



[Simion, M.](#) (2022) Closure, warrant transmission, and defeat. In: Jope, M. and Pritchard, D. (eds.) *Epistemic Closure and Transmission*. Routledge. ISBN 9781003104766 (doi: [10.4324/9781003104766-4](https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003104766-4))

This is the author version of the work.

There may be differences between this version and the published version.

You are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it:

<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003104766-4>

<https://eprints.gla.ac.uk/222811/>

Deposited on: 24 August 2023

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow  
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

# Closure, Warrant Transmission, and Defeat

Mona Simion  
COGITO Epistemology Research Centre, University of Glasgow  
Mona.simion@glasgow.ac.uk

## 1. Introduction

According to what I will dub ‘Concessive’ Neo-Mooreanism, warrant transmits in Moorean-style anti-sceptical inferences; however, the sceptic is rationally obscured from coming to believe the conclusion of Moore’s argument in virtue of psychological higher-order defeat (e.g. Pryor 2004, 2012).

In contrast, ‘Radical’ Neo-Mooreanism (e.g. Williamson 2000, 2007) claims that warrant transmits in the Moorean inference, closure for knowledge holds unrestrictedly, and nothing is wrong with the Moorean argument, dialectically or otherwise; furthermore, Radical Neo-Mooreanism charges the sceptic with epistemic malfunction for resisting Moore’s argument.<sup>1</sup>

This paper argues that both Concessive and Radical Neo-Mooreanism remain unsatisfactory and develops a novel Neo-Moorean view. The view falls squarely within the Radical Neo-Moorean camp, in that it holds that closure holds unrestrictedly, warrant transmits through Moore’s inference, and that there is nothing wrong – epistemically or dialectically - with Moore’s argument. Nevertheless, the account is superior to extant Radical Neo-Mooreanisms in explanatory power: it explains both the precise variety of epistemic failure exhibited by the sceptic, and the intuition of reasonableness when it comes to the sceptic’s resistance to Moore’s argument. It does so in terms of epistemic functions and contrary-to-duty obligations.

In Section 2 I briefly outline the issue at stake and the Neo-Moorean responses that I deal with. In #3 I discuss Concessive Neo-Mooreanism and reject the defeat claim. In #4 I develop my own Radical Neo-Mooreanism, and in #5 I conclude.

## 2. Two Neo-Mooreanisms

Moore sees his hands in front of him and comes to believe that HANDS: ‘Hands exist.’ based on his extraordinarily reliable perceptual belief formation processes. Moore’s belief is warranted, if any beliefs are: Moore is an excellent believer. Indeed, Moore knows that hands exist. In spite of his laudable epistemic ways, Dretske (1971) thinks Moore shouldn’t feel free to do whatever it pleases him to do with this belief, epistemically speaking; in particular, Dretske thinks that, in spite of his warranted belief that HANDS, Moore should refrain from reasoning to some propositions he knows to be entailed by HANDS,

---

<sup>1</sup> Other closure and warrant transmission-preserving responses come e.g. from hinge epistemologists (e.g. Pritchard 2015) and are motivated by e.g. the thought that our doxastic attitudes towards hinge propositions such as ‘The external world exists’ are not beliefs, and thereby not the stuff that makes the proper target of closure and transmission principles. See e.g. (Jope 2019) and (Simion et al. 2019) for discussion.

such as, for instance, WORLD: 'There is an external world.' He thinks that this is an instance of closure failure for knowledge: we don't always know the stuff that we know our knowledge to entail. In better news, conversely, that's why the sceptic is wrong to think that my not knowing that I'm not a brain in a vat implies that I don't know any of the ordinary things I take myself to know.

Wright (2002, 2003, 2004) agrees: Moore shouldn't reason to WORLD from HANDS. However, that's not because closure fails, but because the stronger principle of warrant transmission fails: the problem here, according to him, is not that we sometimes fail to know the stuff that we know is entailed by what we know. Rather, the issue is that the warrant Moore has for HANDS fails to transmit to WORLD. Compatibly, though, Moore may still be entitled to believe WORLD on independent grounds. If Moore is entitled to believe HANDS, then perhaps he must also be entitled to believe WORLD. But it doesn't follow that his warrant to believe WORLD is his warrant to believe HANDS. Rather, it may be that Moore needs to be independently entitled to believe WORLD to begin with, if he is to be entitled to believe HANDS.

