

# Article: Scientists in a race to discover why our Universe exists

Post by "Cassius" of May 20, 2025 at 1:10 PM

## [Quote from Rolf](#)

Related question: How does a modern-day Epicurean reconcile a) the predominant theory that the universe has a beginning with b) the Epicurean idea that the universe has no beginning and end?

Speaking for myself only, i consider this to be the intersection of philosophy vs "science," the latter word of which i find to be a word that is very ambiguous, easy to employ for political purposes, and thrown around far too loosely even by people who don't think they have an agenda. Some of that is discussed [here](#).

It doesn't bother me that the "predominant" theory is that the universe had a beginning because I take the position that these proponents are not addressing the question of "what caused or what was prior to that beginning." Unless they are willing to go on record that "what was before the beginning was god" - which is really what they are implying - then they are just kicking the ball down the road and adding nothing to the conversation. The question is not "how many times has our section of the universe knowable to us expanded and contracted. The question is "what put the whole thing in motion in the first place" and that is best answered by something to the effect that in all human experience nothing has ever been observed to come from nothing, and as a matter of principle I'm not going to entertain speculation without evidence.

As Eikadistes said, much of the apparent turmoil comes from people taking the "observable universe" and not limiting their conclusions to "the observable." Yes, the "observable" universe may be expanding and contracting, but that does not mean that what is beyond the observable is expanding and contracting in the same direction. Epicurus is talking about "the all" when he says that the all is eternal and infinite, not any particular part of it.

I was raised at a time when "universe" was meant to refer to "the all." I realize that people today talk about multiverses and the like, but that just kicks the ball down the road again. I see no need to depart from traditional usage -- universe means "all that exists" and I see no persuasive evidence that indicates that Epicurus was wrong that "the all that exists" has existed for ever, and will exist forever, and that it has no limit in terms of space or time.

You'll find that in Epicurus' own time he and others (Lucian for example) were engaged in battles with the "scientists of their day" who were using mathematics and geometry to speculate that the stars were gods, and reach conclusions that contradict basic Epicurean

physics as to the natural basis of the universe. There are always going to be such conflicts, just as there are now, and the way to deal with them is through understanding Epicurean canonic standards of proof for what is and is not real, and how you deal with theories based on limited information which would appear to contradict fundamental conclusions that are based on repeatable observation and have proven their usefulness over the ages. One such observation is "nothing comes from nothing" and until an instance of that can be established to occur then nothing that contradicts that premise should be entertained to even be possible.