Available on: https://jsshrs.ep-journals.org/ E-ISSN: 3051-3561 P-ISSN: 3051-3553

Journal of Social Science and Human Research Studies

Volume: 02 Issue: 03 March-2026

Accessism: An Epistemology of Exposure and Accessibility

Albert Ulutorti Green
Special Education, St. Paul's Theological College, Awka Orcid: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3641-3948

Ikechukwu Vincent Ezenwa
Heron Preserve, KBar Ranch, Tampa, Florida, USA, Orcid: https://orcid.org/0009-0000-3992-4495

Published Date: March 19, 2026 **Article DOI: 10.65150/EP-jsshrs/V2E3/2026-09**

ABSTRACT: This article introduces Accessism: An Epistemology of Exposure and Accessibility, a structural framework that foregrounds epistemic access in knowledge creation. While classical epistemology has emphasised justification, belief, and truth, it has largely overlooked the structural conditions under which knowledge becomes available to a subject. Accessism holds that knowledge depends on exposure to informational, cultural, linguistic, and institutional channels.Ignorance may be caused by structural inaccessibility rather than cognitive failure or irrationality. This theory articulates foundational axioms, proposes a model of knowledge formation mediated by access and exposure, situates itself within the rationalist, empiricist, and critical traditions, addresses possible objections, and explores normative implications for education, technology, and cross-cultural understanding. By emphasising accessibility as an essential precondition for knowing, Accessism extends epistemology into a global, structurally aware, and ethically sensitive domain.

KEYWORDS: Accessism, Epistemology, Exposure, Accessibility.

INTRODUCTION

Epistemology, the study of knowledge, has traditionally focused on the conditions that make belief justified and true. Giuseffi exemplifies classical tales in his analysis of Pluto circa 399 BCE in "The Investigation of a Nelsonian Approach to Socratic Dialogue with Student-Teachers at a Midwestern Private University" (2024). Justified real belief underscores the logical assessment of beliefs, whereas the rationalist and empiricist traditions, represented by Descartes (2016) and Locke (2022), contend over the origins of knowledge, whether from reason or experience. Alican (2022) sought to reconcile both viewpoints, asserting that knowledge emerges from the interaction between sensory information and the mind's a priori structures. Subsequent work has enhanced these models; yet they remain reliant on reasoning, cognition, and the internal faculties of the knower.

Notwithstanding these thorough assessments, a vital component remains insufficiently comprehended: the accessibility of information, encompassing both its framework and experiential dimensions. Classical epistemology assumes that subjects can access the subject of evaluation; nevertheless, it seldom examines the conditions that facilitate such access. It is impractical to establish beliefs on propositions that have not been encountered, to assess evidence that has not been perceived, or to scrutinise claims that have not been introduced. Access is, thus, a fundamental prerequisite for knowledge.

Accessism rectifies this oversight by prioritising exposure and accessibility within epistemology. Knowledge depends on access to knowledge through language, culture, institutions, and technology. Accessism asserts that ignorance is primarily structural rather than cognitive; it stems from a lack of exposure rather than a weakness in intelligence or rationality.

The central thesis of Accessism can be summarised thus:

Knowledge is structurally conditioned by exposure and accessibility (Smalle et al., 2022; Smith & DeCoster, 1998). Without access, belief, justification, and the appraisal of truth cannot occur. This emphasis does not diminish established epistemology. Rather, it situates justification and logical reasoning within a wider framework that takes into account the sources of knowledge, accessibility, and the structural conditions that give rise to understanding. Accessism highlights the epistemic inequalities present in education, society, and technology. It also incorporates a wider global and ethical viewpoint into the examination of information.

The essay provides a comprehensive analysis of Accessism. It commences by delineating its fundamental concepts, subsequently articulates foundational assumptions, develops a structural model of knowledge formation, interacts with rationalist, empiricist, and critical traditions, addresses critiques, and explores the ethical ramifications for epistemic practice and the dissemination of knowledge globally. It aims to advance a theory of knowledge that is rigorous, structurally informed, and pertinent across diverse cultural and institutional contexts.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

CONCEPTUAL CLARIFICATIONS

To establish Accessism as a rigorous epistemological framework, it is essential to clarify its core principles. Exact definitions guarantee that the theory can endure philosophical scrutiny and be applicable in all settings. Accessism embraces the traditional conception of knowledge as justified true belief. Knowledge is distinguished from mere opinion or belief by the integration of three criteria: truth, belief, and reasonable justification. The Gettier problem (Gettier, 1963) showed that justified true belief may not entail knowledge in certain circumstances. Accessism, however, does not aim to address this dilemma; rather, it places knowledge within a structural prerequisite: the imperative of exposure and accessibility.

