

Another Article Insisting On The Importance of the Kinetic / Katestematic Distinction, Despite Citing Nikolsky

Post by "Cassius" of July 7, 2022 at 12:28 PM

Without taking the time to look back at the editing history of that entry, I would say that is a good example of how Wikipedia must be taken with a grain of salt. There really is no one who is an "authority" on this issue, so anyone who stands up to present a definition ought to be clear to state that there are experts on several sides of this question. I doubt seriously whether Gosling and Taylor of [Nikolsky](#) or any number of others would endorse that passage in whole.

Flatly stating something as if it accepted, without noting controversies, is a good way to pile misinformation on top of misinformation. That's pretty much the core thrust of the Epicurean sayings about waiting and not selecting only one position when the evidence is not clear.

And almost every phrase of that summary is open to serious question, and as it is I would say that entry does a lot more harm than good.

Just to be clear of course I do not mean to criticize anyone citing that article, because it's important for us to know that it is there, and we can't expect everyone to trace back every issue to its core..

But the cultural effect of a resource like Wikipedia appearing to be an arbiter of truth in an instance like this is really an interesting and not a positive thing.

I guess the ultimate Epicurean perspective is to always remember that there IS no "arbiter of truth" and we are always just doing the best we can to develop opinions consistent with the evidence in front of us.