

### Reading 8.1 – 8.3

This chapter suggested an exploration of the ways in which epidemiologists test their theories and verification of those theories. The issues that frame the discussion of this chapter draw a comparison between the way observations are done in the hard sciences vs philosophy. The typical verification strategy for the hard sciences is the observation of phenomenon in the real universe. Where as, we find especially in Gettier's case verification of the theory is done in a monadic thought experiment world.

One other issues discussed is an argument directly against the Gettier case with a COUNTERFACTUAL condition. Which states that justified true belief is not a necessary condition for knowledge. Throughout section 8.2 we find that this counterfactual argument does not in fact have logical weight because the thought experiments that they performed are inherently flawed because they make an inference to a similar world and not the one actually in question.

The last section discusses the philosophers intuition and whether it can be reliably applied as evidence in epistemological cases. The section mentions that in many cases we can view intuition as a series of mental states which may not be rigorous enough to use as real evidence as discussed in chapter 3.