5- Contributes towards modern Gold Standard of Scien Method.

6- Contributed to the success of people like Feynman and Musk.

B. Demerits:-

1- Ignores other aspects of scientific method; induction, deduction.

2- Difficulty of testing theories; Black holes.

3- Neglects the positives of Marxism; worker unions

IV) Conclusion

1- Merits outweighs the demerits.

2- Can be used in our daily lives to become more rational and generate progress

D. Irrefutable theories are not scientific:

- Popper's also argued that the only genuine test of a theory is one that's attempting to falsify it.
- Moreover, irrefutable theories are not scientific.
- If it can't be tested, your theory doesn't have much value.

E- There must be willingness to give up theories:

- Finally when you have disproven your theory, you need to be willing to give it up. This is in line with modern scientific thinking that a theory should be testable, refutable, falsifiable.
- You don't seek to prove scientific hypothesis right, you only prove them wrong.
- You have to be open to the idea that your beliefs might be false because that's only way that holding onto them can really mean anything.
- Otherwise, we can believe anything we want.

III. Critical Analysis:-

A- Merits:

1- Makes people more rational; testability of opinions.
2- Get rid of unstable theories; saves time & energy.
3- Prevents horror of Marxism; Stalin, Mao.
4- Saves money which people spend on psychoanalysis.

- For example, if you believe that Santa placed the candies under your pillow at night then you can look at only confirming evidence to support your theory.

B) It seeks to disconfirm theories:

1. So, the question is, when we begin to test a theory, are we looking to confirm it or disconfirm it?
- This is the key point. For Popper, Science disconfirms while Pseudoscience confirms.
- It is easy to find the confirmation of the theory if you are looking for it.
- In Santa's case, if you are looking for the proof that Santa exists, you are not likely to keep searching for contradictory evidence after that.

C). Confirmation only from risky prediction counts:

- Second, confirmation should only count if it comes from risky predictions. Ones that could actually destroy your theory.
- Because popper observed that every good scientific theory is prohibitive, it rules things out.
- Popper said that every false belief we actually discover is actully good because that gets us that much closer to believing only true things.

# Popper's Fallibilistic Method.

## I. Introduction:

A) As popper put it: "By fallibilism" I mean here the view, or the acceptance of the fact, that we may err, and that the quest for certainty (or even the quest for high probability) is a mistaken quest.

## II) Key Points of Fallibilistic Method.

### A) It distinguishes b/w different theories.

- Popper discovered some important differences in the methods of freud and Einstein.
- He realised that while Einstein theories gave predictions about the future, Freuds' theories only used past to explain the present.
- For example, Freud said that, early childhood experiences has a huge bearing on what a person is like. Specifically, "an emotionally distant person can be explained if her was hugged too much or too little as a child"
- In contrast, Einstein waited for a Solar eclipse that could disprove his entire general theory of relativity.
- Popper's asserted that Freud's theory are not genuine science and could be used to prove anything.

# Fablistic Method

Pst Questions:

Discuss the key points of Popper's Fallibilism (2018)

Discuss Popper's logical Method it Merits and Demerits (2019)

---

Defination:

Fallibilism is the epistemological thesis that no belief can ever be rationally supported or justified in a conclusive way. Always there is a remains a possible doubt as to the truth of the belief.

Explaination:

Unlike Skepticism (the doctrine that true knowledge is by defination uncertain), Fallibilism does not imply the need to abandon our knowledge in that it holds that we need not have logically conclusive justification for what we know. Rather it is an admission that our empirical knowledge can always be revised by further observation. Then any of the things we take as knowledge might possibly turn out to be false.