

Discussion of the Society of Epicurus' 20 Tenets of 12/21/19

Post by “Elayne” of January 7, 2020 at 4:19 PM

Ok, I get what you are saying. It's hard for me to put myself in the shoes of someone who would find any of the unsolved parts alarming, but it may be true.

However, then the problem remains that we have data Epicurus didn't have-- and now his model no longer fits ALL the observed data. It's not just that we are missing data, in case you thought that was the problem -- it's also that we now have data that doesn't fit. So we can no longer use it in the same way he was able to, the way you are describing. We would have to say "our model doesn't fit everything we've observed but we bet there's something amiss with the observations that don't fit, that they are illusory somehow." And that would be a disaster IMO. The stuff that doesn't fit might be misunderstood, but a theory can't survive on that basis.

That is why I think it's more helpful to tell people no matter what, there's no supernatural-- if they are on that simple of a thought process, maybe we can take Vic Stenger's stuff and simplify it. I don't know. I feel sure Epicurus could have done it but Idk if I can, lol.