

**Philosophy 4330: Epistemology
Spring 2015, Fourth Paper Assignment**

Instructions: Write a short, argumentative paper on the topic of normativity and naturalistic epistemology. The paper should be approximately 500-1000 words. The paper must critically engage the assigned readings for weeks 9+10 of class (not necessarily all of them).

Due Date: You must submit your paper through Blackboard before the start of class on Wednesday, April 1st. Remember that these papers will be graded anonymously so do not write any identifying information (such as your name) in the paper.

Grading: There will be five short essay assignments throughout the semester. I will drop your lowest score. The remaining four essays will constitute 40% of your final grade.

References: All sources used in the writing of your paper must be properly referenced. This applies to material in the course readings, other published material, lecture notes from this class and other classes, material 'published' on the internet, and ideas contributed verbally by other students. Failure to follow these guidelines may result in a lowered grade or even an automatic F in the course; it may also lead to charges being brought before the university. If you have any questions about these issues, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Topic:

Quine famously argued that Epistemology should become a branch of Psychology. He thought that this followed from the idea that Epistemology (and actually, all of philosophy) should be done *naturalistically* - that is, in a way that takes science seriously. Goldman in our textbook, Kim in response to Quine, and Bishop and Trout in *Epistemology and the Psychology of Human Judgment* all agree that Epistemology should be done in a naturalistic way and yet, unlike Quine, they think that Epistemology is, and ought to be, a *normative* discipline. But they come to different answers about how this should affect the way we do epistemology. What do you think of the relationship between science (especially psychology or cognitive science) and epistemology? Does good scientific thinking require minimal changes to Epistemology? Perhaps moderate changes focusing on particular topics? Or a radical change in how epistemology has been practiced?