The Principle of Simplicity: From Dogmatic Acceptance to Justified Practice

Term Paper for Philosophy 520
Harry Luo

Abstract

Scientific methodology often relies on simplicity principles, yet their justification frequently rests on shaky foundations of self-evidence or methodological necessity. This paper argues that such justifications are inadequate and can lead to dogmatic adherence to simplifying assumptions, hindering scientific progress. Focusing on the historical sciences, we examine uniformitarianism in geology as a case study, demonstrating how its initial dogmatic formulation resisted evidence for catastrophic events and ultimately evolved into a more nuanced "critical uniformitarianism." Drawing on the work of Norton, Cleland, and Mitchell, we develop a framework for understanding justified simplicity, emphasizing local, context-specific justification over universal claims and advocating for a balance between methodological economy and the recognition of complex, scale-dependent phenomena. The paper concludes that the transition from dogmatic to justified application of simplicity requires explicit justification within specific domains, sensitivity to scale, openness to evidence-based modification, and integration with the recognition of complexity—a framework we term "critical simplicity"— essential for robust scientific practice.

1. Introduction

The principle of simplicity has long served as a foundational methodological tool in scientific practice, guiding theory choice, model construction, and explanatory frameworks across disciplines. In historical sciences particularly, this principle manifests prominently through uniformitarianism - the assumption that present processes and natural laws can explain past phenomena. While such simplicity principles have proven remarkably successful in advancing scientific understanding, their justification often rests precariously on claims of self-evidence or methodological necessity. This philosophical tension between practical utility and theoretical justification raises fundamental questions about the nature and validity of simplicity principles in scientific practice.

Consider uniformitarianism in geological sciences. Since Lyell's (1830) formulation, it has served as a cornerstone methodology, enabling scientists to reconstruct past conditions through present observations. Its practical success in developing geological understanding is undeniable, yet its philosophical justification often reduces to assertions that it represents the "only way" to conduct historical science or that it is "self-evidently" necessary (Turner 2007). Such justifications, while pragmatically appealing, fail to satisfy the rigorous standards of philosophical scrutiny that scientific methodology demands.

This tension becomes particularly acute in light of contemporary recognition of complex systems and scale-dependent phenomena (Mitchell 2009). Modern scientific practice increasingly acknowledges that simple, uniform principles may not adequately capture the full range of natural processes, especially when considering different temporal and spatial scales. The successful integration of catastrophic events into geological understanding, exemplified by the Alvarez hypothesis for the Cretaceous-Paleogene extinction (Alvarez et al. 1980), demonstrates how strictly uniform assumptions sometimes require modification or abandonment.

The philosophical challenge, therefore, extends beyond merely justifying simplicity principles to understanding how such principles can transition from potentially dogmatic assumptions to justified methodological tools. This requires examining not only the historical development of these

principles but also their contemporary application and limitations. As Norton (2003) argues through his material theory of inference, scientific reasoning principles require specific, local justification rather than universal, a priori acceptance. This perspective suggests that simplicity principles, including uniformitarianism, demand explicit justification grounded in particular domains and contexts.

This paper examines whether the widespread acceptance of simplicity as a methodological principle in science has been adequately justified or has occasionally lapsed into dogmatic practice. Through analyzing historical justifications of simplicity and examining the development of uniformitarianism as a central case study, we argue that while simplicity principles have valid applications when properly justified, their acceptance as default assumptions without explicit justification risks dogmatic application. The transition from dogmatic to justified use requires recognizing both the utility and limitations of simplicity principles within specific scientific contexts.

Our analysis employs three complementary theoretical frameworks. First, Norton's (2003) material theory of inference is used as the basis in understanding how methodological principles require local rather than universal justification. Second, Cleland's (2002) analysis of historical science methodology illuminates the particular challenges and constraints facing sciences that investigate past phenomena. Third, Mitchell's (2009) work on the complexity in modern science frame the limitations and proper application of simplifying assumptions in contemporary practice.

The argument proceeds in four main sections. We begin by tracing the historical development of simplicity principles in scientific practice, examining how their justification has evolved from implicit acceptance to explicit theoretical grounding. The second section presents uniformitarianism as a case study, analyzing its transformation from a rigid philosophical principle to a sophisticated methodological tool. The third section examines the specific question of dogmatism in scientific practice, identifying traces of unjustified acceptance and resistance to evidence. Finally, we synthesize these analyses to develop a pragmatic framework that tries to enhance the application and the localized justification for the simplicity principle in contemporary scientific practice. This exploration is an attempt in summarizing and potentially contributing to ongoing discussions about scientific methodology and epistemology by clarifying how fundamental principles can be both critically examined and productively employed.

