

Must All Things That Have A Beginning Have An End?

Post by "Cassius" of May 1, 2025 at 11:43 AM

Ok so now I remember why I connect this back to DeWitt's discussion of the gods having to act to maintain their own deathlessness.

it is logically deducible from experience that given the way the universe generally operates, components which have come together will at some point be broken apart. Our earth does not have an unlimited life-span.

However it is not logically deducible as an overriding rule *when* that breaking apart will occur, except by looking at local circumstances. There's no necessity that could not theoretically be defeated through technology to enforce any limit to how long humanity or a single person can live. Even the destruction of the earth or our solar system or galaxy could be outlived by going somewhere else if technology is available to do so. The universe itself is immortal for reasons stated in 5-351 (there's no place outside it), so there's no necessity to perish with any part of the universe *if* you have the capacity to move from destroyed place to stable place.

As for practical application of this, while it *might* be appropriate to say that all men up to today's technology must die, there's no necessary limit as to "when" that must take place, other than the local circumstances of the people involved. People who have the ability to move so as to remain in safe environments, and who have better technology to control aging, will live longer, with no theoretical limit if their ability to move and improve their technology keeps pace with the dangers.

It would seem likely that something like this is where the "intermundia" theory came from.