

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

Post by "Cassius" of August 19, 2025 at 9:39 AM

[Quote from DaveT](#)

I don't think scientific endeavor used by mainstream scientists exploring and testing the boundaries of physics, have an agenda to prove there are mystical realms or that knowledge is impossible.

I see that as raising the same issue Bryan raised. Who has the authority to say what is "mainstream" and what is not? And if "mainstream" is defined as the majority position, then we are to follow science by majority vote? I suspect it was in a context like this that Philodemus made the aside that democracy is or can be the worst form of government.

[Quote from DaveT](#)

And even those scientists (thinkers and experimenters) who are exploring the degree to which human behavior is entirely mechanistic, i.e. biologically and environmentally determined, will admit that theirs is a minority opinion so far.

And in regard to this, that's a very important "so far" there at the end, and I it is my observation that tolerance of opinions which dissent from that which is proclaimed to be "mainstream" by the majority is declining fast. And that's an inherent bug (or feature) of the deference to experts in matters of philosophy vs. science. You're quite right that many scientists are not willing to state their personal beliefs as to where their opinions lead, so there's an inherent bias toward more and more accumulation of power by those who proclaim that they alone have the expertise to even ask the questions, much less answer them.

i wish I were overstating this problem and I want to keep a bright line against discussing modern politics, but we can find ample illustrations of this problem throughout history, even if we exclude the events of the last 200 years. I don't expect the devoted skeptics or determinists or mysticists to seriously entertain my opinions any more than I seriously entertain theirs, but history has shown that the Epicurean viewpoint is the minority, and the majority are always all-too-ready to enforce their opinions on "science" just as much as on religion or any other subject.

I'm glad there are (were) people like Daniel Dennet promoting compatibilist views, but it's a constant effort to keep the free flow of information and opinions going.

And that what takes us back to the central issue -- do we simply defer to "experts" and get out of their way when they proclaim that modern science makes Epicurean philosophy (except for the ice cream and friendship and tranquility part) totally obsolete? I'd say of course not.