If you think of yourself as at least somewhat a scientific person, you may believe that science is an objective thing. It ought to be, because isn’t one of the most defining aspects of science that it paints an *objective* picture of reality through its methods, hypotheses, and conclusions? Most things that ought to be objective, when they enter the social sphere, become subjective. When something is discussed with others, it is necessarily open to interpretation; when you say words about science, I may glean an entirely different message from the one you were trying to convey. In the realm of discussion of science, some camps consider creationism science, some consider astrology science, and some consider only the most empirical and believable studies to be scientific. How can we decide which sciences are truly sciences, and which are merely pseudoscience or ideology?

First, let us discuss why this question matters. What has and has not been considered science has had large historical effects. For example, historians such as Joseph Needham have asked why premodern China never developed modern science. [Insert backstory on Chinese rejection of Western science, and the effect that had on its people. Also, address how quickly Western science overcame Chinese resistance, due to its attractiveness. What made it so attractive as a science, what made it “right?”] There is this social importance to what qualifies science, and whether we like it or not, what qualifies science is up to social interpretation. Let us examine one theory for what qualifies science as science: the theory of a progressive research program.
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