

Homework Assignment 2

Question about What Is This Thing Called Science? Alan Chalmers:

Chalmer speaks in chapter 4 about: Under precisely what circumstances is it legitimate to assert that a scientific law has been derived from some finite body of observational and experimental evidence? With three conditions. However, this only applies from scientific laws and not with scientific theories. What conditions should there be to prove a scientific theory? Or should it be that once you prove it immediately a scientific law?

Insight about What Is This Thing Called Science? Alan Chalmers:

Back to 'deriving theories from the facts'. An important point is: logical deduction alone cannot establish the truth of factual statements of the kind figuring in our examples. All the logic can offer in this connection is that *if* the premises are correct and the argument is valid, then the conclusion must be right. This argument seems to be reasonable, even if it involves a false belief. Like if there is a strong sense in which logic alone not necessarily the truth, but the reason reveals what follows. Then we can be sure our premises are true, and we can also believe that everything derives from it is true.