Any group of diverse individuals who share information will confront the need to manage disagreement. This is true even when -- sometimes especially when -- the individuals are experts in the field under discussion. Given disagreement in some area, what can be learned about the topic(s) under discussion from the fact that there is disagreement in that area, or about the nature of expertise in the area? Under what conditions, if any, should we regard disagreement as indicating that none of the views that are in dispute is to be taken as knowledgeable? And finally, what should non-experts do when they depend on experts who disagree amongst themselves?

Our confirmed speakers:

**August 28th**

Aaron Panofsky
UCLA
“Misbehaving Science: Controversy and Knowledge Production in Behavior Genetics”

Miriam Solomon
Temple University
“Scientific Disagreement in the Medical Context”

John Beatty
University of British Columbia
“Apparent Consensus and Unapparent Disagreement”

**August 29th**

Branden Fitelson
Rutgers University
“When is Evidence of Evidence Evidence?”

Kate Elgin
Harvard University
“The Realm of Epistemic Ends”

Jeryl Mumpower
Texas A & M University
“A Social Judgment Theory Perspective on Expert Judgment and Expert Disagreement”

(FREE!) Registration Required: [http://tinyurl.com/Sawyer4](http://tinyurl.com/Sawyer4)

Visit [http://tinyurl.com/NUSawyer](http://tinyurl.com/NUSawyer) for updates and details.