

Review of: "Either you know or you've gotta believe"

Spencer Case¹

¹ University of Colorado at Boulder

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

I can't recommend this paper for several reasons. The main one is that I don't see any novel line of argument--or indeed any main organizing thread. Instead, I see an assemblage of paragraphs about different philosophers who have for various reasons rejected the idea that, for any p , knowing p entails believing p . Well... ok. But what's the original contribution here? I don't see it. The main body of the paper and the abstract both begin with the assertion that "The JTB view, that knowledge is justified true belief, is very generally accepted...". Every undergraduate who has taken an epistemology class in the last several decades will know that this hasn't been true since Gettier (1963). This turns out to be unimportant to the thesis (as I understand it) because the idea that knowledge entails belief really is widely held, and this is the target, not the JTB theory of knowledge, but it still makes the paper look amateurish. The writing isn't particularly good. I didn't see any rhyme or reason as to why we were hearing about such-and-such philosopher's view of knowledge at such-and-such place in the paper. The entire thing read like the explication section of a more substantive paper that never arrived.

Here are some instances of bad writing (among many others):

"It is a desperate, however, as I argue later, vain attempt to salvage the entailment thesis." Better: "I'll argue that this move can't rescue the entailment thesis."

"The reason why I am listing all these philosophers and sketching their views is to reinforce doubt about the rightfulness of the entailment thesis." Better: "That so many philosophers have endorsed views incompatible with the entailment thesis should give defenders pause."

"There may be more theories accepting the entailment thesis than rejecting it, but that does not mean that it is correct." Obviously. Delete this because it goes without saying.

"The number and diversity of theories defining knowledge in terms of belief suggest that another approach may be necessary. Philosophers have had a hard time agreeing on a satisfying account of the relationship between knowledge and belief. They all focus on different aspects of the concepts and point towards the weaknesses of one of them." This all seems pretty trivial. Yes, philosophers have lots of different views about knowledge and yes they point out the weaknesses of other views. So? Why are you saying it?

"Also Cook Wilson, an influential representative of the Oxford realism school..." First, this comes after the section in which you were listing all the philosophers who reject the entailment thesis, raising the question of what you're doing in this

section (other than continuing the list in the last section). Second, the Oxford realism school? What realism school? Scientific realism, moral realism, political realism, or something else? I have no idea what this is.

There are many more examples of stuff like this throughout the paper.