

23 JUNE 2025

I follow a complicated criminal trial on TV, where I just cannot decide whether the defendant is guilty. Crucial witnesses contradict one another. Somebody must be lying, I think. Maybe both of them are lying. In any case, there is a true story out there in some sense, even if nobody tells it. The defendant actually did it or didn't do it. Of that I'm sure.

But should I be so sure ? Why I am sure that something definite happened ? After some thought, I decided that I imagined being able to somehow spy on the past. I could lurk like a ghost in all the important rooms at the crucial moments. Then, surely, I'd see what REALLY happened.

I'd see and hear, indeed, through the ghost-version of my eyes and the ghost-version of my ears. I am still pretty sure that my *belief* about what happened would be solidified this way. I would claim to know the "truth."

What's the problem with this ? Well, **I'm just another witness**, who may be contradicted by still other witnesses. These non-me witnesses may insist on the "truth" of their claims no less than I would.

So what does it mean to say that the defendant either did it or didn't do it ? Perhaps this boils down to "give me perceptual access and I'll tell you what happened."

The "something actually happened" assumption seems to be useful. For instance, in a murder trial. It's a bit psychedelic to contemplate that *from-a-point-of-*

view-ness “infects” even this delicate situation.

Yet we already know that it does. It’s just most of us insist that this undecidability is only an **epistemic** issue. “Obviously” something actually happened — even if we also admit that we could always be “wrong.” We might accidentally end up with false beliefs, but the world still functions as a truthmaker for true beliefs, whether or not we can find them.

I connect this to the ontological containment of situatedness — of situated belief in particular. As long as we all share a default belief in this containment, the issue never even comes up.

Is it coherent and rational to doubt that something really happened ?

This must be done carefully. What does **not** work is : *what really happened is that nothing in particular really happened.*

As far as I can tell, a coherent phenomenalist can only indicate a personal suspicion of this concept of what-really-happened.

This what-really-happened can be seen as an important piece of Objective Reality. I express my personal suspicion of that concept as well. Indeed, I deny that the concept of objective reality is “meaningful.” But I just mean that **I** can’t find any depth in it. Other people claim to, and I do not call them liars. But I can’t make sense of their making sense of it.

Yet I definitely consider some beliefs much better than others. I believe that we all have to share many mun-

dane beliefs in order to be able to understand one another in conversations and practical life.

Still, this Something That Really Happened looks “theological” to me, just like Objective Reality. The world as “God” sees it. But even then He’d be one more witness. We’d just trust him more, perhaps.