Many philosophers are on board with rejecting at least one of these principles – be it merely warrant transmission, or closure as well. At the same time, since closure and warrant transmission constitute a bedrock of our epistemic ways – indeed, crucial vehicles for expanding our body of knowledge – one cannot give them up without a working restriction recipe: if closure and/or warrant transmission don't hold unrestrictedly, when do they hold? It is fair to say the jury is still out on this front, and a satisfactory restriction recipe does not seem to be within easy reach.<sup>2</sup>

That being said, several philosophers take the alternative route of resisting the failure claims altogether, and thus fully dismiss the data: according to them, closure and warrant transmission are too important a theoretical tool to be abandoned on grounds of misguided intuitions. They reject the intuition that something fishy is going on in Moore's argument, and argue that scepticism is just an instance of cognitive malfunction: the sceptic's cognitive system malfunctions in that it fails to get rid of her unjustified sceptical beliefs in favour of the justified Moorean conclusion. I call these people 'Radical Neo-Mooreans.' Here is Williamson:

Our cognitive immunity system should be able to destroy bad old beliefs, not just prevent the influx of bad new ones. But that ability sometimes becomes indiscriminate, and destroys good beliefs too (2007: 681).

I like Radical Neo-Mooreanism. The majority reaction to this move, however, is that it is less than fair to the sceptic; indeed, this view (intuitively unfairly) categorizes scepticism, without qualification, in the same normative boat with other epistemic malfunctions, such as, for instance, wishful thinking. It is undeniable, though, that in the case of the sceptic, but not in the case of the wishful thinker, we think that there is something reasonable – even if not quite right – about their resistance to Moore's argument. This intuitive difference cries for an explanation.

At the other side of the Neo-Moorean spectrum, we find concessive Neo-Mooreans (e.g. Pryor 2004, 20012); these philosophers accept both closure and transmission in Moorean inferences, and try to come up with alternative explanations of the data: i.e., with an alternative account of what is intuitively amiss with

---

<sup>2</sup> But see (Kelp 2019) for my favorite proposal.

Moore's argument. In the next section I look closer at the Concessive Neo-Moorean explanation of this datum.

### 3. Against Concessive Neo-Mooreanism

According to Jim Pryor (2004), while Moore is right to reason from HANDS to WORLD, he wouldn't be very convincing were he to do so in conversation with a sceptic. The problem behind the intuitive fishiness of Moore's reasoning pattern is pragmatic, not epistemic: It is lack of dialectical force, not lack of warrant transmission, that's triggering the uneasiness intuition. In the cases of alleged failure of closure and/or transmission, warrant transmits, but the argument fails dialectically due to psychological higher-order defeat.<sup>3</sup> The sceptic about WORLD will not be convinced by Moore's argument in its favour from HANDS. Here is Pryor:

For a philosopher with such beliefs [i.e. sceptical beliefs], it'd be epistemically defective to believe things just on the basis of her experiences—even if those experiences are in fact giving her categorical warrant to so believe" (2012, 286).

Why would it be thus epistemically defective? According to Pryor, the sceptic's unjustified sceptical beliefs rationally obstruct her from believing based on Moore's argument, via psychological defeat. In particular, Pryor thinks that Moore's argument gives the sceptic propositional justification for the conclusion, but it fails to generate doxastic justification, due to the psychological defeat generated by the sceptic's previously acquired sceptical beliefs. Since the sceptical beliefs are not justified, according to Pryor, they don't defeat the propositional justification generated by Moore's argument. They do, however, rationally obstruct the sceptic from justifiably believing the conclusion of Moore's argument, and in this they defeat the sceptic's doxastic justification.

The point then, in a nutshell, is that even though it transmits warrant, the Moorean argument fails to convince the rational sceptic in virtue of the conflict between the Moorean claims and the sceptic's previously held beliefs. The sceptic has propositional justification, but does not have doxastic justification, for HANDS and WORLD.

In what follows, I will take issue with this claim at several junctures. First and foremost, though, it is worth clarifying what exactly the content of the sceptical beliefs that allegedly do the defeating work here is. I want to start off by noting that it is implausible to think that the sceptical belief at stake in the literature is (or should be) something like non-WORLD: 'The external world does not exist.'. After all, what we are talking about - and the philosopher that is worth engaging with - is a reasonable sceptic, who e.g. believes in underdetermination - i.e. thinks that, for all she knows, she may well be a brain in a vat - , not someone who is anxiously fully confident that they're a brain in a vat. The reasonable sceptic that is worth engaging with thinks that, for all the evidence she has supports, there may well be no external world. If so, the reasonable sceptic will, at best, have a .5 credence that Non-WORLD, or else she will suspend belief on the issue. Not much will hang on this below, but since I am interested in being maximally charitable to Concessive Neo-

---

<sup>3</sup> To my knowledge, the first to have introduced the category of psychological (/doxastic) defeat is Jennifer Lackey (e.g. 2006: 438). The first and now considered the classic view on the nature of defeat in epistemology is due to Pollock (1986). For excellent recent work on defeat, see (Brown & Simion 2021).

