

# Infinity and the Expanding Universe

Post by "Cassius" of July 24, 2020 at 11:07 AM

That explanation seems to me a good example of how different people are going to be comfortable with different levels of speculation. I presume that if the theory is that there is a "superstructure" and that "popping" doesn't really mean "from nothing" but rather means that it is somehow generated by the superstructure and "incorporated back into the superstructure," then there's really no violation of the "nothing from nothing" rule which is sort of a logical barrier where the issue is really being fought.

My discomfort with this kind of discussion is that in fact to most common people it does in fact sound "spooky and supernatural" even if it is not intended to be so by the specialists who are theorizing it.

I don't think it is ever appropriate to suggest that there are different "truths" for different types of people on something like this, but I would say that we do need to be aware of the different levels of analysis that people are capable of doing, or maybe said another way, the different perspectives that are in play in which people interpret words at different levels of subtlety.

I'm thinking that Epicurus was perfectly happy to discuss any level of scientific detail himself, but that he also thought it appropriate to reduce things down into broader outlines that most anyone is capable of understanding. "Nothing comes or goes to nothing" is probably such a formulation, useful for most people to keep them away from being manipulated by religion or other types of manipulators, and so it's generally useful to talk in those terms, even if at times it is also appropriate, among experts, to adopt highly-technical definitions of each of the words in the formulation for purposes of scientific theorizing.

So again I think part of this discussion is the issue of context and the purpose of the entire discussion. If we are conducting a seminar of astrophysicists then one way of speaking is appropriate, while if we are talking to the remaining 99% of the people in the world another manner is appropriate. And of course in lumping everyone else into the 99% group, there are huge numbers of subdivisions of categories by language, age, etc, which would be relevant to how to explain things to them.

So maybe this is an issue that involves proper communication as much or more than it does precise scientific theory.