In other words, a belief cannot be justified or evaluated for truth unless the subject has first encountered the relevant content. Knowledge, therefore, is contingent upon prior exposure. Exposure is the event or situation that allows a person to come into contact with knowledge, whether it is factual, conceptual, or experiential. Exposure may occur through: Direct perception or observation (Locke, 2022). Linguistic communication, such as reading or listening. Instruction and teaching. Artistic or symbolic representation. Testimony and dialogue (Fricker, 2007)

Exposure is necessary but not sufficient for knowledge (Uchihara et al., 2023): an individual may encounter erroneous information or lack the interpretive tools needed to comprehend the topic. On the other hand, the process of belief development and justification cannot begin without exposure. Because of this, exposure is the event that marks the beginning of epistemic possibility.

Accessibility denotes the structural conditions that enable or constrain exposure (Mazzulla & Pirrone, 2024)**.** It encompasses the methods and channels that make knowledge accessible to a subject, including educational and institutional frameworks, cultural norms and traditions, technological infrastructure, and language and literacy. Accessibility operates independently of cognition, thereby shaping opportunities to encounter knowledge. Social inclusion or exclusion may result from accessibility. A notion may be situated within a book, archive, or cultural tradition; yet, if it is not accessible to a specific individual or community, it remains epistemically invisible to them.

Accessism distinguishes between different forms of ignorance:

1. *Cognitive Ignorance***:** Failure to know despite having access and exposure.
2. *Volitional Ignorance*: A deliberate refusal to engage with accessible content.
3. *Structural Ignorance***:** Absence of knowledge due to lack of exposure or restricted access.

Classical epistemology has largely focused on cognitive and volitional ignorance (Tanesini, 2025). Accessism emphasises structural ignorance, not as a moral or intellectual failing but as a function of epistemic infrastructure and opportunity.

Accessism holds that all epistemic encounters are mediated by structures**:** linguistic, cultural, institutional, technological, and social. Knowledge formation is therefore not solely a matter of individual cognition; it is situated within a network of mediating systems (Farzanfar et al., 2023). Without these mediators, exposure and access may be impossible, regardless of cognitive capacity.

In the philosophy of accessism, one of the most important principles is that the mere existence of knowledge does not entail that it is accessible. Scientific discoveries, cultural narratives, and historical records may exist, yet remain inaccessible to individuals who lack the necessary channels or techniques. Availability is a precondition for epistemic engagement (Currie, 2023); without it, knowledge cannot be acquired or evaluated.

Accessism is a theory that holds that exposure and accessibility are necessary for knowledge but not sufficient. However, justification, truth, and rational evaluation remain vital components, as they make the creation and evaluation of beliefs possible. In the absence of access, knowledge cannot be acquired, but access by itself does not guarantee knowledge.

The Foundational Axioms of Accessism

To establish Accessism as a systematic epistemological theory, its core commitments must be formulated as explicit axioms. These axioms articulate the necessary structural conditions for knowledge and provide a logical foundation for subsequent argumentation.

Axiom 1: The Exposure Condition

No subject can know a proposition unless the subject has been exposed to it.

Formally: *For any subject* S *and proposition* P, *if* S *knows* P, *then* S *has been exposed to* P. This axiom states a necessary condition. Belief formation presupposes awareness; awareness presupposes encounter. Classical empiricism already implies a version of this claim through its emphasis on sensory input (Locke, 2022). However, Accessism generalises the condition beyond sensory experience to include linguistic, testimonial, institutional, and technological forms of encounter. Without exposure, cognitive evaluation cannot begin. One cannot justify, doubt, affirm, or deny what one has never encountered.

Axiom 2: The Accessibility Condition

Exposure is contingent upon structural accessibility.

Formally:

If *S* is exposed to *P*, then there exist mediating structures that render *P* accessible to *S*.

This axiom posits structural mediation as a prerequisite for epistemic interaction. Access is not solely a psychological condition but a relational attribute between the subject and the informational framework. Language, literacy, institutional transparency, and technological infrastructure serve as facilitating conditions. This principle aligns with Alican's (2022) observation that cognition is influenced by structural frameworks; however, Accessism shifts the conditioning factor from solely cognitive categories to socio-structural systems.