Mooreanism, I will, for the most part, discuss the reasonable sceptic rather than the maximally anxious sceptic in what follows. Everything I will say, though, will apply *mutatis mutandis* to the anxious sceptic as well.

Now here is a widely endorsed thesis in philosophy: justification is normative. The following is an attractive way of capturing this thought: One's  $\phi$ -ing is *prima facie* practically, morally, epistemically, etc. justified if and only if one *prima facie* practically, morally, epistemically, etc. permissibly  $\phi$ s. Plausibly enough, then, one's belief that  $p$  is epistemically justified if and only if one epistemically permissibly believes that  $p$ . Justifiers are considerations that support belief, in that, if all else goes well – i.e. proper basing, no defeat, good processing etc. – enough justifiers render a belief epistemically permissible.

Where does defeat fit in this picture? Just like justification, defeat is a normative category, in that it affects the permissibility of belief. Unlike justification, however, its function is to counter rather than support believing. If justifiers support belief – they contribute to rendering it permissible – defeaters contribute to rendering it impermissible. It is plausible, then, to think that defeat is the archenemy of justification: if justification is normative with a positive valence – in that it renders belief permissible – (full) defeat is normative with a negative valence, in rendering belief impermissible. In reasons-talk, if you wish, justifiers are normative reasons for belief, while defeaters are normative reasons against believing.

Now let's go back to Pryor's account of what goes on in the exchange between Moore and the sceptic. Recall: according to Pryor, even though Moore's argument does provide the sceptic with propositional justification, it fails to provide her with doxastic justification, in virtue of her unjustified sceptical beliefs defeating the latter, but not the former. As such, according to Pryor, the sceptic's belief that HANDS (and WORLD) based on Moore's argument would be rendered unjustified via defeat.

The problem with this picture is that it's not clear how an unjustified belief can have defeating force to begin with. To be clear, I am not claiming that we do not often resist information we are presented with because of our previously held unjustified beliefs. Indeed, we often resist information presented to us for bad reasons, e.g. due to wishfully believing that it is not true (think, for instance, of cases of partisanship in virtue of friendship, or cases of people in abusive relationships that refuse to acknowledge the abuse etc.). The question at stake when it comes to defeat, though, is not one concerning the *possibility* of resistance to evidence, but of permissibility: since justification and defeat are normative, they can only be instantiated in cases in which permissibility is at stake. Cases of wishful thinking are paradigmatic cases in which the hearer is, to use Pryor's term, 'obscured' from believing information that is presented to them, due to their wishes. Clearly, though, wishful thinking cases are impermissibility cases: the hearer should not, as a matter of fact, resist the testimony in question, even though they do. Again, to follow Pryor's terminology, these are cases where the believer is not 'rationally obscured' from forming said beliefs, but merely 'obscured.' Or to put it in reasons terms, their unjustified, wishful thinking-based beliefs are mere *motivating* reasons for resisting testimony, but not *normative* reasons.

If all this is so, the question that arises is: is the sceptic being 'rationally obscured', as Pryor would have it, from adopting a belief based on Moore's testimony by her previously held unjustified sceptical beliefs, or rather, just like the wishful thinker, merely 'obscured' from so doing? Since defeat is a normative category, and since, by Pryor's own stipulation, the sceptic's sceptical beliefs are

unjustified, it would seem as though they do not qualify as defeaters proper, but rather as mere motivating reasons for resisting Moore's argument. The non-normative cannot defeat the normative: motivating reasons cannot outweigh normative reasons normatively. Just because I wish really hard to steal your purse, it does not follow that it is permissible to steal your purse: my motivating reasons, no matter how strong, in favour of stealing, cannot outweigh the normative reasons against stealing, since they don't factor into the overall permissibility calculus to begin with.

Why, then, is it intuitive, and according to Pryor, right to think that, once one has adopted a belief that non-p (or a doubt about whether p, or a .5 credence that non-p), it would be importantly epistemically defective to adopt a subsequent belief that p? Take the following standard case of higher order defeat: I come to believe that the walls in your studio are white but illuminated by a red light to look red. Subsequently, upon arriving at your studio, it seems problematic for me to adopt the belief 'The wall in front of me is red' based on my corresponding perceptual experience as of a red wall. Why is this so? In particular, why is it that, even if we stipulate that my initial belief that the wall is white and illuminated to look red is unjustified, it would seem that, now that I hold it, I shouldn't just trust my perceptual experience?

