### David Armstrong’s “Knowledge Entails True Belief”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>Strong Assertion of the Belief-Condition: If you know p, then you’re certain of p.</td>
<td>Strong Denial of the Belief-Condition: If you know p, then you don’t believe p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Problem: “The Case of the Unconfident Examinee” (Malcom’s strong vs. weak knowledge)</td>
<td>Problem: “I know the earth is round, but I don’t believe it is round.” (Possible contradiction: “I know it and am certain of it, but I don’t believe it.”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Weak Assertion of the Belief-Condition: If you know p, then you believe p.</td>
<td>Weak Denial of the Belief Condition: You know p, but you still might not believe p.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Problem: The wife whose husband is reported dead.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Armstrong's Rejection of the Weak Denial of the Belief Condition:
(Analysis of a supposed counterexample to Kap entails belief of p:
Woman who claims to know p, but acts as if she doesn't believe p.)

Is this a true counterexample?

Yes

Knowledge of p still does not entail not belief of p.

“"I know p, but I don’t believe p is true." (Kap & ~Bap)

If true, weak denial is established.

Why doesn’t she believe?

Husband is not dead.

Not knowledge.
(Knowledge requires truth.)

No

Then, we need further counter-examples to establish the weak denial.

“I know p, but I believe p is not true.” (Kap & Ba~p)

Does Ba~p entail ~Bap?

Not necessarily. If Kap entails Bap, then it could be a case of Ba~p & Bap.
(Irrationality; Split mind.)

Evidence is not satisfactory.

She can’t claim to know if she doesn’t accept the evidence.

She only believes he is dead.

Bap & ~Bap

Contradiction