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Undeterminism and Holism al Affiliation Even though it may appear that the empirical examples that are mentioned by Ladyman may be the only claims that underscore the importance of underdetermination, one cannot easily conclude that it is not a critical issue in science in general. In the philosophy of science there are situations in which evidence is needed to know a belief and a theory which holds and underdetermination therefore comes in to contexts in such situations1. Moreover, Descartes claims indirectly supports the underdetermination arguments plausible. His claims that human beings have knowledge about things and are capable of even discovering others including those which make up the fundamental truth of the structure of reality supports the underdetermination arguments. This therefore implies that both weak and strong underdetermination are critical aspects in the understanding of philosophy of science. It is however worth noting that his call for more epistemic resources like the ampliative principles of beliefs which are meant to help in narrowing down merely logical possibilities to come up with those that are rationally defensible is very problematic.   
Despite the fact that underdetermination is known to pose a threat to the rationality of scientific enterprise, Laudan argued that the significance of underdetermination is often exaggerated in a variety of contexts and claims. To him, underdetermination comes with a variety of strengths2. However, the known or seen strengths primarily depends on what is being said or asserted about a given character, the rational defensibility of the competing hypothesis and the ways through which people revise their beliefs on different evidences which are available to them.   
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