What is the rational way to respond when two equally intelligent and fair-minded people who have the same evidence for a hypothesis H – ‘epistemic peers’ – arrive at different credences in H? Does their disagreement provide additional evidence for or against H? Several competing accounts have recently been developed on the rational response to peer disagreement. I will argue that there is a certain kind of belief which these accounts cannot handle adequately. These beliefs, 'deep beliefs,' of which religious beliefs are typical instances, play foundational roles in epistemically grounding many of our other beliefs. I will argue that the parties to a disagreement about a deep belief H (a 'deep disagreement') are not epistemic peers, because they typically arrive at their credences in H by conditionalizing on different evidence. The reason is that our evidence for deep beliefs is often difficult to share with others. I will suggest an alternative to agnosticism in deep disagreements.