

This course is a survey of issues in epistemology, with a focus on recent debates. Topics include the nature of knowledge, whether knowledge can involve luck, epistemology and technology, epistemic injustice, and social epistemology.

Professor: P.D. Magnus

E-mail: pmagnus<at>albany.edu

Office phone: (518) 442-4223

Office: HU 218

Office hours: M 1:00–3:00 and by appointment

Texts: Course readings will be available via Brightspace.

Response papers: Students are required to write a 300–500 word critical response to the assigned readings each week. These should be turned in via Brightspace by midnight (end of day) on **Saturday** before the class meeting for which the reading is assigned.

A reading response paper should address one of the assigned readings for the week and do three things.

1. Quote and cite a sentence or two of the assigned reading which could be taken as the the thesis, capturing the core claim being made. (Direct quotations do not count toward the assigned length.)
2. Provide a critical summary of one of the readings. State in your own words what the author is trying to do. Ask yourself: What *reasons* does the author give for believing their thesis? Why do they think it matters?
3. Raise at least one question about the reading.

Reading response papers should *not* outline the whole reading. You should not try mention everything. Decide which parts you think are important.

You may pose an objection, but you still need to concisely state what you're objecting to.

If parts were confusing or hard to follow, then you can say so! You are not expected to understand every reading fully before we meet to discuss it. The goal is to engage with the reading, struggle with it, and form an opinion of how things fit together.

Presentations: Students registered for 522 will make two short presentations. Students registered for 422 may choose to do a presentation for extra credit.

#1: During a regular class meeting, offer a summary of the central claim and argument of a reading and raise points to open class discussion. It should not be a point-by-point repetition of the reading! It may dig in on one particular theme, evaluate how successful the article is, or connect the article to earlier readings in the course. The target length is 5–15 minutes.

#2: At the last class meeting, pitch the final paper.

Final papers: Students registered for 422 will write a 5–8 page (about 2000 word) final paper which may be on an assigned topic.

Students registered for 522 will write a 10–12 page (about 3000 word) paper on a topic of their own choosing.

Grading: The two lowest response paper grades will be dropped. Late response papers will be marked at a penalty, based on how late it was and how much of a habit the student has made out of turning things in late.

Undergraduates (422) 10% Participation, 60% Response papers, 30% Final paper

Graduates (522) 10% Participation, 45% Response papers, 10% Presentations, 35% Final paper

Absences: Attendance contributes part of the participation grade, but absences for legitimate reasons will be excused. Let the instructor know in a timely fashion. If you are or suspect you are contagious, *do not* come to class.

Academic honesty: You are encouraged to discuss issues from the course with each other and with others outside of class, but you are responsible for your own ideas and your own words. Students who turn in work that is not theirs will be failed for the assignment on the first infraction and failed for the course on the second infraction.

Note that turning in text which you have harvested from an AI counts as plagiarism.

Schedule of topics

This is a tentative schedule. Specific readings may take more or less time than indicated, we may drop or add some readings as we go.

Week 1 22 jan - introduction

Edmund Gettier, "Is Justified True Belief Knowledge?" (1963)

Week 2 29 jan - Gettierology

Linda Zagzebsky, "The Inescapability of Gettier Problems" (1994)

Joachim Horvath and Steffen Koch, "Experimental philosophy and the method of cases" (2020)

Week 3 5 feb - knowledge and luck

Nathan Ballantyne, "Anti-luck Epistemology, Pragmatic Encroachment, and True Belief" (2011)

Peter Baumann, "No Luck With Knowledge? On a Dogma of Epistemology" (2014)

Week 4 12 feb - internalism and externalism

Amia Srinivasan, "Radical Externalism" (2020)

Zoë Johnson King, "Radical Internalism" (2022)

Week 5 19 feb - interest-relativity

Brian Weatherson, "Interests" and "Belief" (draft)

Week 6 26 feb - deepfakes

Regina Rini and Leah Cohen, "Deep Fakes, Deep Harms" (2022)

Joshua Habgood-Coote, "Deepfakes and the Epistemic Apocalypse" (2023)

Week 7 4 mar - epistemology and bots

P.D. Magnus, "On trusting chatbots" (draft)

Keith Raymond Harris, "Liars and Trolls and Bots Online: The Problem of Fake Persons" (2023)

Week 8 11 mar - epistemic norms

Eliran Haziza, "Norms of Inquiry" (2023)

Simon Barker, "Deep Disagreement, Epistemic Norms, and Epistemic Self-trust" (2023)

Spring Break!

Week 9 25 mar - epistemic injustice

Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice* pp. 17–29, 43–108 (2007)

Week 10 1 apr - epistemic injustice (continued)

Miranda Fricker, *Epistemic Injustice* pp. 147–175 (2007)

Nick Clanchy, "Tackling Hermeneutical Injustices in Gender-Affirming Healthcare" (forthcoming)

Week 11 8 apr - feminist epistemology

Kristie Dotson, "Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing" (2011)

Briana Toole, "Standpoint Epistemology and Epistemic Peerhood: A Defense of Epistemic Privilege" (2023)

Week 12 15 apr - social epistemology

Nathan Ballantyne, "Epistemic Trespassing" (2019)

C. Thi Nguyen, "Transparency is Surveillance" (2021)

Week 13 22 apr - social epistemology of science

Will Fleisher, "Intellectual Courage and Inquisitive Reasons" (2023)

Daniel C. Friedman and Dunja Šešelja, "Scientific Disagreements, Fast Science and Higher-Order Evidence" (2023)

Week 14 29 apr - conclusion

final presentations, discussion