Maybe the answer to this question has something to do with the order in which the beliefs have been acquired; that is, maybe a difference in extant doxastic states is an epistemologically significant difference. Indeed, Pryor himself alludes to an answer along these lines. According to him, were the sceptic to believe based on Moore's testimony that HANDS, and thereby WORLD, her belief would be irrational, because it would not cohere with her previously held sceptical beliefs. According to Pryor, since irrationality precludes justification, were the sceptic to believe what Moore says, her belief would also be unjustified:

I will count a belief as rational when it's a belief that none of your other beliefs or doubts rationally oppose or rationally obstruct you from believing. [...]A rational commitment is a hypothetical relation between your beliefs; it doesn't "detach." That is, you can have a belief in P, that belief can rationally commit you to believe Q. and yet you be under no categorical requirement to believe Q. Suppose you believe Johnny can fly. This belief rationally commits you to the belief that someone can fly. If you're not justified in believing that Johnny can fly, though, you need not have any justification for the further belief. You may even have plenty of evidence and be fully justified in believing that no one can fly. But your belief that Johnny can fly still rationally commits you to the belief that someone can fly. Given your belief about Johnny, if you refrain from believing that someone can fly, you'll thereby exhibit a rational failing (Pryor 2004: 363-364).

Since rational failings are incompatible with justification, Pryor takes it that this hypothetical type of normativity that he associates with rationality – of the form 'if you believe that p, then you are rationally committed to believing that q' – will affect the permissibility of belief *tout court*: were the sceptic to believe what Moore tells her, her belief would be irrational – since she is antecedently committed to believing the opposite – and thereby unjustified.

There are two problems with this normative assessment, though. First and foremost, note that there are two ways of resolving cognitive dissonance due to holding two conflicting beliefs B1 and B2: one can either abandon B1, or B2. Coherence doesn't tell us which one we should choose: it merely tells us that one needs to go.<sup>4</sup> There are two ways of proceeding in cases in which one is presented with information B2 that runs counter to one's extant belief B1: one can resist adopting B2, or, alternatively, one can abandon B1. Again, coherence doesn't recommend any particular course of action: it just tells us we need to choose between them.

One thing that Pryor could reply at this juncture is: time makes a difference, epistemically. The previously held belief takes precedence over the incoming information; this is what explains why the sceptic is rational to resist Moore's argument.

The question that arises, though, is: why should we think that time is of such devastating epistemological significance? Why is it, just because the sceptical belief precedes Moore's testimony temporally, that we should think that it also gets normative priority? After all consider the following pair of cases (adapted from Jessica Brown 2018):<sup>5</sup>

Case 1: A reliable testifier A, who knows that p, asserts that p. At the very same time as receiving A's testimony, the hearer also receives contrary testimony from another reliable testifier, B, that not-p.

Case 2: We slightly change Case 1 so that the testimony from B arrives just a bit later than the testimony from A, but for whatever reason the hearer does not form any belief about p before the testimony from B arrives.

In the cases, the evidentiary and doxastic situation is constant: one testimony item for, one against p, and no difference in mental states. Clearly, the time difference will not make any epistemic difference: in both Case 1 and Case 2, the hearer has equally strong evidence for and against p. She should suspend belief. But now consider:

Case 3: Differs from Case 2 only in the following respect: as a result of receiving A's testimony, the hearer forms the belief that p before receiving B's testimony.

Now note that there is no temporal difference between Case 2 and Case 3. As such, by the lights of the philosopher who believes that time can make an epistemic difference, there should be no difference in epistemic assessment either. But if there is no epistemic difference between Case 1 and 2, nor any epistemic difference between Case 2 and 3, it follows that there is no epistemic difference between Case 1 and Case 3 either. If so, what the hearer should do in both cases is suspend, rather than give priority to the first belief she formed and dismiss the second.

Let's take stock: we have seen that considerations pertaining to coherence cannot explain why we should think that the sceptic is rational to resist Moore's argument: coherence is indifferent between resisting Moore's argument and abandoning the previously held sceptical belief. We have also seen that time does not make an epistemic difference either. If so, just because a belief is antecedently held, it does not follow it takes epistemic priority. All of this suggests that the sceptic has no epistemic normative reason to give priority to her sceptical belief and thereby resist Moore's argument.

---

<sup>4</sup> See also (Simion 2020) and (Graham and Lyons 2021) for similar points.

<sup>5</sup> See also (Goldberg 2021).

