

Circumstantial (Indirect) and Direct Evidence / Dogmatism vs Skepticism

Post by “DaveT” of March 17, 2026 at 12:36 PM

[Quote from Cassius](#)

It's probably also a good way of looking at it to compare this to court.

If we're going to reach a conclusion about something, we have to tell the jury the standard of proof.

Telling them to just decide what's "probably" happened or happened "with a high degree of confidence" isn't what we do, especially in important criminal cases.

Perhaps you might also have discussed that in **Civil Law** cases where “probably” is acceptable.

In criminal cases, people go to prison. Generally, in civil cases which are far more common, you don't go to prison.

And I am suggesting this clarification because, when we are discussing standards of proof in response to the beginning question of this thread. But sometimes *beyond reasonable doubt*, like in criminal cases, or *probably (more likely than not)* like in civil cases, need a lot more clarification when applied to issues we have in this thread.

Proof, whether to support philosophical, scientific, or legal subjects, whether directly or circumstantially arrived at, by consensus or individual logic, must be clearly defined as a basis for discussion. . And not just defined, but also limited in application. Otherwise, when we discuss the ancient debates of Hellenistic philosophers, we can get distracted from the original topic under study in the thread.