Axiom 3: Structural Mediation of Knowledge

All knowledge is structurally mediated.

There is no epistemic access without mediation, whether through perception, testimony, text, or technology. Even perception is filtered through conceptual and linguistic schemes (Alican, 2022). Testimonial knowledge depends on social trust networks and communicative practices (Fricker, 2007).

Thus: *Knowledge is never immediately available in an absolute sense; it is always mediated by systems that enable interpretation and transmission.*

Axiom 4: Structural Ignorance Principle

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Ignorance can result from structural inaccessibility rather than from cognitive failure.

Traditional epistemology frequently regards ignorance as the lack of cognition, evaluative evidence, or intellectual merit. Accessism expands the explanatory framework: if S is unaware of P and P is true, this shortcoming may be attributed to a lack of access rather than a limitation in cognitive ability. This principle corresponds with analyses of epistemic injustice (Fricker, 2007), demonstrating how societal structures can systematically impede epistemic participation.

Axiom 5: Necessity Without Sufficiency

Access is necessary but not sufficient for knowledge.

Exposure and accessibility create epistemic possibility, but they do not guarantee truth or justification. A subject may be exposed to misinformation, propaganda, or conceptual confusion.

This preserves compatibility with classical epistemic criteria such as justification and truth (Gettier, 1963). Accessism supplements, rather than replaces, these standards.

From these axioms, the following dependency chain emerges:

1. Accessibility → enables
2. Exposure → enables
3. Belief formation → enables
4. Justification and evaluation → enables
5. Knowledge

Thus, knowledge is the culmination of a structured sequence. Remove accessibility, and the entire epistemic process collapses before belief can arise.

Accessism therefore shifts epistemology from a purely internal analysis of justification to a layered model that incorporates structural preconditions. The next section will formalise this dependency into a systematic model of knowledge formation.

The Structural Model of Knowledge Formation

According to the principles of Accessism, knowledge is the result of a systematic process where exposure and accessibility are prerequisites for believing, justification, and truth assessment. This part establishes a model that contextualises Accessism within the epistemological framework and illustrates its analytical precision. Accessism perceives the production of knowledge as a series of interconnected stages:

Sources → Accesibility → Exposure → Cognitive Processing → Belief Formation → Juatifiction → Knowledge

Each stage is important and dependent on the stages prior to it:

Source: The propositional or experiential content exists autonomously from the subject. This corresponds with the traditional realism premise that truth is objective.(Moberger, 2022).

Accessibility: Structural mechanisms make the source accessible to the subject. Examples encompass language, literacy, education, institutional authorisations, technology, and cultural behaviours. (Fricker, 2007).

Exposure: The subject encounters the source through perception, testimony, instruction, or mediated interaction. Exposure converts potential knowledge into possible cognition (Yao et al., 2022).

This model illustrates the fundamental need of access: without accessibility and exposure, the progression to belief, justification, or knowledge is impeded. Accessism alters the analytical perspective from merely examining beliefs to evaluating the conditions that enable such assessments. Traditional epistemology frequently assumes that all pertinent propositions are accessible to the rational subject; Accessism exposes this assumption as implicit. This strategy prioritises accessibility to mitigate knowledge gaps arising from structural, cultural, or technological constraints.

A scientific breakthrough published in an academic journal is inaccessible to those without literacy, language skills, or institutional access. Notwithstanding the veracity and rational basis of the breakthrough, the person continues to be epistemically marginalised. Oral indigenous knowledge may be inaccessible to outsiders without cultural or linguistic interpretation. Epistemic gaps are ascribed to structural constraints rather than cognitive inadequacies. In both instances, Accessism offers a framework for the methodical examination of epistemic disparities.

Logical Formulation of Accessism

To establish Accessism as a systematic epistemological theory, its conceptual commitments might be articulated using a formal logical framework. This statement aims to illustrate that knowledge arises not merely from belief, justification, and truth, but from an antecedent series of structural prerequisites that enable cognition. By converting Accessist concepts into symbolic logic, the theory elucidates the dependence relationships that underpin knowledge production and demonstrates how accessibility serves as a pre-epistemic foundation.

Symbolic Definitions

Let S be the epistemic subject (the knower) and P signify a proposition. The epistemic relations are delineated as follows: K(S,P) represents that S possesses knowledge of P; B(S,P) shows that S holds a belief in P; J(S,P) indicates that S is justified in holding the belief in P; and T(P) asserts that P is true. Accessism introduces supplementary structural predicates: E(S,P) signifies the exposure of S to P; A(S,P) denotes that P is accessible to S; and M(S,P) indicates the presence of mediating structures, such as language, institutions, perception, or technology, that facilitate access between the subject and the proposition.