Furthermore, recall that on Pryor's view, Moore's argument is justification conferring, while the sceptical belief is unjustified. If so, there *is* epistemic normative reason for the sceptic to adopt the conclusion of Moore's argument, and *no* epistemic normative reason to hold on to the sceptical belief – albeit, of course, the sceptic may well have a merely motivating reason to do so. All in all, it would seem, the sceptic ought (epistemically) abandon her sceptical belief and adopt the conclusion of Moore's argument. The Concessive Neo-Moorean solution to the sceptical puzzle is wrong: Moore's argument, while it may well often fail to convince the sceptic, that's not because it lacks dialectical power, but rather because the sceptic is epistemically impermissibly resisting its conclusion, in virtue of her previously held unjustified sceptical beliefs.

#### 4. A New Radical Neo-Mooreanism

Let's take stock: we've seen that Radical Neo-Mooreanism – claiming that the sceptic's resistance to Moore's argument is an instance of epistemic malfunction – is thought by many to fail to offer a fully satisfactory explanation of the datum, in that it places the sceptic in the same boat with wishful thinkers, epistemically speaking. However, intuitively, we find the sceptic reasonable, even if wrong, when she resists Moore's inference.

Concessive Neo-Mooreanism does better on this front: according to this philosopher, the intuition of epistemic permissibility concerning the sceptic's resistance to Moore's argument is to be explained in terms of psychological defeat: Moore's argument is warrant conferring, but dialectically defective. Alas, on closer investigation, this account was shown to run into normative trouble: given that the sceptical belief is unjustified, it remains unclear why the sceptic should favour it over the warranted conclusion of the Moorean argument.

In what follows, I will develop a new Neo-Mooreanism. My view falls squarely within the Radical Neo-Moorean camp, in that it takes transmission to hold in Moorean inferences and finds no flaw – epistemic or dialectical – with Moore's argument. However, as opposed to extant Radical Neo-Mooreans, it does predict that there is something epistemically good about the sceptic's doxastic response, that sets her apart from believers merely displaying full-on cognitive malfunctions, such as wishful thinking.

Here is how I think about these things (Simion 2020, Forthcoming): Evidence consists of facts. They can be facts about the world around us, or mere facts about a subject's psychology. My having a perception as of a table in front of me is a psychological fact; it (*pro tanto, prima facie*) supports the belief that there is a table in front of me. So does the fact that there is a table in plain view in front of me.

In my view, evidence consists of facts that are knowledge indicators, in that they enhance closeness to knowledge: it consists of facts that one is in a position to know, and that increase one's evidential probability – i.e., the probability on one's total body of evidence - of *p* being the case. The fact that there is a table in front of me is a piece of evidence for me that there is a table in front of me. It is a knowledge indicator: it raises the probability on my evidence that there is a table in front of me, and I'm in a position to know it.

Not just any psychological facts will constitute evidence that there is a table in front of me: my having a perception as of a table will fit the bill in virtue of having the relevant indicator property. Perceptions are knowledge indicators; the fact that I have a perception as of *p* is a fact that I am in a position to know and that increases my evidential probability that *p* is the case. The fact that I wish that there



was a table in front of me will not fit the bill, even if, unbeknownst to me, my table wishes are strongly correlated with the presence of tables: wishes are not knowledge indicators, for they don't raise my evidential probability of  $p$  being the case. For the same reason, mere beliefs, as opposed to justified and knowledgeable beliefs, will not be evidence material; they lack the relevant indicator property.

Here is the view in full:

**Evidence as Knowledge Indicators:** a fact  $e$  is evidence for one for a proposition  $p$  just in case one is in a position to know  $e$ , and one's evidential probability that  $p$  is the case conditional on  $e$  is higher than one's unconditional evidential probability that  $p$  is the case.

Or, more formally, and where  $P$  stands for the probability on one's total body of evidence:

**Evidence as Knowledge Indicators:** a fact  $e$  is evidence for  $p$  for  $S$  iff  $S$  is in a position to know  $e$ , and  $P(p/e) > P(p)$ .

Conversely, defeaters are indicators of ignorance: they are facts that one is in a position to know, and that lower one's evidential probability that  $p$  is the case:

**Defeaters as Ignorance Indicators:** a fact  $d$  is a defeater for  $S$ 's evidence  $e$  for  $p$  iff  $S$  is in an position to know  $d$  and  $S$ 's evidential probability that  $p$  conditional on  $e \& d$  is lower than  $S$ 's evidential probability that  $p$  conditional on  $e$ .

Or, more formally:

**Defeaters as Ignorance Indicators:** a fact  $d$  is a defeater for  $S$ 's evidence  $e$  for  $p$  iff  $S$  is in a position to know  $d$ , and  $P(p/e \& d) < P(p/e)$ .

