

Source: [\[KB20200828003106\]](#)

## 1 | Notes

### Highlighted bits

- One should not believe another person who lacks the qualifications to have an informed opinion.
  - What is expertise though? What makes a person qualified?
  - One interpretation is that knowledge, or expertise is simply a perspective.
    - However, that expertise is always true to you, so that cannot be a good way of defining expertise
  - Socrates soon proposes that one can not get knowledge through experiences, but only through logic.
    - Knowledge is now defined more as true judgment.
      - They dismiss this by saying that knowledge can't be true judgment since a person can make a true judgment without having any knowledge.
      - They now narrow this definition to true judgment with some reasoning behind it.
        - However, this reasoning is based off of knowledge which puts you into a catch 22 situation

**Discussion point:** Does knowledge have to be correct, or complete to be knowledge? The working and used definition of knowledge is less about what is actually correct as much as what is seemingly correct to the observer. Even if you're perceiving something incorrectly, that to you is knowledge. This is the first definition they discuss and Socrates deems it incorrect due to the fact that an uninformed person can take something as knowledge that isn't correct and can be disproved by a more experienced person. However, the fact remains that to that person, even that uninformed perception is considered knowledge by them and anyone else who has the same perception until they deem it disproved. In fact, things widely considered to be false now in some cases been in the past considered to be true and common knowledge. To those people who believed it to be common knowledge, it was common knowledge since they lacked sufficient evidence/reasoning to change their perspective.