Main Accessist Axioms

The initial axiom, known as the Exposure Condition, asserts that knowledge necessitates an encounter. Formally expressed as K(S,P) → E(S,P). If a subject possesses knowledge of a proposition, it is a prerequisite that the subject has been previously exposed to such a proposition. Knowledge inherently presupposes awareness, and awareness, in turn, presupposes encounter.

The second axiom, referred to as the Accessibility Condition, posits that exposure is dependent upon accessibility: **E(S,P) → A(S,P).**

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Exposure cannot transpire unless the proposition is structurally accessible to the individual. Therefore, accessibility must antecede epistemic contact.

The third axiom, known as the Structural Mediation Principle, asserts that accessibility is fundamentally reliant on mediating systems.

A(S,P) → M(S,P).

Access is available only when enabling frameworks whether linguistic, perceptual, institutional, or technological facilitate engagement. Consequently, knowledge is never direct but always mediated.

The fourth axiom, known as the Structural Ignorance Principle, elucidates ignorance without attributing any cognitive deficiency. Formally,

¬K(S,P) ∧ T(P) ∧ ¬A(S,P).

A subject may be unaware of a true proposition due to its inaccessibility, rather than due to a deficiency in rational capacity.

The fifth axiom, Necessity Without Sufficiency, elucidates that access in isolation does not suffice to produce knowledge. Accessibility and exposure are essential but inadequate conditions:

A(S,P) ↛ K(S,P), or equivalently,

A(S,P) ∧ E(S,P) ⇏ K(S,P)**.**

A subject may encounter misinformation or fail to attain justification despite having access.

Classical Knowledge Condition Retained

Accessism preserves the classical epistemological formulation that knowledge consists of justified true belief:

K(S,P)↔B(S,P)∧J(S,P)∧T(P)

Rather than substituting this model, Accessism introduces structural preconditions that must be in place prior to the emergence of belief and justification.

Accessist Dependency Chain

From the axioms emerges a structured epistemic sequence:

M(S,P)→A(S,P)→E(S,P)→B(S,P)→J(S,P)→K(S,P)

Mediating structures facilitate accessibility; accessibility fosters exposure; exposure permits the formation of beliefs; belief enables justification; and justified genuine belief results in knowledge. Knowledge is thus perceived not as a solitary cognitive condition but as the culmination of a systematic process.

The Accessist Knowledge Formula

The integration of these relations results in the Accessist knowledge condition.

K(S,P)→J(S,P)∧B(S,P)∧T(P)∧E(S,P)∧A(S,P)∧M(S,P)

Knowledge exists only when truth, belief, and justification operate within conditions of exposure, accessibility, and mediation.

Compact Principle of Accessism

The theory may be summarized functionally as:

K=f(M,A,E,B,J,T)K = *f*(M, A, E, B, J, T)K=f(M,A,E,B,J,T)

Knowledge is therefore a function of mediation, accessibility, exposure, belief, justification, and truth. Cognitive factors and structural conditions collectively produce epistemic outcomes.

Accessist Collapse Principle

Accessism further asserts that the removal of accessibility terminates the epistemic process.

¬A(S,P)→¬E(S,P)→¬B(S,P)→¬K(S,P)

Access is a fundamental prerequisite for exposure; Exposure is crucial for the development of belief, and believe is vital for the attainment of knowledge. Epistemic failure may therefore transpire prior to the cognitive process. The logical formulation of Accessism indicates that epistemology must investigate the structural prerequisites that underlie conventional interpretations of justification. The classical approach defines knowledge as justified true belief; nevertheless, Accessism contends that this definition assumes prerequisites that are rarely examined: accessibility and exposure. Accessism elucidates that knowledge exists at the pinnacle of a hierarchical dependency structure established by mediating mechanisms that enable epistemic interaction. The notion does not undermine the significance of sociological knowledge or dismiss rational assessment; instead, it broadens epistemology into a pre-epistemic realm where structural access affects the capacity for knowledge acquisition. In this context, Accessism is articulated as a logical progression of classical epistemology, asserting that the essential basis of knowledge is accessibility rather than justification.

Compatibility With Classical and Contemporary Epistemology

The model maintains compatibility with traditional accounts of knowledge:

Rationalist elements: Cognitive processing relies on reason (Descartes, 2016)

Empiricist elements: Exposure can occur through sensory experience (Locke, 1690).

