

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

**Post by “Elayne” of January 22, 2021 at 8:17 AM**

Ack. Relying primarily on observations does not mean we can't make pragmatic conclusions. I thought last night I was "done" with trying to explain myself but lol ☹️ apparently I am not!

1) The universe was not created by a supernatural god and this has not one thing to do with how long it has existed. There is no observational OR logical connection between those two things. So don't worry about new theories regarding the beginning of the universe.

2) Not having "space" outside the universe for a supernatural god has not a single thing to do with there not being one. Such a being would still have to take action within the universe to be relevant to us, and it doesn't happen. There's space outside my living room but that doesn't mean I need to consider a magical unicorn being outside. Besides, this argument does not dissuade supernaturalists who believe in a supernatural realm apart from the material one, a realm invisible to all our instruments. The idea of material "room" would just make them roll their eyes. Recognize this as an endless "god of the gaps" situation and move on.

3) We don't quite know yet how stability and predictability work at the smallest level, but we can clearly observe it happening at the macro level, so we do know these are properties of matter and energy.

4) He who says he knows nothing may be technically correct, because the tiny degree of uncertainty is there, but it has no bearing on our lives unless we get obsessed with it. If getting obsessed with it causes a person maximum pleasure, then that's fine, but if it causes anxiety, there's therapy to get over obsessions. No amount of evidence can relieve someone's anxiety, according to evidence, but therapy can be extremely helpful. \*\*\*\* When someone clings to a conceptual conclusion as if adjusting it would make reality disintegrate before their eyes, given that reality doesn't in fact disintegrate, this is a dysfunctional anxiety situation as well and may not respond to more data.

5) The most unreliable logic is casual; formal logic eliminates some of those errors; and the most reliable procedure is to spend time making observations from senses and feelings for premises, and when you form deductive models from those observations, remember that no abstract model can ever fully replace reality, models are thus inherently incomplete (the word "pleasure" is not the same as the feeling of pleasure), and even a deductive model is abstract. Models can be pragmatically useful despite being incomplete. Always subject your deductive models to the available evidence. Be aware of your innate pattern recognitions and of your concepts, and remember that these patterns, such as the sensation of justice, are experiential, and that there is no material item "justice" that is the same for every person.