

Fixed or Unfixed

Post by “Elayne” of January 5, 2020 at 8:59 AM

This is definitely worth discussing.

Not to beat a dead horse, but I consider my own philosophy to be "the philosophy of reality"-- some aspects of reality are not changed by conversations among friends, such as the speed of light, but others are, such as the feelings of those in the conversation. Sometimes the conversation may include discussion of research evidence that affects parts of the philosophy.

I consider Epicurus' writing to be the gold standard for what he meant, and I agree with him to the extent he was correct about reality, according to how his words have held up after centuries of ongoing scientific research and my own briefer subjective experience. I've personally found him to be amazingly on point in a startling array of conclusions, but not infallible. If none of his words were incorrect, I would wonder if I'd been brainwashed, because I don't think that's humanly possible. His basic structure is sturdy. When he talks about the stomach not being insatiable, that's certainly how it is for me-- if he said hunger couldn't be satisfied, I would say for sure, he was wrong about me!

For everyone after him who goes by the identifier Epicurean, if their words conflict with reality _and _ Epicurus, I would say they don't have grounds for self-identifying that way, although I cannot stop them. If they conflict with Epicurus but are reality based, my guess is that he would have accepted compelling new evidence and wouldn't have a problem. If they stick with Epicurus but ignore modern physics, they are more in the religious category than me, for sure, and I think but can't prove that he would not be impressed.

Basically, the test of any philosophy should be its compatibility with evidence. And since reality was the core of his philosophy, it's hard for me to think of anything non reality based as Epicurean. Conversations among friends can lead to nonsense if not grounded in evidence.