2. Defining Simplicity

The principle of simplicity, an often-invoked null assumption in many scientific practices, contains distinct conceptual forms in need of careful treatment. As Baker (2016) demonstrates, simplicity principles can be categorized into claims about ontological parsimony, methodological economy, and theoretical elegance, each operating differently in scientific practice.

Ontological parsimony, often associated with Occam's Razor, concerns the entities postulated by a theory. Following Quine (1981), this involves the concept of ontological commitment - what entities a theory claims exist. This notion subdivides into qualitative parsimony (concerning types of entities) and quantitative parsimony (concerning numbers of individual entities). As Mitchell (2009) notes, these distinctions are of decisive importance when weighing competing theoretical frameworks, particularly in complex systems where simple qualitative frameworks may require more-than-desired individual entities to explain observed phenomena.

Methodological simplicity, distinct from ontological parsimony, concerns the economy and uniformity of scientific procedures. This form becomes particularly relevant in historical sciences where, as Cleland (2002) demonstrates, researchers must reconstruct past events using present evidence through uniform methodological principles. Theoretical elegance, as characterized by

Lipton (2004), involves both syntactic simplicity and explanatory power. This criterion can create tension among different theories and sometimes decisively favor one explanation over another.

The justification of simplicity principles has generated substantial philosophical debate, with approaches broadly falling into three categories: a priori philosophical justifications, naturalistic justifications based on scientific practice, and formal probabilistic approaches (Baker 2016). While a priori approaches attempt to establish simplicity as a fundamental principle of rational inquiry, naturalistic justifications, exemplified by Norton's (2003) material theory of inference, ground simplicity's value in its demonstrated utility within specific scientific contexts.

Crucially, as Sober (1988) argues, the rational warrant for employing simplicity principles depends fundamentally on domain-specific background assumptions rather than universal logical considerations. This context-dependency is vital, especailly when examining how simplicity principles operate across different scientific domains and scales (Mitchell 2009). Understanding this context-dependency is criticalfor analyzing localized applications of simplicity principles – with uniformitarianism in the historical sciences as an example.

3. Uniformitarianism as Exemplar of Simplicity Principles

Uniformitarianism provides an illuminating case study of how simplicity principles, initially adopted as broad methodological assumptions, can evolve into more critically applied tools. Lyell's (1830) original formulation drew on simplicity in multiple senses: it assumed consistent natural laws (ontological parsimony), applied straightforward present-to-past reasoning (methodological simplicity), and strove for unified explanatory elegance. Yet, as Gould (1987) and others have shown, these seemingly simple assumptions often concealed deeper complexities.

Over time, geological inquiry revealed that uniformitarian assumptions required careful calibration rather than universal enforcement. While gradual, uniform processes can explain much of Earth's history, exceptional events—such as the catastrophic impact hypothesized by Alvarez et al. (1980)—demanded that researchers acknowledge conditions that vary by temporal and spatial scale. This shift reflects the broader challenge of aligning simplicity principles with complex, context-sensitive phenomena (Mitchell 2009).

As these adjustments occurred, uniformitarianism moved from an almost dogmatic stance to what Dresow (2023) calls "critical uniformitarianism." Rather than treating uniformity as a universal given, geoscientists learned to justify it domain-by-domain, guided by Norton's (2003) material theory of inference. This approach no longer positions simplicity as an unassailable starting point but as a context-dependent methodology, open to revision in light of new evidence and scaled appropriately to the phenomena under study (Page 2021).

The uniformitarian example thus demonstrates how simplicity principles can remain scientifically useful while avoiding dogmatic rigidity. By acknowledging complexity, drawing on multiple lines of evidence, and adapting to different investigative scales, scientists can maintain the heuristic value of simplicity without obscuring the intricate realities of nature. In this way, uniformitarianism's transformation exemplifies how a principle once employed as a blanket assumption can mature into a finely tuned, critically justified tool, informing a more robust understanding of Earth's past and, by extension, scientific practice more broadly.

