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Module Philosophy of Science Feyerabend’s perspective on the concept of science can be viewed as being radical by most science philosophers. However, I strongly agree with his argument that science is an ideology that we must preserve society from based on the arguments in the section below. To start with, the comparison of science with religion clearly demonstrates that science does not stand up against religion. This means that scientists end up changing their facts when experimental evidence going against them comes up (Feyerabend 57). Overall, no scientific theory survives over an extended period of time. Secondly, his ideas on scientific imperialism are viewed as being important in the argument against science. There have been numerous studies showing that the use of science in the societal setting has not always been advantageous. In fact, there are some studies that show that scientific legitimacy was used to establish unnecessary and unpopular initiatives on populations.   
Thirdly, conflicts arise between well- established scientific theories leading to confusion in their interpretation and application. He states that Newtonian perspectives on the concept of gravity were rebellious as it went against Galileo’s beliefs. This shows that science is simply an ideology that society should be shielded from (Feyerabend 65). Historians support Feyeraband’s claims by stating that prominent scientists in the past including Galileo would probably oppose the modern day science.   
In summary, Feyerabend arguments on the concept of science being an ideology are true. This is basing on the fact that science is contradictory, inconsistent and is even considered to be harmful against mankind in some instances.   
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