

Making Epicurean Canonics Understandable

Post by "Cassius" of October 31, 2020 at 7:22 AM

[Quote from Elayne](#)

So there's my bright line on causal explanations: at least some sense evidence vs zero evidence, and then when I have some evidence, I choose the explanation with the highest available reliability to base my action decisions on, because that is the most secure way to achieve pleasure

OK to extend the discussion I expect at least one question someone would ask would be:

How do you fit the requirement of "some sense evidence" into the framework of "circumstantial evidence" vs. "direct evidence?" It is common in our society to consider that circumstantial evidence can be held to be sufficient when direct evidence is unavailable. Is that appropriate, and if so under what conditions?

For example, do you mean that one or more people must be able to see, touch, hear, smell, or taste the phenomena directly before you would consider the existence of the phenomena to be reliably proven? Or do you allow that it is possible based on things which are seen, touch, heard, smelled, or tasted to **infer** the existence of other phenomena which cannot be observed directly?

For example, what status would you assign to the theory of atomism prior to the date when atoms could be observed directly by an electron microscope? (I am presuming that's the right terminology and that atoms in fact can today be visualized.) Presumably you will say that once atoms were observed directly then the reliability of the assertion of their existence improved incrementally. But prior to their observation was there not a great deal of reason to be confident in their existence even though they could not be directly observed?