

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

Post by "Cassius" of August 20, 2025 at 12:01 PM

Dave:

The primary example I have cited in the past is Lawrence Krauss and his book "A Universe from Nothing" which we've discussed in the context of the [Heraclitian Flux thread](#). We've also discussed Sabine Hossenfelder and her strongly determinist viewpoint.

But I know you're asking a much more general question, and it comes down to asking for specific cites to particular scientists to whom I object, in the absence of which it is your view that the concerns I have about these issues is unwarranted.

I would very much like to oblige you and go through specific citations, and in fact we could use AI questioning (as I believe I recall us doing in that other thread) to try to make the effort more manageable. Or as an alternative, we could look these issues up in Wikipedia and get a sense of the general drift of the majority viewpoints from their point of view. Over time I will do my best to satisfy you and those who ask these questions (as you are definitely not alone) with all the resources I can bring to bear on it. In fact this is one example why I have not agreed to ban all use of AI resources on the forum. Doing raw research on who takes what position is likely to be an excellent use of AI as a starting point for answering these questions.

But at the most basic level, we'll simply have to disagree as to what we individually observe from our own experiences. My observation is that not only are my general concerns not overstated, but they are in fact understated. In fact I think these issues are much more of a concern than is generally appreciated precisely for the reason that the observation is correct. It is my view that much of "science" has become so dominated by political and corporate considerations that it is not even acceptable to discuss the possibility that there is any suppression of dissent.

At the moment I have to budget my time and pick my battles, and I think it is much more important for me to focus on the "absence of pain" and "nature of pleasure" ethical issues, along with the epistemology questions that come into play, than it is to catalog the scientists who I believe to be on the wrong side of these issues.

I'll get back to this as I can find the time, because I do agree that the issue is important. But it is my strong perception that the battle over deference to experts in physics is closely related to issues of dogmatism and determinism that some people consider to be outside physics. If our physics issues were limited to "X scientists are right about subatomic particles and Y scientists are wrong," then there would seem to be no reason for urgency or concern over which set of

scientists is correct.

But it is precisely because the positions taken on physics do impact the other issues and have such clear implications for them that Lawrence Krauss and Richard Dawkins found it appropriate to argue. Again I do not defer to Richard Dawkins as a modern-day Epicurus, but if there is anyone sensitive to Epicurus's viewpoint as they conflict with modern attitudes, I would put Dawkins near the top of the list. It is my perception that Krauss sees the importance of the same conflict as does Dawkins, but from the opposite viewpoint. And I do not see Dawkins and Krauss as outliers, but as the tip of the iceberg.

If your experience has been different, and you see no scientists arguing these positions I am concerned about, then I'll take that as an encouraging data point and consider it in my future attention on this issue. But my own personal experience in attempting to keep current on educated but non-specialist literature over my adult life has led me to a strongly opposite conclusion.

But by all means let's continue this discussion now and over time and as long as anyone reading this thread is willing to continue it, because it's certainly a goal of mine to have more material developed on this extremely important issue.