What is it for me to be in a position to know  $e$ ? Plausibly, a certain availability relation needs to be instantiated. The fact in question needs to be at hand for me in my epistemic environment: at hand qualitatively (it needs to be the *type* of thing a creature like me can access and process), quantitatively (it needs to remain within the *amount* of things a creature like me can access and process at one particular time), and environmentally (it needs to be easily *available* in my – internal or external – epistemic environment, i.e. in my mind, or in my physical and social surroundings). On my view, a fact  $F$  being such that I am in a position to know it has to do with the capacity of my properly functioning knowledge generating processes to take up  $F$ :

**Being in a Position to Know:**  $S$  is in a position to know a fact  $F$  iff  $S$  has a cognitive process with the function of generating knowledge that can (qualitatively, quantitatively, and environmentally) easily uptake  $F$  in cognizers of  $S$ 's type.

Some evidence and defeaters I take up with my belief formation machinery, while some I fail to take up, although I should. What grounds this 'should', in my view, is proper epistemic functioning.<sup>6</sup> Because they are knowledge indicators, pieces of evidence are warrant makers: they are the proper inputs to our processes of belief formation, and when we have enough thereof, and the processes in question are properly functioning in all other ways,

---

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. (Graham 2012), (Millikan 1984), (Simion 2020).

the resulting belief is epistemically warranted. In turn, when our belief formation processes either fail to take up knowledge indicators that they could have easily taken up, or they take them up but fail to output the corresponding belief, they are malfunctioning. A subject S's belief formation process P is malfunctioning epistemically if S has sufficient evidence supporting *p* that is available to be taken up via P and P fails to output a belief that *p*.

The proper function of belief formation processes, then, on my view, is input dependent: failing to take up the right inputs – whether it occurs by taking up the wrong inputs, or by failing to take up the right inputs – is an instance of malfunctioning.

One illuminating analogy here is the proper functioning of the lungs: as opposed to functional traits whose proper function is not input-dependent (e.g. hearts can function properly in vats with orange juice,<sup>7</sup> even though they fail to pump blood), what it is for our lungs to function properly is, partly, for them to take up the right amount of the right stuff, i.e. oxygen, from the environment. Lungs that fail to do so are improperly functioning – whether they fail via taking up carbon dioxide, or by just failing to take up easily available oxygen.

Our cognitive systems are not like our hearts, they are like our lungs: their proper functioning is input-dependent. To see this, note that cognitive systems that take up wishes as inputs are instantiating malfunctioning, just like lungs that take up carbon dioxide. Just like the lungs, then, our cognitive systems can also malfunction by not taking up easily available proper inputs. On my view, then, one way in which our belief formation processes can fail to function properly is by failing to take up easily available evidence.

Going back to our sceptic: just like the wishful thinker, on this view of evidence and defeat, the sceptic has no epistemic reason to believe in her preferred skeptical hypothesis. There are no knowledge indicators available to her to this effect. There are no facts that raise the evidential probability of the skeptical hypotheses within her reach. Furthermore, Moore's assertion that HANDS provides the sceptic with evidence that there are hands, since Moore's testimony to this effect is a knowledge indicator. Also, since the sceptic's sceptical belief is not a knowledge indicator, it does not qualify as a defeater for HANDS. In this, the sceptic is in double breach of justification-conferring epistemic norms: she has unjustified sceptical beliefs, and she resists knowledge indicators on offer because of them. The sceptic does not have defeaters for HANDS; rather, she has mere motivating reasons to this effect: facts - i.e. the fact that she believes Non-WORLD/doubts WORLD - that lead her to unjustifiably reject HANDS.

What is it, then, that explains our intuition of reasonableness in the sceptic case, and the lack thereof in the case of the wishful thinker? Recall: According to the view developed here, the sceptic ought not hold sceptical beliefs to begin with, ought to come to believe that WORLD based on Moore's argument, and thereby ought draw the inference to WORLD with Moore and abandon her antecedently held sceptical beliefs. If she fails to do all that, she is in breach of the justification-conferring epistemic norm: her resistance to Moore's argument is epistemically impermissible.

Now, here is, however, a well-known fact about norms, generally speaking: sometimes, when we engage in impermissible actions, this gives rise to contrary-to-duty obligations. Consider the following normative claims:

- (1) It ought to be that John does not break the neighbour's window.
- (2) If John breaks the neighbour's window, it ought to be that he apologizes.

---

<sup>7</sup> I borrow this from (Graham 2012).

(1) is a *primary obligation*, saying what Jones ought to do unconditionally. In contrast, (2) is a *contrary-to-duty obligation* about (in the context of 1)) what Jones ought to do conditional on his violating his primary obligation. (1) is a norm of many sorts: social, prudential, moral, and a norm of politeness. Should John break the neighbour's window, there would be nothing good about it. That being said, John would be even worse off if, should he break the neighbour's window, he would also fail to go and apologize to the neighbour.

