

Philosophy of science

[Philosophy](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

Response to questions of Philosophy of Science Response to Question There is a real risk in saying “ real scientists”. This is because the concept “ real scientists” implies that there are some scientists who are not real or pseudoscientists. This concept, therefore, would raise the critical question of demarcating between the “ real scientists” and the “ pseudoscientists”. Since there is no clear-cut and holistic criterion of demarcating the “ real scientists” and the “ pseudoscientists”, this practical attitude of terming some scientists “ real scientists” and other scientists “ pseudoscientists”, would allow us to be arbitrary and to favour scientific hypotheses put forward by prominent scientists, at the expense of lesser, or not prominent, scientists.

Response to Question 2

Unlike Dunham’s rather practical view that, “ it is never possible to deduce any statement about what will be observed from a single hypothesis alone”, rather, other assumptions and conditions etc. are in the mix as well”, Popper did not allow for such practical matters. This is because for Popper, induction cannot give us any true knowledge about reality. For Popper, any scientific theory is tentative and will soon or later be refuted and superseded by other better scientific theories. For this reason, Popper wants us to shoot down any scientific prediction that comes from a hypothesis, even though that hypothesis cannot exist in isolation.