

# Question Re Thermodynamics And Deductive Reasoning v. Empiricism

Post by "Cassius" of October 4, 2019 at 1:32 PM

THIS is my position too:

[Quote from JJElbert](#)

In a hundred years our conception of physics might be as unrecognizable to us now as our models now would be to those living a century ago. For the practical student of philosophy, the ends remain unchanged. There continues to be no good evidence for the miraculous. The explanatory power of a hypothetical 'god' continues to be, as Neil DeGrasse Tyson put it, "an ever-receding pocket of scientific ignorance". And the stage is still too big for the drama.

Any of us could put down what we are doing, devote every waking moment to studying and pursuing the latest in physics, but I think we can say with confidence that at the end of that time we would still find questions to pursue which cannot be answered. We'd know a lot more, but have an entirely different set of questions.

And we can with certainty state that we'll still face the argument "How can I know FOR SURE? I wasn't there to see it myself!"

So we will always face a question of 'evidence' as to what we choose to accept as "final" for us, and what we choose to reject or hold open. And if that is the case, it makes sense right at the start to recognize the limits of how much knowledge we will ever accumulate, and instead of pouring every waking moment into physics books, think about the big picture of what we DO know, what we can practically do with our limited knowledge, and what kind and amount of evidence we are going to accept, given that we will never obtain "god-like certainty" or even "I was there" certainty about the answer.