

Tactical Question for the Group Re Terminology In Discussing Reason and Logic

Post by “Elayne” of January 21, 2021 at 1:28 PM

Wow, you are making a lot of straw man arguments [Cassius](#) . Conclusions about absence of gods can't be accurately made from logic. I would have insufficient confidence in a logic based conclusion. That would make me nervous.

I put my confidence in my first-hand observations of nature, and in the complete absence of evidence for supernatural gods. And whenever more detailed evidence is obtained, at the level too small or too far away to investigate without instruments, never has any researcher found any observations a god was needed to explain. They haven't included gods in their models because none are necessary. So I am saying that new observations which invalidate old models have not challenged the conclusions about absence of supernatural gods. At every level, from the simple to the complex-- no supernatural shows up.

You seem to want explanations which appeal to those with less education or intelligence, whether those explanations are correct or not. But a sturdy philosophy should not repel scientists who note inaccuracies or cling to conclusions that could result in less educated people feeling threatened by published reports about new observations. The philosophy must have integrity, so that the simple explanations are not saying inaccurate things. It is possible to state this material in simple ways without stating it inaccurately. In order to maintain structural integrity and be an ongoing source of reassurance, a philosophy has to occasionally adjust some of its statements about reality in response to new observations.