

# Sunday Zoom - August 17, 2025 - 12:30 PM ET - Topic: "All Sensations Are True"

Post by "Cassius" of August 19, 2025 at 7:43 AM

[Quote from Rolf](#)

even when they have a higher degree of expertise than you?

I think the key is in this part of the question. I certainly admit that there are many people with more expertise in many subjects than I have. Doctors know more medicine, computer scientists know more programming, and so on down the line.

But despite their expertise in specific subject areas, claims of mysticism, radical skepticism, and total determinism are already adequately proved to be false. And there is no good reason to hold open a possibility in one's mind that they will ever prove to be true.

Proof of mysticism would require not simply proof of a force stronger than ourselves. In fact it's part of the philosophy that there are many living beings in the universe other than ourselves on earth, and that we expect some of them to be more technologically advanced than we are. There may in fact be intelligent forces in operation in our world now or in the past which we do not currently recognize. We will likely soon visit Mars and then eventually leave our solar system and visit other parts of the universe, and it is possible that others from other parts of the universe have already visited ours. But there are thousands of years of human experience (observation plus deductive reasoning) to establish that the forces of nature operate on regular principles which are consistent with having a fixed nature. There is no evidence or logical reasoning based on that evidence to postulate an intelligent force behind the universe \*as a whole.\*

Proof of radical skepticism would require evidence that \*nothing\* in the universe has a regular consistency that can be predicted. There is no real reason to argue this one further other than to observe that many things are in fact known and deserve to be considered facts of reality.

Proof of total determinism would be on the same order as proof of radical skepticism. Epicurean philosophy firmly holds that many things are in fact determined by purely physical factors, but the issue is that not \*all\* things are so determined. In our (and my), own experience we have held the ability to affect how our future lives will be lived, and that is sufficient proof of the point.

All of these are issues on which Epicurus had every reason to be confident in his day, and we today have 2000 years more evidence that confirms that he was right to be confident then.

But there is one more thing I would add to this analysis, and that is that experience also shows that there are people who are strongly motivated to push this issue for reasons that also have to be acknowledged to exist. There are no supernatural forces, and knowledge is possible, but because humans have free will they are free to postulate the opposite, and there is a lot of power to be gained and money to be made in doing just that.

The arguments made by Lucretius at the beginning of his poem about the priests spinning tales, and the arguments by Lucian in *Alexander the Oracle Monger* and the other citations go in exactly that direction. It is for that reason that the Epicurean approach is so important. Certain people will always find it in their self-interest to throw around fear, uncertainty, and doubt as a means of manipulating people who are not steeled against this by the Epicurean approach. It is not true that there are mystical forces, it is not true that all things are predetermined, and it is not true that knowledge is impossible, but it certainly is true that there are people who will make such claims, and it is therefore necessary to have a proper understanding of why they are wrong.