

# How to be an Equal Weight Theorist about Disagreement

Mattias Skipper Rasmussen

April 2016

## **Abstract**

When you find yourself disagreeing with an epistemic peer, how (if at all) should you revise your credence in the disputed proposition? According to the Equal Weight View (EWV), disagreeing peers should place equal weight on each others' opinions. Although EWV has played a prominent role in the disagreement debate, it remains unclear what it precisely means to place 'equal weight' on peer opinions. On one common interpretation of EWV, disagreeing peers should Split the Difference (SD) by adopting their average credence in the disputed proposition. I will argue that SD fails as a general interpretation of EWV because it ignores the possibility that two disagreeing peers may both have misjudged the available evidence. I offer a novel interpretation of EWV that takes this possibility into account.

The full draft can be found at [researchgate.net/publication/296026030](https://researchgate.net/publication/296026030)