

**Phil 5330 Fall 2017
Second Assignment**

Please email me your homework answers before class on Monday, September 25th. Answer these four questions. Each answer is meant to be short, but long enough to show that you are being thoughtful (each should be at least several sentences and certainly no more than a page).

1. Think about the problem of induction as presented in the Hume and Salmon readings. It seems as though Hume is saying that we can't be justified in making any predictions at all about the future (say, for example, that the bowling ball will not come back and smash Professor Silvia in the face). This seems crazy as we clearly are justified in making that prediction (so I boldly assert). Pick one of the possible answers that the student suggests and try to develop it a bit more as a defense of how we can be justified. Make sure to think about how the relevant interlocutor in the story responded and respond back. You don't have to actually believe that the defense will work to show that you understand how it might go.

2. Think about Hempel and Popper's descriptions of the scientific method. Are they equivalent? Or are there important differences in the two views?

3. What does Duhem mean when he talks about a "crucial experiment" and why does he think it is impossible? Is this exactly the same as what Hempel means and says about it? (starting on page 25).

4. Describe a case of a scientific inference that you think involves some kind of principle of simplicity. Do you think this inference is justified? If someone said "the laws of nature are really complex so I don't accept Ockham's Razor" what could be said in response?