

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

Post by “Cassius” of January 22, 2021 at 4:13 PM

OK I have to apologize to everyone for being so distracted today that I have been delayed in responding more completely. As for myself, I continue to see this exchange as totally productive and a good-faith difference in perspective among friends. I do not doubt for a moment the good faith of everyone involved. I don't insist that my friends see everything the same way I do, nor do I let my friends insist that I see things their way.

I do, however, doubt the good faith of people like Lawrence Krauss, especially after watching his debate on [something from nothing](#) with Richard Dawkins. I believe that history has shown that scientists are every bit as open to errors of prejudice and bias and self-interest as anyone else, and I believe that nothing revolutionary has happened in human nature in the last 100 years to think that those errors of bias and prejudice and self-interest have been or ever can be eliminated.

Elli in referring to Epicurus I was mainly referring to those mathematicians whose mathematics was indeed in retrospect pretty good in calculating the size of the sun. It seems to me that Epicurus doubted them in large part because of what he perceived was their lack of good faith in arguing for conclusions beyond the scope of their facts. That remains a hazard today.

Here's my list of views that I personally hold but expect no one else to consider as evidence any more than they would consider the nonsense of any other dottering old fool. I've never suggested that anyone should take my point of view on anything, as a matter of fact. All I do is take the material I can find on Epicurus and interpret it in a way that seems the most persuasive to me. That's all I can do and of course everyone is entitled to their own opinion. These are mine. In each of these I should probably add "And I do not believe that any evidence to the contrary is conclusive" -- but that get's tiresome. These are my conclusions at this point in my life:

- I do not believe that the universe as a whole was ever created at a single point in time.
- I do not believe that the universe as a whole will ever come to an end.
- I do not believe that the universe has a size limit.
- I do not believe that the things we see around us are infinitely divisible.
- I do not believe that the viewpoint that the universe is composed of solid bodies and void has entirely lost its usefulness.
- I do not believe that any enumeration of elemental particles would ever come to an end.
- I do not believe that from any realistic viewpoint that the elementary particles, no matter how we define them, are motionless.

- I do not believe that the universe as a whole has a center (or floor, walls, or ceiling, for that matter)
- I firmly believe that elemental parties have a capacity that is reasonably describable as being capable of swerving at no fixed time and no fixed place

To me, that leaves me in broad agreement with the fundamental assertions of Epicurean physics quite well.

So to compare this to the [original list of twelve](#), the only one that my understanding that truly indisputable modern science would say needs revision would be eleven and perhaps nine.

[PN 01](#) Matter is uncreatable.

[PN 02](#) Matter is indestructible.

[PN 03](#) The universe consists of solid bodies and void.

[PN 04](#) Solid bodies are either compounds or simple.

[PN 05](#) The multitude of atoms is infinite.

[PN 06](#) The void is infinite in extent.

[PN 07](#) The atoms are always in motion.

[PN 08](#) The speed of atomic motion is uniform.

[PN 09](#) Motion is linear in space, vibratory in compounds.

[PN 10](#) Atoms are capable of swerving slightly at any point in space or time.

[PN 11](#) Atoms are characterized by three qualities: weight, shape and size.

[PN 12](#) The number of the different shapes is not infinite, merely innumerable.

Now of course I am not saying that modern science does not have lots of detail that can be applied to stating these more accurately or in ways that would significantly revise them. But I think each of these can be interpreted in a way that remains consistent with what I understand to be modern science.

Now is Lawrence Krauss and / or other people going to tell me that my views are obsolete and that I need to spend more time in physics classes.? Sure. And he'll go to his grave doing his best to make sense of the evidence in front of him, as I will to mine.

I know it's somewhat uncomfortable to talk about these issues so frankly, but my analysis is that it helps everyone to think about these issues and see where people stand. I never represent that I am a physicist, and I freely admit that many physicists don't seem to agree

with these conclusions.

I do what I do because it is enjoyable and satisfying on many different levels, and as Epicurus said "In a philosophical discussion he who is defeated gains more, since he learns more."

And I say all this with a smile and is as good a humor as ever! 😊