

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

**Post by "DaveT" of August 21, 2025 at 10:48 AM**

[Cassius](#) **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. \*\*\* It is my perception that Krauss sees the importance of the same conflict as does Dawkins, but from the opposite viewpoint."**

I do want to honor your desire to focus more on the ethics, which I principally enjoy studying as well. However, it would have been clearer and helpful to show what particular physics topics you are referring to here as impacting other topics.

I followed your lead but only quickly reviewed Krauss' and Dawkins' professional relations. I see that they have a long history of collaboration rather than argument. Indeed, Dawkins wrote the *Afterward* to Krauss' mentioned book mentioned by you, *A Universe From Nothing*. Looking further, apparently they did initially have different views on the degree to which science and faith could coexist. Krauss was early in favor in order to ease the conflict between the two, and Dawkins opposed. However, Krauss, while asserting that the universe can have occurred without the involvement of any divine hand, apparently has abandoned the view of coexistence that for public acceptance of the science and he is more in line with Dawkins belief in the incompatibility of the two.

[Cassius](#) **"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."** This seems somewhat accurate regarding his position on ongoing Divine Providence, but of course they differ in that Epicurus acknowledged disinterested gods and I expect Dawkins does not acknowledge them at all.

[Cassius](#) **"And I do not see Dawkins and Krauss as outliers, but as the tip of the iceberg."**

And here, I'm not clear on the iceberg reference. What iceberg? If it refers to atheistic science, I see them both agreeing, but rather than sharing a tip, they are part of the entire iceberg threatening the Abrahamic religions of the Western world, indeed all other faiths proclaiming divine creation and involvement in the universe.

Last, I don't see any actual conflict between Krauss' cosmology and physics and Epicurus' physics. As far as determinism versus indeterminism is concerned, the same goes. I'm quite content to follow the experimental proofs to see if the appropriate scientific community finds consensus on any theoretical proposition, as I've discussed earlier. This process continues, and

consensus may take many years to reach, even beyond my lifetime. I'm fine with that.  
Of course, I don't need an immediate response, so please respond at your convenience.