

# Infinity and the Expanding Universe

Post by "Cassius" of July 25, 2020 at 7:14 AM

## [Quote from Martin](#)

Heat "death" is somewhat misleading. While we are no more after death, the universe exists without being alive and will still exist when it reaches heat death. .... conditions will become too adverse for any lifeform to survive.

Martin, I think you mentioned this aspect briefly in the podcast, that the "death" part in "heat death" does not refer to the universe ceasing to exist, but to conditions for life (at least as we know it) not being possible.

I meant to backtrack and bring that out but I think I failed to get back to it. My concern with the subject was that we were planting the notion in less-read peoples' minds that we were entertaining a view in which the universe ceased to exist entirely. But I definitely remember your saying that so it's in the podcast episode and can always be referred to if anyone got really confused and thought we were totally off base from Epicurus.

In general that's really my main concern with most of the terminology like Krauss' "A Universe From Nothing." ([Is Lawrence Krauss a Physicist, Or Just a Bad Philosopher?](#)) I just came across that article and have only read it once, but I think the writer pretty much has the attitude I have. I am not sure if this attitude I am describing is that of a philosopher, or a "theologian" as the article mentions, but I think that whatever the issue really boils down to, Epicurus himself would be accused by Krauss of being a philosopher rather than a physicist in taking a position on the eternity of the elemental particles, and that there is no reason from a philosophical perspective to ascribe their existence to a supernatural god.

So I get the impression Krauss and people like him would not be on the side of Epicurus, and would actually be significantly opposed to many of his conclusions, or at least his procedures for reaching his conclusions, and that makes me concerned about seeming to cite their arguments without clarification.

The modern use of words like "nothing" (and maybe I should add "heat death") appear to the untrained to be making claims about ultimate traditional logical issues that are counterintuitive from/against the traditional Epicurean perspective, and should not be accepted on that level.

Plus, I have always been concerned, and continue to be concerned, that people like Krauss did not pick up their terminology because it was really compelled by the science, but exactly because it "tweaked" those who held to the older views, and that's an attitude I personally associate with radical skepticism and nihilism. That's just my personal viewpoint, of course, and

it isn't necessarily implied or true in the case of any particular individual or theory, just something that seems to me to be worth considering in writing/talking about these issues to wider audiences.

(Sorry that this post is disjointed - i came across the article in mid-post and added it in. I need to pick up some of those points from that article in a separate post.)