

"Facts don't care about your feelings."

Post by "Cassius" of November 6, 2020 at 4:24 PM

[Quote from Godfrey](#)

The senses, prolepses and feelings, and after these, reason, cover all the bases as to how we determine truth. They are all "corrective" of each other as in the bent oar problem. EP isn't a touchy-feely philosophy but one that uses all of the tools available to us to determine truth and how to live our lives.

I think this is what Don is getting at, because people aren't being clear about what is meant by "truth." The debate goes along the lines too of "my truth" vs. "your truth" as if everyone has exactly the same definition of truth, but the reality is that "truth" is a word that has many levels of meaning, and unless you specify what you're talking about it's easy to get tripped up. Same with the "my facts" vs "your facts" debate. The religionists/ Platonists want to imply that all truth and all facts are the same for everyone. The nihilists/radical skeptics want to say that NO ONE has any claim to any truth or facts whatsoever. Epicurus points the way to a reasonable evaluation of what is contextual and what is not contextual, and gives you the tools to deal with the problem of "ought" by referring to the only realistic standard of preference -- the pleasure and pain of the person/people involved in the analysis.

Those distinctions have been wiped away in modern terminology so we're regularly at each others' throats about issues where we not communicating on a basic level.

Just like there is both atoms AND void, there is both contextual truth (some prefer vanilla) and "absolute truth" (all men die).

But if we get caught up on "well there is really no such thing as void because modern science says that there is energy and fields and so talking about void is obsolete" then we are always going to be stuck in the level of the trees and never see the forest.