Our functionalist normative schema has the resources needed to explain this datum: input-independent proper functioning – of the type that governs hearts – remains a dimension of functional evaluation in its own right, independently of whether the general proper functioning of the trait in question is input-dependent or not: just like we can ask whether a heart is doing what it's supposed to do with the stuff that it takes up – be it blood or orange juice –, we can also ask whether the lungs are doing the stuff that they're supposed to do with the stuff that they have taken up – be it oxygen or carbon dioxide. There's going to be an evaluative difference, then, between two pairs of lungs that are both improperly functioning *simpliciter* – i.e. in the input-dependent sense, in that they take up the wrong kind of stuff from the environment – in terms of how they process their input gas: are they carrying the input gas through the respiratory system, and subsequently through the lining of the air sacs, to the blood cells? The pair of lungs who do are better than the pair of lungs who don't, in that, even though strictly speaking both are malfunctioning overall, the former are at least displaying input-independent proper functioning.

What explains our intuition of reasonableness in the sceptic's case, I claim, is not an epistemic norm *simpliciter*, but rather an epistemic contrary-to-duty imperative: now that the sceptic is in breach of the justification-conferring epistemic norm, short of abandoning her unjustified belief, the next best thing for her to do is embrace the commitments following from her unjustified beliefs, and reject the commitments that follow from their negation. The next best thing for the sceptic, now that she believes/has a .5 credence that non-WORLD and rejects HANDS, both impermissibly, short of abandoning her impermissible beliefs, is to reject whatever follows from HANDS. The sceptic's cognitive system, just like the wishful thinker's, and just like lungs taking up carbon dioxide from the environment, is overall malfunctioning on several counts: it takes up improper inputs (her sceptical beliefs) and rejects excellent inputs (Moore's testimony that HANDS). That being so, though, the sceptic does something right in terms of input-independent functioning: it processes the (bad) stuff that she takes up in the right way. Her cognitive system would be even worse were she, now that she believes/has a .5 credence that non-HANDS, go ahead and infer that WORLD.

Before I close, I would like to consider a possible objection to my view. So far, I have been assuming, with Pryor and Williamson, that the sceptic's sceptical beliefs/doubts are unjustified. One could worry though: Doesn't my view of evidence allow for the (reasonable) sceptic to have induction-based evidence for her .5 credence that non-World? After all, the sceptic could reason as follows: (1) When I can't tell the difference between pears and apples, I can't come to know that there's an apple in front of me; (2) When I can't tell the difference between John and his twin brother Tim, I can't come to know that John is in front of me.....(3) Therefore, when I can't tell the difference between x and y, I can't come to know that x is the case. (4) I can't tell the difference between WORLD and non-WORLD, therefore (5) I don't know that WORLD. In turn, If the sceptic believes that (5), on pain of Moorean paradoxicality, she can't believe that WORLD.

Two things about this: first, crucially, the envisaged sceptic is wrong, (3) is notably too strong: I can come to know that there's a pear in front of me in a world where there are no apples, or where apples are extremely rare, even if I can't tell the difference between pears and apples. That being said, of course, (3) may well be justified inductively, which would lead to (5) being justified inductively. Second, though, note that Moorean paradoxicality, just like incoherence, tells us nothing about which of the two beliefs should be abandoned: it merely predicts that one needs to go. Why think WORLD needs to go, rather than (5)? Furthermore, notice that in everyday testimonial cases, it's the previously held ignorance belief that should be abandoned: I believe I don't know whether you are 32 years old, you tell me that you are 32 years old, I thereby come to know that you are 32 years old and abandon my belief that I don't know that you are 32 years old. That's how it normally goes.

Last attempt: maybe the sceptic's inductively justified belief that she can't tell the difference between WORLD and non-WORLD acts as an undercutting defeater for Moore's testimony that HANDS? This could work. The problem, though, is that undercutting defeaters need to exhibit particular strength properties in order to successfully undercut. For instance, my 3 year-old's testimony that Dretske is wrong about closure failure, because he took a hallucinogenic drug before writing 'Epistemic Operators,' will not successfully undercut my evidence that closure fails sourced in Dretske's paper. Why not? My 3-year-old is just not a very reliable testifier on the issue – not reliable enough to undercut Dretske's written testimony, at any rate. The testimony from my 3-year-old does not lower my evidential probability conditional on Dretske's testimony that closure fails. If so, what would need to happen in the case of the sceptic for her induction-based skeptical belief to undercut Moore's testimony would be that the former is weighty enough, epistemically. Why, though, think that the sceptic's induction has such devastating epistemic effects against Moore's testimony? Also, recall that the inductive argument only warrants the reasonable skeptical belief 'I don't know that WORLD', not the anxious skeptical belief that non-WORLD.' Of course, though, the former is much weaker than the latter, and thus with much less defeat power.<sup>8</sup>

