

What If Anything Has Changed About Human Nature In the Last 2000 Years?

Post by "Cassius" of January 8, 2024 at 9:50 AM

BrainToBeing I apologize for not being able to follow this thread more closely - I have been traveling on business and extremely short of time. Here's a place where I will hop back in:

[Quote from BrainToBeing](#)

Therefore, I'm smart enough to know I don't know everything and cannot exclude the possibility of God. In my journey I simply leave the issue as undecided.

...And if that position works for you, and you feel no stress or strain in your life by "leaving the issue as undecided," then I say more power to you!

And while I expect that Epicurus would likely tell you something similar (that what doesn't bother you is of no concern), the project Epicurus was on as a philosophical and moral reformer was that of developing a full "worldview" that could be of help to those people Lucretius described as "hearts in darkness" or Diogenes of Oinoanda described as "lost sheep." I would wager that you as a science professional have developed knowledge and capabilities that only a very small fraction of the world has ever or will ever duplicate, and Epicurus was addressing his philosophy to those ordinary people for whom these questions of life after death and supernatural gods are of great immediate concern. Epicurus' position, with which I would agree, is that it is necessary to deal forthrightly with those critical issues and not remain in "doubt" (which is itself a pain) on these subjects. There has been and probably will always be a continuing tension between a philosophical approach to questions of epistemology vs a "clinical" approach where someone is comfortable taking the position "this is all I know" and stopping. Observation alone is not going to get someone past that question of how to deal with what cannot be observed. There's lots of good material out there on the debates between philosophers and scientists, and in the end the bigger questions of life that people must act upon are in the realm of philosophy, which (when you are a part of the Epicurean school) leads to the rejection of radical skepticism as a tenable position.

I haven't been able to read this thread closely enough to tell where you are on those issues other than to observe that you are dedicated scientist, and in the end "science" is not the same as "philosophy." I'm not sure I can adequately define the difference, but maybe that is something that needs to be addressed in this conversation.