causes, which we note not as wanting, but as ill-placed; these causes being usually sought in physics, not in metaphysics, to the great prejudice of philosophy; for the treating of final causes in physics has driven out the inquiry of physical ones, and made men rest in specious and shadowy causes, without ever searching in earnest after such as are real and truly physical. And this was not only done by Plato, who constantly anchors upon this shore; but by Aristotle, Galen, and others, who frequently introduce such causes as these: “*The hairs of the eyelids are for a fence to the sight. The bones for pillars whereon to build the bodies of animals. The leaves of trees are to defend the fruit from the sun and wind. The clouds are designed for watering the earth,*” etc. All which are properly alleged in metaphysics; but in physics are impertinent, and as remoras<sup>1</sup> to the ship, that hinder the sciences from holding on their course of improvement, and **introducing a neglect of searching after physical causes.** And therefore the natural philosophies of Democritus and others, who allow no God or mind in the frame of things, but attribute the structure of the universe to infinite essays and trials of nature, or what they call fate or fortune, and assigned the causes of particular things to the necessity of matter without any intermixture of final causes, seem, so far as we can judge from the remains of their philosophy, much more solid, and to have gone deeper into nature, with regard to physical causes, than the philosophy of Aristotle or Plato; and this only because they never meddled with final causes, which the others were perpetually inculcating. Though in this respect Aristotle is more culpable than Plato, as banishing God, the fountain of final causes, and substituting nature in his stead; and, at the same time, receiving final causes through his affection to logic, not theology.

-Sir Francis Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning*

<sup>1</sup>A marine suckerfish, which was thought of old to hinder the progress of sailing ships by attaching itself via suction to the hull.

## Post by "Cassius" of April 28, 2026 at 8:58 AM

This is a particularly good line:

*Though in this respect Aristotle is more culpable than Plato, as banishing God, the fountain of final causes, and substituting nature in his stead; and, at the same time, receiving final causes through his affection to logic, not theology.*

It seems like pretty well accepted that Plato and his cave and ideal forms was the wrong path, but Aristotle seems to get a pass that he does not deserve.

---

## Post by "Joshua" of April 28, 2026 at 2:46 PM

We were chatting on a Sunday zoom a few weeks ago when someone mentioned the parallel that can be drawn between the physics of Epicurus (mutually exclusive atoms and void) and the ethics of Epicurus (mutually exclusive pleasure and pain).

I tried to explain that in Aristotle there is a different parallel--a parallel between the square of opposition in the four classical elements on the one hand, and the square of opposition in logic on the other. One implication might be that logic is rooted in the very fabric of the cosmos, independent of mind or language. This might relate to our broader conversation as to the difference between the Cartesian dictum *cogito ergo sum*, and the Jeffersonian; "I feel, therefore I exist."

---

## Post by "Cassius" of April 28, 2026 at 4:12 PM

Well duh sometimes I wonder if Cassius can walk and chew gum at the same time. While we wait for the Epicurean combination of Richard Dawkins and Victor Stenger to arrive, I can at least use the method we've been discussing to provide *something* to those who would be interested in an Epicurus-themed response. I'm reminded of the cliché about lots of things being possible when you don't care who gets the credit. I'll get something started and then I can incorporate suggestions from others over time, as with the other articles.

Please stand by.

---

**Post by “Cassius” of April 28, 2026 at 4:48 PM**

I am sure others can do better and I hope they will. In the meantime, I have set up a first version of an article on this topic at the link below. This is a particularly good example of where collaboration can make for a better product. I will have to retain editorial control over the article to prevent it from turning into a camel designed by committee, as the article is long already, but i am sure that there are points not raised in the article that could be fruitfully added. Please submit commentary on it in [the designated discussion thread](#). I'll eventually publish it over on substack for wider circulation.



Blog Article

## [Epicurean Responses To The Intelligent Design Argument](#)

### **Introduction: A Very Old Argument**

The intelligent design argument is one of the oldest and most persistent claims in the history of human thought. In its simplest form it says: the world we observe is too complex, too orderly, and too well-fitted to human life to have arisen without purpose. Something designed it. Something ordered it. Something or someone stands behind the apparent organization of nature and is responsible for that organization existing. Whether that something is called God,...



Cassius

April 28, 2026 at 4:41 PM