

# Epicurus' Prolepsis vs Heraclitus' Flux

Post by "Martin" of July 10, 2025 at 5:40 AM

Response to Bryan's comment #19:

Quote

"A lot of data has been automatically bent to fit incorrect assumptions."

No!

Quote

"Every year there are many good students, potential physicists, who do not accept the current model and therefore have been turned away from the priesthood."

I did not encounter such students while I studied physics in Cologne. So, the many good is "exaggerated" if not outright wrong. Being able to apply established models to solve simple problems usually assures graduation. You do not have to accept the current model as "true" or adequate to graduate.

In Germany, more than half of the students who start studying physics give up, mostly because they are just bridging the time until getting accepted for another subject or at another university. The second most common reason is that the mathematics courses in the first year, i.e. just mathematics as a tool set to be mastered without reference to physics, is too difficult for them. I never heard of disagreement with the "current model" as a reason.

Quote

"Real atoms are too small for machines to detect, and what looks like the bending of space is really just the effect of "oceans" of these invisible atoms and their wakes."

No! Electrons and photons are adequately described as elementary particles, i.e. "atoms" in Epicurus' sense, and can be detected by our equipment. "Invisible atoms and their wakes" sounds more like Heraclitus' flux than Epicurus' atomism.