



## Discovery Series – TWO

In answer to Bertrand Russell, Ed Gettier published in 1963 other alternatives he saw to Russell's thoughts.

1. Justification for Belief. One has justification for some belief only if that justification entails the truth of the belief. In other words, one cannot have a justified false belief. Under this view, most of the things people know would not count as knowledge: their knowledge of the past based on memory, their view of ethics, religion, the mind of others etc...
2. No Relevant Falsehood. Truth can't be too closely associated with one's false reasons for believing it. Suppose someone knows that the stock market rose yesterday because his wife calls and tells him she heard it on T.V. However, suppose that she only thought she heard it and she was hearing a report about the Standard and Poor's. She calls to correct her mistake. In reality though, the stock market did rise, which the man sees in the paper later. His partially false belief has not damaged the reality of the truth.
3. Defeasibility: There is no relevant truth to defeat one's knowledge. The problem we find here is that there are often "unknown defeaters." Suppose a man drops off his kids at a friend's house to play. He has every reason to believe that they are there. While playing, his friend's wife gathers up the kids and takes them to a local park. His relevant truth is defeated by another truth.
4. The causal theory. A person knows something if and only if his true belief that the body of knowledge was caused by the state of affairs consisting in the fact itself. If a red object is before someone and is what causes him to truly believe that it is there and it is red, we have an account of the causal theory.

However, what about our knowledge of the future? Mike can know that his wife will be pleased if he comes home with flowers and jewelry for her, but the fact cannot cause this knowledge because it does not yet exist.

5. The Reliable Theory. Knowledge is a true belief that is produced and sustained by a "reliable, belief-forming method." For example, people increase their willingness to count as knowledge a belief based on someone else's testimony to the degree that they

consider the person to be reliable. If you go to take flying lessons, you are willing to count as knowledge that a man or woman can safely teach you to fly because other's have learned from this person and they have all the proper credentials.

If nothing else, would it not be proper to say that knowledge is at least true belief plus that which confers justification, warrant, or rationality on that belief. In this sense, knowledge presupposes truth. There could be truth without knowledge but no knowledge without truth.

Truth does not suddenly appear in degrees like the accumulation of a snowfall nor does it change. The fact that  $2 + 2 = 4$  or that George Brett retired from Baseball in 1993 are either completely true or completely false. Sports statistics are accumulated knowledge (as is all of history) but that is not the same as saying that truth can be added.

One final thought: Doxastic means "having to do with beliefs" and "doxastic voluntarism" is the notion that everyone has at least some control and choice about their beliefs.