

A Critical Analysis of Epistemic Luck

Process Reliabilism and The Truth Tracking Theory

Ousmane Amadou — 1003013222

PHL232H1 December 2017, 1437 Words, Evan Taylor

As of December 2017 no proposed theories of knowledge have managed to specify knowledge conditions that are immune to the problem of epistemic luck. The most common approach of specifying conditions for someones knowing a proposition, is to provide an account of knowledge that is a modification of the **Classical Analysis of Knowledge**:

- S knows that P if and only if
- (i) P is true.
 - (ii) S beleives that P, and
 - (iii) S is justified in beleiving that P.

so that each condition is necessary for knowledge, and jointly sufficent for knowl-
edge. Among these attempts include **Robert Nozick's Truth Tracking The-
ory**:

- S knows that P* if and only if
- (i) P is true.
 - (ii) S beleives that P.
 - (iii) If P were false, S would not beleive that P.
 - (iv) If P were true, S would beleive that P.

and **Process Reliabilism** which asserts that:

- S knows that P* if and only if
- (i) P is true.
 - (ii) S beleives that P.
 - (iii) S is justified in beleiving that P.
 - (iv) S is only justified in beleiving that P, if that beleif was formed
using a reliable beleif forming process.

The focus of this paper is to compare and contrast the strengths of the process reliabilist and truth tracking theories of knowledge when it comes to solving the problem of epistemic luck. I will argue that the Truth Tracking theory should

be preferred over the Truth Tracking Theory as a general solution to epistemic luck by describing Epistemic Luck, then providing a characterization of what it could mean to prefer one theory over another as a general solution to Epistemic Luck, and showing that Truth Tracking Theory satisfies this characterization.

Epistemic Luck is a generic term ascribed to instances of knowledge, where a belief in a proposition P is true merely by luck. In other words, epistemic luck can be used to describe any number of ways in which it can be accidental, coincidental, or fortuitous that a person has a true belief. To understand why epistemic luck has proved to be a hard problem in epistemology, consider the following example(s) of knowledge claims that suffer from epistemic luck:

Example 1.

Example 2.

Example 3.

Now that we have well defined the problem of epistemic Luck, I will give a provisional definition of what it could mean to prefer the Truth Tracking Theory over Process Reliabilism as a general solution to epistemic luck. For two theories of knowledge T_1 and T_2 , consider the following formulation preferredness:

Definition 1. As a general solution to Epistemic Luck, T_1 *should be preferred over T_2 as a general solution to epistemic luck* if and only if at least two of the following conditions are met:

- (i) T_1 is a more tenable account of knowledge than T_2 .
- (ii) T_1 resolves a larger number of epistemic luck knowledge claims than T_2 .
- (iii) T_1 offers the favorable basis for further investigation of epistemic luck.

There may be other combinations of conditions that could accurately capture what it means to prefer Truth Tracking over Process Reliabilism as a general solution to epistemic luck. In fact, I am not claiming that the conditions specified give the most accurate definition preferredness. However, I do think this definition suffices as a basis for comparing these two theories because the most important aspects of these theories are being accounted for and weighted equally.

One of the biggest criticisms of the Truth-Tracking theory is that it requires the rejection of the highly intuitive closure principle. That is, according to the truth tracking theory if S knows P and S knows that $P \Rightarrow Q$, then S does not necessarily know that Q . Nozick, however, claims that rejecting the closure principle is actually a feature of the theory as a response to this criticism. He maintains that the fact the truth tracking theory illuminating a certain property of knowledge. Indeed, there is no substantial evidence that would prove other

wise. Even after considering that, it is still more plausible to prefer a theory that coheres with our logical belief system. Abandoning the closure principle hurts the Truth Tracking's theory's tenability. Another criticism of the Truth-Tracking theory is that it is vague. For instance, how are we supposed to interpret the Subjunctive conditional? In particular, how exactly do we know in scenarios where it were the case that P? One proposed semantics, is the possible worlds semantics that says:

Possible Worlds Based Semantics. If ϕ were true, then ψ is true if and only if:

- (i) ψ is true at some ϕ -world w (where a ψ -world is just one in which ψ is true); and
- (ii) w is closer to actuality than is any ϕ and $\neg\psi$ world w' .

However, if one is not moved by any such discrimination requirement, one will not be moved by this objection. Therefore Process Reliabilism is the more tenable account of knowledge.

Suppose E is the set of all knowledge-claims that are true merely by luck. It is conceivable to partition this set into different classes, or types of epistemically lucky knowledge claims. That is $E = C_1 \cup C_2 \cup C_3 \dots \cup C_i$ where each $C_j, \forall j \leq i$ represents a class of epistemic knowledge claims. It is important to note that it is perfectly possible for an epistemically lucky knowledge claim to be of more than one type. Furthermore, partitioning epistemically lucky knowledge claims is a somewhat aggergious task. The manner in which you could

Types: * False Grounds * Original Counter Examples * General Formula *
Unclassified

An advantage of Process Reliabilism is that it is a theory of both justification and knowledge. If correct, Process Reliabilism would allow us to understand how knowledge is constructed and would offer a basis for analyzing epistemic luck itself. However, it is still debated whether knowledge actually requires justification. If it were the case that knowledge did require justification, Process Reliabilism would be valuable. However, if knowledge doesn't require justification Process Reliabilism doesn't offer much value for further investigation since it is fundamentally flawed in assuming knowledge require justification. A response to this could reject the Process Relibilist theory of justification In Goldmans What is JTB, we learn that a reliable belief forming Process is neither sufficient nor necessary for knowledge.