## 5. Conclusion

This paper has developed a novel, functionalist variety of Radical Neo-Mooreanism. I have argued with Williamson that, just like the wishful thinker, the sceptic is displaying epistemic malfunction in rejecting Moore's testimony. On my account, that is because her cognitive processes fail to pick up knowledge indicators. I have also shown, however, that the intuition that there's something reasonable about the sceptic who resists going through Moore's inference is right: the sceptic is in compliance with a contrary-to-duty obligation akin to input-independent well functioning.

To be clear: this account does not make any concessions to the sceptic in terms of justification-conferring epistemic norms – i.e. primary epistemic obligations: no justification for sceptical beliefs, nor any defeat against Moore's testimony, is instantiated at the context. The account merely explains why we find the sceptic reasonable (albeit wrong) to resist Moore's inference from HANDS to WORLD: she is in compliance with her contrary-to-duty epistemic obligations. Now that she's broken the window, as it were, the sceptic might as well go ahead and apologize.

---

<sup>8</sup> Thanks to Chris Kelp for pressing me on this.

## References

- Brown, J. (2018). *Fallibilism: Evidence and Knowledge*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, J. and Simion, M. (2021). *Reasons, Justification, and Defeat*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Davies, M. (2003). The problem of armchair knowledge. In Nuccetelli, Susana (ed.), *New Essays on Semantic Externalism and Self-Knowledge*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press: 23-55.
- Davies, M. (2004). Epistemic entitlement, warrant transmission, and easy knowledge. *Aristotelian Society Supplement*, 78: 213-45.
- Dretske, F. (1970). Epistemic operators. *Journal of Philosophy* 67: 1007-23.
- Goldberg, S. (2021). The Normativity of Knowledge and the Scope and Sources of Defeat. In J. Brown and M. Simion (eds.), *Reasons, Justification, and Defeat*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, P. (2012). Epistemic Entitlement. *Nous* 46/3: 449-482.
- Graham, P. and Lyons, J. (2021). The Structure of Defeat: Pollock's Evidentialism, Lackey's Framework, and Prospects for Reliabilism. In J. Brown and M. Simion (eds.) *Reasons, Justification, and Defeat*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Joep, M. Closure, credence and rationality: a problem for non-belief hinge epistemology. *Synthese* (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02153-5>
- Kelp, C. (2019). Inquiry and the Transmission of Knowledge. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 99: 298-310.
- Lackey, J. (2006). Knowing from testimony. *Philosophy Compass* , 1/5: 432- 48.
- Millikan, R. (1984). *Language, Thought, and Other Biological Categories*. MIT Press.
- Moore, G. E. 1939. Proof of an external world. *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 25: 273-300.
- Pollock, J. (1986). *Contemporary Theories of Knowledge*. Savage, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Pritchard, D. (2015). *Epistemic Angst: Radical Skepticism and the Groundlessness of Our Believing*. Princeton University Press.
- Pryor, J. (2000). The skeptic and the dogmatist. *Nous*, 34, 517-49.
- Pryor, J. (2004). What's Wrong with Moore's Argument? *Philosophical Issues*, Vol. 14: Epistemology: 349-378.
- Pryor, J. (2012). When Warrant Transmits. In *Mind, Meaning, and Knowledge: Themes from the Philosophy of Crispin Wright*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Simion, M. (Forthcoming). Resistance to Evidence and the Duty to Believe. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*.
- Simion, M. (2020). *Epistemic Norms and Epistemic Functions*. Book Manuscript.
- Simion, M., Schnurr, J. and Gordon, E. (2019). Epistemic norms, closure, and No-Belief hinge epistemology. *Synthese*, Online First. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02165-1>
- Williamson, T. (2000). *Knowledge and Its Limits*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Williamson, T. (2007). Knowledge and Scepticism. The *Oxford Handbook of Contemporary Philosophy*. F. Jackson and M. Smith (eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press: 681-700.
- Wright, C. (2002). (Anti-)sceptics simple and subtle: Moore and McDowell. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 65, 330-48.
- Wright, C. (2003). Some reflections on the acquisition of warrant by inference. Nuccetelli, Susana (ed.), *New Essays on Semantic*

Externalism and Self-Knowledge. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press: 57-77.  
Wright, C. (2004). Warrant for nothing (and foundations for free)?  
*Aristotelian Society Supplement*.