Critical philosophy elements: Knowledge formation is structured and mediated, echoing Alican's (2022) notion that cognition depends on conditions that shape experience.

Contemporary concerns: The model aligns with epistemic injustice theory (Fricker, 2007) by demonstrating how social and structural factors limit access to knowledge.

Accessism functions as a meta-epistemological framework by incorporating these perspectives; it does not replace criteria for justification, truth, or belief but rather contextualises them within a structurally conscious architecture of knowledge. Accessism extends its implications beyond personal cognition. Globally, disparities in technical, linguistic, and educational accessibility generate uneven epistemic terrains. Improving access through translation, technology, or social inclusion promptly broadens the scope of potential knowledge, in accordance with the Expansion Principle.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

This positions Accessism not merely as a theoretical innovation but also as a practically relevant epistemology for understanding knowledge inequalities and for informing policy, education, and technology design (Hume, 2016).

Accessism in Dialogue with Major Epistemological Traditions

For Accessism to evolve into a comprehensive epistemological framework, it must integrate both traditional and contemporary concepts. Accessism demonstrates its novelty and conceptual coherence by identifying areas of concurrence and divergence with established concepts. The rationalist philosopher Descartes (2024) claimed that reason is the primary means of acquiring knowledge. For instance, Descartes asserts that individuals can attain specific knowledge by deliberate scepticism and intrinsic rational faculties. Rationalism often presupposes that the necessary material for logical reflection is accessible to the individual, either intrinsically or through restricted sensory experience. Accessism reinforces rationalism by highlighting the fundamental structural prerequisites for rational reflection. Rationality cannot be applied to a statement that has not yet entered the realm of intellect. In this sense, Accessism defines an epistemic requirement that rationalists implicitly acknowledge but never examine explicitly. Empiricist philosophers, such as Locke (2022) and Hume (2016), assert that all knowledge originates from experience. Locke posits that the mind begins as a "tabula rasa," gradually filled by sensory experiences. Empiricism inherently emphasises direct sensory experience, disregarding mediated or socially regulated forms of access.

Accessism enhances empiricism by recognising mediated exposure as legitimate methods of learning. Testimony, literacy, education, and technology methods are many means by which individuals might gain knowledge beyond direct observation. This perspective expands the scope of empiricism to include the complex realities of contemporary and cross-cultural knowledge systems. Kant's critical philosophy (1781) posits that knowledge is formed by a priori cognitive structures. The mind does not passively receive information; rather, it actively organises sensory data based on inherent classifications.

Accessism aligns with Alican's assertion that structural elements affect cognition; nevertheless, it shifts focus from internal cognitive abilities to exterior mediating mechanisms. Alican enquires, "How does the mind organise experience?" Accessism examines: "In what ways do external structures facilitate or impede experiences?"

Accessism represents a structural enhancement to Alicanian analysis, integrating critical philosophy into the technological and cultural domains that influence our learning processes.

Modern epistemology has increasingly acknowledged the societal implications of knowledge. Feminist and social epistemologists, notably Fricker (2007), clarify how testimonial injustice and systemic biases obstruct epistemic participation. Accessism expands upon this concept by proposing a comprehensive structural framework applicable to all forms of information, not exclusively instances of social injustice.

Social epistemology examines variations in communication and mutual recognition among individuals. Accessism denotes a meta-structural position wherein epistemic involvement is unattainable without access and exposure, irrespective of social or cognitive credentials. Accessism offers a comprehensive paradigm that integrates classical and social epistemology.

Accessism positions itself as a meta-epistemological framework: Rationalism emphasizes the primacy of reason, which Accessism presupposes but locates within a structural context (Kant, 1998). Empiricism prioritises experience, while Accessism expands this concept to include mediated kinds of exposure. Critical philosophy provides the understanding that knowledge is systematically organised, a concept that Accessism expands to encompass external, socio-structural contexts. Contemporary social epistemology illustrates how structural impediments generate injustice; Accessism generalises this concept to include all varieties of knowledge accessible. Through these interactions, Accessism illustrates both alignment with known epistemological findings and innovation in emphasising the significance of structural prerequisites for knowledge.

Objections and Critical Engagement

An effective epistemological theory must endure challenge and exhibit resilience under thorough examination. Accessism, by prioritising exposure and accessibility, may face criticisms that include accusations of triviality and worries of reductionism. This section presents substantial arguments and offers rational rebuttals.

