

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

Post by "Cassius" of January 7, 2020 at 4:39 PM

[Quote from Elayne](#)

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.

I completely agree with that!

As to this:

[Quote from Elayne](#)

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.

As to that I would say that we ought to be very rigorous in requiring confirmation and explanation of any data that allegedly does not fit. For example, if someone is alleging that all that has been observed is moving away from some center or in some other way expanding, then I would rigorously demand of him whether he is maintaining that he has now observed ALL matter, or exactly what he is claiming about that which he has not observed, for obvious reasons.

So I would apply to those who assert that the universe may not be eternal a requirement that they may fully accessible in complete detail the evidence that they say supports that conclusion, along with any reservations and limitations that they themselves admit exist (in the way that when Lawrence Krauss writes a book entitled "A Universe from Nothing" he admits that he really doesn't mean "nothing") And I would not give someone who was willing to do less than that the respect that I would give to Epicurus and the nothing from nothing / nothing to nothing argument unless and until the evidence and argument could be lined up in that kind of way.

Of course I am not suggesting any kind of bright line exists today or tomorrow on what to do or what not to do. I'm really just discussing in a general way the different approaches that make

sense to talk about. Unless and until someone wants to suggest a "catechism" or some set of rules for a particular organization, it's not necessary for us to come up with that kind of rigor.

Of course the reason we are typing this, or course, is that coming up with that sort of list is exactly what the "Society of Epicurus" is doing, and so it's appropriate for the Society of Epicurus to deal with those issues (and to decide whether to take a position or not) since it is in the middle of that process. Hiram can do that, and then people can decide whether they want to be part of his organization or not based on the decisions he makes. As to us, we're just discussing!

Quote

That is why I think it's more helpful to tell people no matter what, there's no supernatural-

.... Which is kind of like the approach we probably should be taking on anticipations, [Epicurean gods](#), and maybe other subjects where there are ambiguities that are difficult or impossible to resolve due to lack of texts and other issues.

No way we can do it now or over the short term, but over time we need to explore these issues in detail, group-sourcing the effort, and try to help each other here: [Nothing From Nothing / Nothing To Nothing / Eternity and Infinity of the Universe](#)