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Scientific Realism

1. The Miracles Argument
2. Laudon’s Historical criticism
3. As an objection to the Miracles argument
4. As an objection to Scientific Realism
5. The Problem of Introduction
6. Focus on Hume’s discussion

The Miracle Problem is Problematic

1. Predictive success cannot always to be explained by the truth of the theory.

2. For realists’ reference is necessary for truth.

Scientific Realism is at best a partial explanation of success.

Current theories may false in the future.

One concern: the “ Turnover Fallacy”

False theories will turnover much more often than true theories.

If this is correct, then we should expect there to be more far false theories than one’s now considered true.

If is therefore quite easy for the historical premise of a pessimistic to turn out to be true- far easier than it ought to be for the induction to go through.

The fact that most past theories are taken to be false, really does not tell us anything about the status of current theories, it merely follows from a fact about turnover.

The problem of Induction

Relations of ideas and matter of fact

Relations of ideas

1. Intuitively or demonstratively certain

e.g. Geometry, Algebra, and Arithmetic

A priori

Matters of fact

e.g. Empirical claims

Their denial implies no contradiction

1. My current perceptual experiences provide me with evidence regarding.
2. My memory provides evidence regarding the past.
3. But I have beliefs regarding matters of fact that go beyond current perceptual experience and memory

Hume’s question: what is the basis of my beliefs regarding unobserved matters of fact?

All reasonings concerning matter of fact seem to be founded on the relation of Cause and Effect.
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The Problem of Induction

Hume’s argument for the impossibility of solving the problem

Hume’s “ Skeptical Solution” to the Problem of Induction

Some Reponses to the Problem

Pragmatic response

Inductive solutions and circularity

Inductive inferences:

Ampliative: They go beyond what is contained in the premises

They are non-demonstrative: Their conclusions are necessary truths

They do not seem to be deductive inferences: It is possible for the premises all to be truth, and the conclusion false.

Hume: provides an analysis such inferences

All observed instances of bread(of a particular appearance) have been nourishing, so the next instance of bread will be nourishing.

Observer: have found

Unobserved: foresee

It is hard to deny that we make such inferences.

Hume accepts that people routinely make such transitions in though

This is true in ordinarily life

It also seems that such inferences are important to science

But Hume poses the task of understanding the “ foundation” of these inferences

Problem of Induction: Assuming that we reason or argue inductively, how can be justify such reasoning practices?

Successful reasoning = reasoning that justifies its conclusion

Hume’s Skeptical solution to the problem of induction

We cannot justifiably reason from observations to unobserved phenomena

We do make such inferences. But it is the result of “ custom” or “ habit”

Some other possible solutions:

A sample pragmatic justification of inductive methods

It seems natural to say that our use of induction is justified by its usefulness
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Creationism

Is creation science a science?

Focus on Michael Ruse’s discussion

1. Preliminaries
2. Argumentative Strategy
3. Characteristics of Science
4. Creation Science
5. How Good is Ruse’s Characterization of Science?

Preliminaries: Disambiguating the question

We might be interested in different issues:

Is the ID (or creationist) hypothesis a scientific hypothesis?

Are the practices of intelligent design theorists (and / or creationists) scientific?

Is the creationist science a scientific program?

Ruse on why creation science is not science:

Ruse declines to specify a precise set of necessary and sufficient conditions on being science

Ruse’s argumentative strategy:

1. He presents that he thinks are core characteristic future of (good) science
2. He argues that creation science performs poorly by these standards:

It fails to have these features

Core features if science

1. Aim of science: Science is an enterprise that seeks to understand the empirical world.
2. The central role of Laws: Laws play a central role in science’s attempt to understand the empirical world.

Science does not allow for events that violate laws. e.g. Miracles

The various roles of Laws in science

Ruse: Laws figure in at least three different scientific activities.

Explanation, prediction, discovery

Further feature of science

Scientific explanations are testable:

Confirmation: There must be some evidence in favor of the hypothesis

Falsifiability: Being falsifiable is crucial

Science is tentative

Scientists must be prepared to change their minds in the face of evidence

Good science is subject to norms of integrity

Data ought not to be made up

Falsifying data ought not to be ignored

The creation science report care (Ruse’s version)

Does Creation Science seek to understand the empirical world?