

- Hope, Uncertainty, and Justification
  - Goal: Explore the relationship between hope's justificatory status and the justificatory status of the cognitive component.
- Background:
  - Hope = cognitive attitude + conative attitude
    - Cognitive =df tracking the truth, responsive to evidence, and evaluable via epistemic reasons, etc. *Mind-to-world* direction of fit.
    - Conative =df inherently motivating, reflective of what an agent desires or values, and not requiring epistemic reasons, etc. *World-to-mind* direction of fit.
  - Hope requires uncertainty.
    - A subject *S* hopes for outcome *O* iff, *S* desires that *O* obtains and *S* is uncertain whether *O* will occur or fail to occur.
- Uncertainty: If *S* hopes that *p*, there are two ways I see that *S* can be uncertain about the outcome described by *p*: (i) *S* believes that *p* with a less-than-certain confidence level (ii) *S* believes that “*p* has such-and-such chance of occurring”. (iii) *S* has a low credence that *p*.
  - Two Major Differences
    - Content of the cognitive attitudes.
    - Credence (or confidence) of the attitudes may vary.
- Justification: Traditional Idea is that the justification of the whole depends on the parts (i.e. Justified hope = justified cognitive component + justified conative component). Two thoughts:
  - **(1)** Depending on whether your hope is enabled by (i), (ii), or (iii), your justification for hoping can change.

- (2) The Traditional Idea is false, the justification of each component isn't always required (there is some nuance here). It may be sufficient, but it isn't necessary.
- (1) Let's look at an example of each.
  - *Shawshank Redemption*: Inspired by Stephen King's novel, Red and Andy are both prisoners. Red lives in despair while Andy has hope for escape. Red resists hope because he believes hope will drive you mad, saying "I grant you it is possible, but the chance is only one in a thousand!" Whereas Andy responds, "I grant you the chance is only one in a thousand, but it is possible!" (Meirav 2009, 222-23).
    - This is an instance of (iii).
  - *Cancer Research*: Bess is part of a trial to try a new cancer treatment. She is told by the researchers that the treatment has a 1% chance of success so far. Bess hopes that she will be cured by the treatment.
    - This is an instance of (ii).
  - *Sports Fan*: Jane believes team  $x$  will win and so bets big money that  $x$  wins. However, Jane recognizes that it isn't a certainty so, being good at betting, she hedges against her own bet. Jane hopes that team  $x$  will win.
    - This is an instance of (iii).

- Assume you have practical justification for your desire for the above outcomes. Notice how evidence affects each one.
  - Clear Cut cases
  - Middle cases.
- 2) Imagine the following case:
  - Bob believes that the odds winning a certain raffle are very low for him. He bought five tickets, but he assumes many other people bought tickets as well since the prizes seem so desirable to him. Bob hopes that he wins the prize. Turns out both his assumptions are unjustified. Thus, his belief is unjustified that the odds are low. In fact, it turns out he has a 60% chance of winning the raffle. Is Bob's previous hope justified given the correct odds even though his belief was unjustified? (please say yes)
  - Argument Against Compositional Justification
    - P1) If the Traditional Idea is true then Bob is unjustified in his hope.
    - P2) Bob is justified.
    - C) So the traditional idea is false.