4. From Dogmatic to Justified Practice

The transition from dogmatic to justified application of simplicity principles requires first understanding what constitutes dogmatic scientific practice. For our purposes, we define scientific dogmatism as the uncritical acceptance and application of principles without adequate justification

or consideration of limitations, particularly when confronted with contradictory evidence. As Kuhn (1962, pp. 77-79) notes, such dogmatic adherence to established principles can become embedded in scientific practice, resistant to modification even in the face of anomalous findings.

In the context of simplicity principles, dogmatism manifests in several identifiable patterns. First, as Douglas (2009, pp. 445-447) argues, there is often an unexamined assumption that simpler explanations are inherently more likely to be true, without domain-specific justification for this belief. Second, methodological principles may be applied beyond their justified scope, what Norton (2003, pp. 648-649) identifies as the inappropriate universalization of local inferential practices. Third, there can be systematic resistance to evidence that suggests more complex explanations are necessary.

Uniformitarianism provides clear historical examples of these patterns. Gould (1987, pp. 119-121) demonstrates how Lyell's strict uniformitarianism initially resisted evidence for any catastrophic events in Earth's history, exemplifying what we might term "simplicity dogmatism" - the insistence on simple, uniform explanations even when evidence suggests otherwise. This resistance was not merely methodological but reflected deeper philosophical commitments to particular forms of scientific explanation.

The transition away from such dogmatic application requires explicit recognition of both the utility and limitations of simplicity principles. As Mitchell (2009, pp. 54-56) argues:

"The challenge is not to abandon simplifying assumptions entirely, but to understand when and how they can be productively employed while maintaining awareness of their limitations and potential distortions."

The transition from dogmatic to justified practice can be observed through several key developments in geological sciences. The Alvarez hypothesis (Alvarez et al., 1980) provides a particularly instructive example. Initial resistance to the impact theory of dinosaur extinction reflected what Turner (2007, pp. 160-162) identifies as dogmatic adherence to gradualistic assumptions. However, the eventual acceptance of this hypothesis demonstrates how scientific practice can evolve beyond dogmatic simplicity when confronted with compelling evidence.

Several key strategies emerge for avoiding dogmatic application while maintaining the utility of simplicity principles. First, as Norton (2003, pp. 652-654) emphasizes, justification must be grounded in specific empirical contexts rather than abstract philosophical commitments. This approach is exemplified in modern geological practice where, as Page (2021, pp. 468-470) demonstrates, uniformitarian assumptions are employed with explicit recognition of their scope and limitations.

Second, scientific practice must maintain what Mitchell (2009, pp. 82-84) terms "pragmatic pluralism" - the recognition that different phenomena may require different explanatory frameworks at different scales. In geological sciences, this manifests as what Dresow (2023, pp. 420-422) describes as a "sophisticated uniformitarianism" that integrates both gradual and catastrophic processes within a broader methodological framework.

Third, explicit attention must be paid to what Douglas (2009, pp. 451-453) identifies as the value-laden aspects of methodology. The preference for simple explanations, while often productive, must be recognized as a methodological choice requiring justification rather than an inevitable feature of scientific reasoning. As Steel (2010, pp. 22-24) argues:

"The challenge is not to eliminate values from scientific practice but to make their role explicit and subject to critical examination."

These strategies collectively support what might be termed “critical simplicity” - an approach that maintains the utility of simplicity principles while subjecting their application to ongoing critical evaluation. This approach aligns with what Bokulich (2018, pp. 3735-3737) identifies as best practice in historical sciences: the integration of simplified models with explicit recognition of their limitations and domains of applicability.

The success of this transition can be measured by examining how modern scientific practice handles apparent violations of simplicity principles. Rather than treating such violations as threats to be resisted, contemporary approaches treat them as opportunities for methodological refinement. This shift reflects what Cleland (2002, pp. 479-481) identifies as a more sophisticated understanding of historical scientific methodology, one that recognizes both the utility and limitations of simplifying assumptions.

5. Conclusion

The methodological evolution on the justification and application of the principle of simplicity is rather typical of an example of scientific improvement. Through our analysis of simplicity principles in general, and uniformitarianism in particular, we can observe several important insights about the nature and application of such principles in contemporary science.

