

Two Types?

Post by "Elayne" of January 11, 2020 at 8:20 AM

Oscar, I am going to request a favor. It is very hard to converse if you introduce unconventional definitions into a discussion. The rest of us were having a conversation about something specific, Epicurus' description of gods, and our takes on that. You commented that you were not an atheist and got pleasure from thinking about the creators of the universe, plural, which does not imply nature. Lucretius personifies nature, but it's a poetic device-- nature is not conscious or a being. Epicurus' gods were actual beings, conscious.

And now you say you are using nature interchangeably with creators and gods, which the rest of us were discussing as possible conscious beings or not ("not" being the atheist position even towards material blissful beings).

If nature, not a being, not conscious, is interchangeable for you with creators and gods as material blissful beings, then how is this not using a metaphor to say you are atheist towards material blissful beings? If non being equals being, how can any of us understand you or respond?

Please try harder to communicate clearly, so the rest of us can understand you. Thank you!