

# Responses to Gettier: NOT PLATO'S RESPONSES

## Infallibilism

You know that p if :

p is true

You believe p

You cannot rationally doubt p

**Infallibilism:** Gettier style counter-examples rely on luck, to remove this to claim that knowledge can only be allowed if the justification is that strong that it is impossible to be wrong (infallible).

We should only count as knowledge these things we cannot rationally doubt, e.g. that you exist,  $2+2=4$ , that you're seeing the colour white with black writing.

Beliefs can be doubted, knowledge cannot. For example, pain. When you are in pain, you know you are, it makes no sense to say you believe your in pain, as you know you are. Other people maybe able to see that your in pain, so they would hold a belief about your pain, but they would not know your in pain, but there is no possibility of you being wrong about being on pain. Not open to Gettier style counter-examples, as our knowledge requires a level of certainty which works with our intuition.

## No false lemmas (K=JTBN)

You know that p if :

p is true

You believe p

Your belief that p is justified

You did not infer p from anything false

**No false lemmas:** A lemma is a premise accepted as true in an argument.

The Gettier examples include a false belief/lemma, so they should not be considered examples of knowledge.

Smith's belief that the man with 10 coins in his pocket was based on a false belief that Jones would get the job, so the false lemma is that he believes Jones will get the job because he has been told so. The same with Jones owning a Ford.

So no false lemmas claims that knowledge is justified, true belief where the justification is not based on false belief.

## Reliabilism (K=RTB)

You know that p if :

p is true

You believe p

Your knowledge of p comes from a reliable source

**Reliabilism:** Linking knowledge to the reliability of the person or thing that led to it.

Consider a quality newspaper compared to gossip, one is more reliable and trustworthy than the other as it produces the truth more than the other source.

So with beliefs, we should only grant the status of knowledge to those beliefs that have been formed by a reliable source as it is highly likely to result in true belief.

Replaces justification with reliabilism. Animals have evolved to have reliable processes of vision, cognition, memory etc. these reliable processes mean they can interact successfully with the world and so we can say they have knowledge about it.

## Virtue epistemology (K=VTB)

You know that p if :

p is true

You believe p

Your true belief is as a result of you exercising your intellectual virtues

**Virtue epistemology:** An act of knowledge occurs when the belief is successful (it is true) and where its success stems from intellectual virtues (so not just luckily true).

SOSA: 3 key elements in shooting an arrow.

1. Accuracy, hits the target, likewise a belief is accurate if it is true.
2. Skilful, a belief is skilful if formed by an intellectual virtue.
3. Aptness, accurate because it was skilful, an apt belief is one that is true because it was formed with intellectual virtue.

The Gettier cases were not a result of any intellectual virtues, it was just coincidence. Under Sosa's version of VE, Smith's beliefs would not count as knowledge even though it was an accurate skillful belief it was not apt. But the fake barn example would fit with Sosa's view and so would be knowledge, yet many people would say it is not. But Sosa would say it is an animal knowledge, not human. Human knowledge requires the ability to reflect on your belief which an animal cannot as Barney cannot tell if his belief is apt or not.