First, simplicity principles require explicit rather than implicit justification. As Norton (2003) argues, the validity of such principles depends on specific empirical contexts rather than universal logical considerations. This understanding transforms simplicity from a dogmatic assumption into a methodological tool whose application requires careful justification in each domain of use. The development of uniformitarianism exemplifies this transformation, evolving from Lyell’s universal principle to what Dresow (2023) describes as a sophisticated methodological framework sensitive to scale and context.

Second, the recognition of complexity does not negate the utility of simplicity principles but rather demands more nuanced application. As Mitchell (2009, pp. 88-90) demonstrates, effective scientific practice requires balancing the pragmatic benefits of simplifying assumptions with recognition of their limitations. This balance is particularly evident in historical sciences where, as Turner (2007, pp. 164-166) notes, researchers must navigate between the methodological necessity of uniformitarian assumptions and the reality of complex, scale-dependent phenomena.

These insights have significant implications for scientific practice. They suggest that the application of simplicity principles should be:

1. Explicitly justified within specific domains
2. Sensitive to scale and context
3. Open to modification based on evidence

Future research might examine how these insights apply across different scientific disciplines, particularly in areas where simplicity principles play an unsatisfactory role of “null assumption”. The refined understanding of simplicity principles developed in historical sciences may offer valuable lessons for other domains where researchers must balance methodological economy with recognition of complex phenomena that often happens beyond a naiive invitation of simplicity.

Bibliography

[1] L. Alvarez, W. Alvarez, F. Asaro, and H. Michel, “Extraterrestrial cause for the Cretaceous-Tertiary extinction,” *Science*, vol. 208, no. 4448, pp. 1095–1108, 1980.

[2] A. Baker, “Simplicity,” *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2016.

[3] A. Bokulich, “Using models to correct data: Paleodiversity and the fossil record,” *Synthese*, vol. 195, no. 9, pp. 3727–3745, 2018.

[4] C. Cleland, “Methodological and epistemic differences between historical science and experimental science,” *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 69, no. 3, pp. 447–451, 2002.

[5] H. Douglas, *Science, policy, and the value-free ideal*. University of Pittsburgh Press, 2009.

[6] S. Gould, *Time's Arrow, Time's Cycle: Myth and Metaphor in the Discovery of Geological Time*. Harvard University Press, 1987.

[7] T. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press, 1962.

[8] P. Lipton, *Inference to the Best Explanation*, 2nd ed. Routledge, 2004.

[9] C. Lyell, *Principles of Geology*. John Murray, 1830.

[10] S. Mitchell, *Unsimple Truths: Science, Complexity, and Policy*. University of Chicago Press, 2009.

[11] J. Norton, “A Material Theory of Induction,” *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 70, no. 4, pp. 647–670, 2003.

[12] W. Quine, “Two Dogmas of Empiricism,” *The Philosophical Review*, vol. 60, no. 1, pp. 20–43, 1951.

[13] M. Rudwick, *Bursting the Limits of Time: The Reconstruction of Geohistory in the Age of Revolution*. University of Chicago Press, 2005.

[14] P. Schulte and others, “The Chicxulub Asteroid Impact and Mass Extinction at the Cretaceous-Paleogene Boundary,” *Science*, vol. 327, no. 5970, pp. 1214–1218, 2010.

[15] E. Sober, “What is the Problem of Simplicity?,” *Simplicity, Inference and Modelling*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 13–31, 2001.

[16] E. Sober, *Ockham's Razors: A User's Manual*. Cambridge University Press, 2015.

[17] D. Steel, “Epistemic Values and the Argument from Inductive Risk,” *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 77, no. 1, pp. 14–34, 2010.

[18] D. Turner, *Making Prehistory: Historical Science and the Scientific Realism Debate*. Cambridge University Press, 2007.

[19] B. van Fraassen, *The Scientific Image*. Oxford University Press, 1980.

[20] J. Woodward, *Making Things Happen: A Theory of Causal Explanation*. Oxford University Press, 2003.

[21] M. Dresow, “Uniformitarianism Re-Examined, or the Present is the Key to the Past, Except When It Isn’t (And Even Then It Kind of Is),” *Perspectives on Science*, vol. 31, no. 4, pp. 405–436, 2023, doi: 10.1162/posc_a_00573.

[22] M. Page, “The Role of Historical Science in Methodological Actualism,” *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 88, no. 3, pp. 461–482, 2021, doi: 10.1086/712833.