Objection I: The Triviality Objection

Claim: The assertion that one cannot know what one has not been exposed to is self-evident and therefore unremarkable. Critics may argue that Accessism adds little to epistemology.

Response: Although the principle may seem intuitive, the significant philosophical contribution of Accessism resides in its systematic formalisation and the implications it has within the structure. Similar to the law of non-contradiction in logic, a principle that appears self-evident becomes fundamental when it supports a broader theoretical framework. Accessism elevates this intuitive insight into an axiomatic system, linking exposure and accessibility to belief formation, justification, and the assessment of knowledge. Moreover, it elucidates structural and ethical consequences, such as epistemic injustice and global knowledge inequality, which are largely overlooked by classical epistemology.

Objection II: Reduction to Sociology

Claim: By emphasising structural mediation (language, institutions, technology), Accessism risks reducing epistemology to sociology or social analysis. Knowledge becomes a function of social structures rather than truth and justification.

Response: Accessism does not alter the core concept of knowledge; instead, it specifies necessary conditions for epistemic engagement. Truth, belief, and justification are fundamental notions. The structural conditions exclusively dictate the viability of epistemic interaction. A concept may be valid and justified yet remain unavailable due to linguistic or technological obstacles. Accessism enhances conventional epistemology by contextualising justification and belief within a pragmatic framework of opportunity, rather than substituting epistemic criteria with social determinism.

Objection III: Innate Knowledge

Claim: Rationalists, such as Descartes (2016), contend that certain knowledge is innate. If knowledge can originate internally without external exposure, then Accessism's emphasis on accessibility may be overstated.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Response: Accessism does not deny innate capacities. It emphasises that activation of these capacities requires content**.** Even mathematical reasoning, logic, or moral insight relies on engagement with propositions or stimuli. Innate structures provide potential, but exposure actualises knowledge. Thus, Accessism is compatible with rationalist claims while highlighting that knowledge formation is contingent upon structural availability.

Objection IV: Infinite Access Problem

Claim: If access depends on prior knowledge (e.g., literacy, prior education), Accessism risks circularity: knowledge requires access, which requires prior knowledge.

Response: Accessism acknowledges the developmental stratification of accessibility rather than presuming comprehensive prior knowledge. Basic sensory exposure precedes literacy, which in turn precedes advanced scholarship. Each stage broadens the scope of attainable knowledge. The model is cumulative rather than circular. Accessibility at early stages establishes the foundation for subsequent epistemic advancement, in accordance with the Expansion Principle.

Objection V: Overemphasis on External Conditions

Claim: Accessism may excessively prioritise structural conditions, thereby undermining individual intellectual agency.

Response: Accessism situates agency within the context of structural frameworks. Cognitive diligence, reasoning, and critical reflection are essential for the formation and justification of beliefs. Accessism asserts that structural conditions either facilitate or constrain agency, but do not replace it. Knowledge is derived from the interaction between available information and logical cognitive engagement.

Objections highlight important factors; yet, Accessism demonstrates resilience by methodically formalising an assumption about exposure that was originally implicit. It integrates structural mediation without reducing knowledge to social determinism. It accommodates inherent abilities while underscoring the significance of exposure. It takes into account the hierarchical evolution of access, thus circumventing circular reasoning. It preserves cognitive autonomy within structural paradigms.

Normative Implications of Accessism

Accessism surpasses descriptive epistemology, resulting in significant moral consequences. Situating knowledge within frameworks of exposure and accessibility alters our understanding of epistemic responsibilities, teaching methodologies, and the ethical distribution of information. Conventional epistemology often ascribes ignorance to cognitive deficiencies or insufficient effort. Conversely, accessism offers a structural viewpoint: specific types of ignorance arise from inaccessibility rather than cognitive deficiencies. Therefore, moral and epistemological responsibilities must be accurately aligned. A student hindered by linguistic or institutional obstacles cannot be deemed responsible for their ignorance of academic research. It is not their responsibility to ensure that people marginalised from historical records or technical comprehension stay misinformed. This viewpoint corresponds with Fricker's (2007) concept of epistemic injustice, highlighting the ethical duty to acknowledge how social structures might obstruct the attainment of knowledge. Accessism expands this notion to include all humans, arguing that everyone is accountable for improving accessibility, which may entail teaching, interpretation, or the incorporation of technology. Accessism redefines education as a systematic broadening of epistemic bounds rather than simply the dissemination of information. Educational activities must focus on exposing learners to different content, removing systemic hurdles including literacy, language, and digital connectivity, and fostering the development of critical thinking abilities and knowledge engagement. Accessism emphasises accessibility, perceiving education as a vehicle for epistemic empowerment that allows individuals to engage in knowledge creation rather than only rote memorisation.

