

# What Would Epicurus Think of the Big Bang?

Post by “Cassius” of January 15, 2024 at 1:12 PM

## [Quote from Bryan](#)

yet nevertheless states that there are “parts of which no one on the planet understands,”

Giving Tong (the presenter) the benefit of the doubt (that the person who suggested that part of the equation understood what he was suggesting) to me this emphasizes how necessary it is to understand the limits of the equation rather than oversell it. In the end, can you take that overall equation and actually do anything with it other than perhaps predict the output of some experiment that you've developed in parallel with the equation? It's not like being able to conceptually state the equation is equivalent to an incantation that can bring something into being from nothing. In the end you are always working from what was there already to change it, not bringing something into being from nothing.

## [Quote from Bryan](#)

After all, who will choose to seek what he can never find?

This is a line that strikes me as super-important every time I read that. I remember years ago in a Facebook discussion someone made the comment "But yeah, people do that all the time," and he was probably right that they do, at least in a way. But in most cases sane people don't keep searching for things that they know they can never find, and that's where the philosophical point comes in that you have to have an opinion about whether something really exists or not before you decide to invest your life into looking for it. And it seems to me pretty important to start off at the very beginning of this discussion finding some common ground and being clear about the playing field. People like Tong and those who are persuaded by Epicurus are confident that natural answers exist which could answer the questions if we had further details, and so we go on pursuing those details. But that presumption that there is a natural answer is a big one, and can't be left to implication.

## [Quote from Bryan](#)

how can the empty be represented? What then are they?... for films which are so subtle and lack the depth of a solid constitution cannot possibly possess these faculties.”

Yep. That's a visual description of the disconnect. No way that they video of the globs moving around is what most people would understand by the term "empty."

### [Quote from Bryan](#)

I feel that the explanation the presenter repeats -- basically the endorsed explanation since the world wars -- simply takes pre-suppositions from other schools, which are contrary to our school, and then labors to argue that recent experiments and technological advances prove their pre-suppositions correct.

Yep. I don't see a reason why most of what is being said could not be stated in traditional "universe means everything" and "nothing means nothing" terms. It's as if somewhere along the line someone decided to intentionally shift the traditional meanings of the words explicitly to undercut the Epicurean interpretation of an eternal and infinite universe. In fact the more I think about it, what possible "good" reason was there to shift the meaning of "universe" and "nothing" \*other than\* to distance themselves from the ultimate conclusions?