

PD24 - Commentary and Translation of PD 24

Post by "DaveT" of March 11, 2026 at 1:57 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

Yet it in my view it held and holds the correct answers as to the absence of (1) supernatural forces (2) life after death, (3) absolute standards of virtue. It also presents a practical and logical approach to having confidence in the best way to live in the absence of those fictions.

I get it, your view. I lean more to the side that says I don't believe any of those items are true because I have never seen evidence that they are true. Therefore, since I believe them all to be false, I'm not concerned about the amount of evidence I have to dig up to prove what Epicurus taught is true. If those who believe 1 to 3 above want to believe it, no harm is done to me. Now when it comes to organized religions that preach those items, I see the harm they have done with the power of the fear of disobedience.

[Quote from Cassius](#)

The "until there is a consensus" illustrates the problem of generic references to "modern science" and "the scientific method" and "experts" as if using those phrases actually means anything final. There are only particular experts and scientists and particular assertions of results using any method at any time. Consensus is not a logical goal, especially in ethics, and often is later decided to be wrong.

OK. But surely you don't have a problem with relying on expert opinion and consensus of experts on any specific issue when we as average people have zero ability to know about the topic. We all have to draw the line somewhere on what we believe is true, like your 1 to 3 above, and where we don't believe them to be true. We have to trust expert consensus on specific topics that are far beyond our knowledge when making important decisions. For example, I don't ingest anything that the experts say causes cancer in mice, even though I have no idea if it is possible I'll get cancer, too.

One last point that I think I have to make here. Science and the Scientific Method are distinctly different concepts in common usage and practical applications. Perhaps they are conflated as a result of poor educational systems or force of habit. Conflating the two invites confusion, in my opinion. Throughout the ages Science has eventually and always been shown to be wrong on any topic once better tested ideas came along. The Scientific Method invites and expects that we, as average people and experts in particular, examine any assertion to the best of our ability. This is how we determine whether something is true or false. And always our estimation

is based on the best evidence available at the time.

You know, to say, " Consensus is not a logical goal, especially in ethics, and often is later decided to be wrong." is a hard one for me to agree on. Perhaps consensus is not a logical goal in ethics because how to live life well on a daily basis is not individually testable among diverse people. However, consensus on Epicurean general guidelines is testable, and I suggest we arrive at our belief in it by consensus through discussion among friends and comparative study.