Contemporary technology significantly enhances access (Angwaomaodoko, 2023). Digital platforms, translation software, and online education serve to facilitate the acquisition of new knowledge. Nonetheless, disparities persist: the digital divide obstructs internet access for economically disadvantaged populations. Language and cultural disparities impede global mutual understanding. Accessism offers a theoretical framework for evaluating these inequalities. Improving access to technology and language substantially broadens our knowledge base, whereas neglecting them sustains ignorance.

Knowledge transferred through culture. Oral traditions, artistic endeavors, and symbolic systems encapsulate epistemic knowledge in ways that may be opaque to outsiders (Ihejirika, 2024). Accessism underscores the importance of translation, mediation, and communication for understanding the world.

Without such structural adjustments, humans are uneducated not owing to a lack of intelligence, but rather due to insufficient access to information. Accessism underscores the moral imperative to reconcile knowledge gaps among persons from varied linguistic, cultural, and social contexts. It expands the notion of epistemic justice beyond the scope of social epistemology related to marginalised populations. Accessism posits that systemic inequalities in access represent a worldwide concern. Equity is not the only rationale for ensuring widespread access to information. (Morrison & Rahman, 2020); it is also vital for meaningful participation in rational discourse, scientific progress, and cultural exchange.

Normatively, Accessism reconceptualizes epistemic duty in consideration of structural contexts. It frames education as a means to enhance epistemic accessibility and establishes a framework for evaluating the ethical implications of technology and globalization on the distribution of knowledge. Advocates support intercultural interaction and equitable access to information.

Philosophical Significance

Accessism offers a fundamental redefinition of epistemology by emphasizing the structural prerequisites for knowledge. Its significance lies in its ability to connect classical, contemporary, and socially conscious methodologies while providing a robust framework for analyzing epistemic development within a globally interconnected, yet hierarchically organized society.

Foregrounding Structural Conditions: Traditional epistemology concentrates on belief, justification, and truth (Capps, 2024; Giuseffi, 2024), often presupposing that knowledge content is equally accessible to all individuals. Accessism emphasizes the structural preconditions of knowledge, asserting that accessibility and exposure are essential for any epistemic assessment.

Integrative Approach: Accessism consolidates insights from various traditions**:** *Rationalism* (Gaines, 1989; Shin, 2019); *Empiricism***,** which asserts that knowledge depends on exposure, now expanded to encompass mediated forms (Locke, 1690); *Critical Philosophy, which posits that*

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

*k*nowledge is conditioned by structures, now extended externally (Alican, 2022); and *Social Epistemology*, emphasizing that access and injustice hold ethical significance (Fricker, 2007). This comprehensive approach positions Accessism as a meta-epistemology, capable of engaging with both normative and descriptive analyses of knowledge.

Clarifying Ignorance: By distinguishing between cognitive, volitional, and structural ignorance, Accessism clarifies the sources of epistemic gaps. It demonstrates that ignorance is not invariably indicative of intellectual deficiency, thereby reshaping ethical assessments of blame and responsibility.

Practical Relevance: Accessism extends epistemology into practical domains, including: Education, which frames teaching as an expansion of epistemic horizons; Technology, involving the evaluation of the ethical implications of the digital divide; and global discourse, emphasizing translation, mediation, and cross-cultural epistemic engagement.

CONCLUSION

Throughout human history, the analysis of knowledge has focused on the concepts of belief, justification, and truth. Conversely, these studies frequently overlook a fundamental requirement: the accessibility of content regarding both its structure and user experience. This understanding is encapsulated by accessism, which posits that exposure and accessibility are fundamental prerequisites for information acquisition. Accessism enables the acknowledgement of this necessity. This perspective posits that exposure is essential for belief formation. Moreover, the attainment of publicity is substantially contingent upon accessibility. This obligation resides with structural mediation, which is responsible for creating the conditions that enable knowledge. In contrast to cognitive or volitional ignorance, structural ignorance represents a unique and pervasive form of ignorance worldwide. Accessism does not supplant classical epistemology; instead, it enhances it by contextualising traditional issues within an ecologically conscious and structurally informed framework. This methodology facilitates the creation of innovative techniques for assessing knowledge gaps, structuring educational initiatives, and tackling ethical issues in information transmission. To achieve these aims, significant emphasis is focused on the function of access.

