

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

Post by "DaveT" of August 20, 2025 at 11:22 AM

[Cassius](#) [Bryan](#) [Rolf](#) I'm sorry to say this discussion makes me believe there are two points of argument that do not intersect. I'm not sure [Cassius](#) and [Bryan](#) are relying on the same language as I have been using about the scientific process. Let me restate my point of analysis and then ask you for further clarification.

Scientific inquiry in the modern sense demands that actual experiments prove theoretical (mathematical) evidence to the satisfaction of the entire community of that discipline. This is the consensus that the scientific process demands before something satisfies the experts as true.

The community does this process to the best of its ability to disprove the theoretical concept. Scientists who propose theories, and who present actual experiments to prove their theories, demand that their colleagues disprove their experimental results as they try to advance the field of knowledge. So, only after someone propounds a theory and other scientists either prove it repeatedly in experiments or disprove it, does a consensus get reached. The community cannot decide something as true to the best of its ability before that.

Now, for example, the priestly class, which I do not follow as experts, always tries to protect its own expertise against challenge, rather than invite efforts to challenge their beliefs (which often have no discernible proofs anyway). This is especially true of the priests of the peoples of the book: Jews, Christians, and Muslims. When people consider any book inspired and immutable, priests claim the sole right to interpret those books, solicit no challenges, and deny all challenges.

Isn't the distinction between the two clear? One protects ancient truths against all comers, and the other invites all comers to disprove past beliefs (or a proposed new discovery).

Now, I know this may cut deep as I explain my understanding of these topics, but I think a discussion of this topic can be illuminating if we understand our points better. So, for example, the assertions that there are "others" out there who use science to attack Epicurus' beliefs has confused me. In law and debate, referring to an unnamed party to make a point is called creating a straw man. Surely, to have a fair discussion if a theoretical straw man is used to support an argument, we can't get far in understanding each other.

For example:

Quote from [Cassius](#) "I think that Epicurus would reject that attitude even if he were here today. and especially if he were here today to see the effects of some scientists - by no means all - making similar claims." Who specifically are the scientists you refer to?

And [Cassius](#) "But despite their expertise in specific subject areas, claims of mysticism, radical skepticism, and total determinism are already adequately proved to be false." Who claim mysticism radical skepticism and total determinism?

And [Cassius](#): "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." Declining fast? Where is this observed? Tolerance of proclaiming? (experimental proof is not a proclamation, nor an opinion) How is it a bug? and who is deferring to which experts?

And [Bryan](#) "If someone says they have a particular knowledge that you cannot access -- but from their knowledge they then teach you something that contradicts your experience, then they have all the intellectual power. They may as well have hypnotized you! How can anyone else have contradictory experience to challenge an expert if it is knowledge they cannot access?

They can then say absurd things such as "matter has no fundamental form" or that "matter can generate from no matter" -- which comes from religious assumptions and is supported by self-referencing mathematics not scientific real-life observations. In this way they cover your eyes and remove all your footing." Who are these people (the they)? Religious assumptions of whom? Do you perceive specific scientists to be trying to cover the eyes of anyone?

I'm hoping my clarifications are useful, and look forward to more clarity overall in this discussion.