

If epistemic authority is, in the nature of the case, "secondary," because it is dependent on the primary executive authority of the "facts" and of "reason," then how could it possibly be true, without an important qualification, that, as De George claims, "[n]onexecutive authority cannot be delegated" (105)?

Even if it were true that one epistemic authority cannot delegate her, his, or its authority to another (and even this is questionable), it would still be the case that, on De George's own principles, any epistemic authority must itself be secondary, because derived from the primary executive authority of the facts and of reason, and, in *that* sense, may be properly said to be "delegated."

9 July 1996