Consequently, accessism represents an epistemology that is both theoretically robust and practically relevant, as well as ethically responsible. A theory of knowledge positing that the boundaries of comprehension are frequently dictated by accessibility, and that the extent of knowledge expands concurrently with enhanced availability, is termed a horizon theory of knowledge.

REFERENCES

1) Alican, N. F. (2022). What's So Good About the Good Will? An Ontological Critique of Kant's Axiomatic Moral Construct.
2) Angwaomaodoko, E. A. (2023). An appraisal on the role of technology in modern education, opportunities and challenges. *Traektoriâ Nauki*, *9*(12), 3019-3028.
3) Capps, J. (2024). Epistemology, logic, and inquiry. *The bloomsbury handbook of pragmatism*, 101.
4) Chang, H. (2022). *Realism for realistic people*. Cambridge University Press.
5) Currie, A. (2023). Epistemic engagement, aesthetic value, and scientific practice. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, *74*(2), 313-334.
6) Descartes, R. (2016). Meditations on first philosophy. In *Seven masterpieces of philosophy* (pp. 63-108). Routledge.
7) Farzanfar, D., Spiers, H. J., Moscovitch, M., & Rosenbaum, R. S. (2023). From cognitive maps to spatial schemas. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *24*(2), 63-79.
8) Fricker, M. (2007). *Epistemic injustice: Power and the ethics of knowing*. Oxford university press.
9) Gaines, B. R. (1989). Social and cognitive processes in knowledge acquisition. *Knowledge Acquisition*, *1*(1), 39-58.
10) Gettier, E. L. (1963). Is justified true belief knowledge?
11) Giuseffi, F. (2024). The Investigation of a Nelsonian Approach to Socratic Dialogue with Student-Teachers at a Midwestern Private University. *InSight: A Journal of Scholarly Teaching*, *20*, 1.
12) Hume, D. (2016). An enquiry concerning human understanding. In *Seven masterpieces of philosophy* (pp. 183-276). Routledge.
13) Ihejirika, C. (2024). Harnessing African indigenous knowledge systems for knowledge production: A redefinition of a culture-centric epistemology. *Journal of Contemporary Philosophical and Anthropological Studies*, *2*(1).
14) Kant, I. (1998). of pure reason (1781). *Translated by: NK Smith, URL: http://staffweb. hkbu. edu. hk/ppp/cpr/toc. html*.
15) Locke, J. (2022). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding. Volume One* (Vol. 1). Lindhardt og Ringhof.
16) Mazzulla, G., & Pirrone, C. G. (2024). Accessibility measures: from a literature review to a classification framework. *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information*, *13*(12), 450.
17) Moberger, V. (2022). The truth about objective truths. *Free Inquiry*, *42*(6), 50-52.
18) Morrison, H., & Rahman, A. (2020). Knowledge and equity: analysis of three models.
19) Oeberst, A., & Imhoff, R. (2023). Toward parsimony in bias research: A proposed common framework of belief-consistent information processing for a set of biases. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *18*(6), 1464-1487.
20) Shin, H. S. (2019). Reasoning processes in clinical reasoning: from the perspective of cognitive psychology. *Korean journal of medical education*, *31*(4), 299.
21) Smalle, E. H., Daikoku, T., Szmalec, A., Duyck, W., & Möttönen, R. (2022). Unlocking adults' implicit statistical learning by cognitive depletion. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *119*(2), e2026011119.
22) Smith, E. R., & DeCoster, J. (1998). Knowledge acquisition, accessibility, and use in person perception and stereotyping: Simulation with a recurrent connectionist network. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *74*(1), 21.
23) Tanesini, A. (2025). *Social Epistemology: The Niches for Knowledge and Ignorance*. John Wiley & Sons.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

24) Uchihara, T., Webb, S., Saito, K., & Trofimovich, P. (2023). Frequency of exposure influences accentedness and comprehensibility in learners' pronunciation of second language words. *Language Learning*, *73*(1), 84-125.
25) Yao, Y., Wang, K., & Xiang, H. (2022). Association between cognitive function and ambient particulate matters in middle-aged and elderly Chinese adults: Evidence from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). *Science of the Total Environment*, *828*, 154297.

License: This is an open access article under the CC BY 4.0 license: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Corresponding Author: Albert Ulutorti Green