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Timothy Williamson has offered the “no close risk” conception of safety in his *Amherst Lecture in Philosophy* “Probability and Danger” (2009a). The “no close risk” conception of safety is modal and in general not identifiable with any probabilistic connection. In this paper, I argue against Williamson’s “no close risk” conception by offering a counterexample to the necessity of the corresponding condition for safety. By doing this, I argue for the modal, non-probabilistic “no close undefused risk” conception of safety. More precisely, safety in general is defined as the absence of modally close undefused risks. An acceptable conception of epistemological safety follows from the definition naturally.