REVOLUTIONS AND RATIONALITY IN HISTORY OF SCIENCE

Charles Kosolu Onebunne (PhD)
Department of Philosophy, Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Nigeria
Email – ck.onebunne@unizik.edu.ng
Phone - 07039442817

Abstract
One of the enduring controversies in twentieth-and twenty first century philosophy of science concerns the logic of scientific revolutions. At the heart of this debate is whether scientific revolutions can be adequately explained on a purely rational ground or whether extra-rational factors, such as psychological, sociological as well as institutional influences also play significantly role in scientific development. The two major participants in this debate are the rationalists and non-rationalists. While the rationalists, both the verificationist and falsificationist traditions maintain that scientific progress can be explained through rational criteria alone, the non-rationalist argue that extra-rational factors and indispensable to understanding scientific revolutions. This paper uses the library research approach and the analytic method to investigate the rationalist-non-rationalist impasse with the aim of reconciling the tension between traditions. Drawing on evidence from the history of science, the paper contends that the rationalists were correct in insisting that scientific inquiry is fundamentally committed to logical and methodological accountability. Equally, the non-rationalists were correct in arguing that these rational standards are neither applied nor developed in historical vacuum but within scientific communities shaped psychological, socio-economic and institutional influences. The paper concludes that scientific revolutions are best understood as dynamic historical processes in which rational evaluation and historical circumstance continuously interact.

Introduction

The development of modern science following the Scientific Revolution of the seventeenth century has not simply been a chronicle of discoveries, and technological innovations; it is also a history of profound intellectual transformations that have irreversibly altered humanity's conception of nature and its place in the world. Beginning with the displacement of the Ptolemaic geocentric cosmos by the Copernican model, through the emergence of Newtonian mechanics, to the revolutionary development of Einstein's relativity, science has periodically undergone episodes of radical change. These episodes, commonly described as scientific revolutions, have generated one of the most enduring questions in the philosophy of science: what explains scientific revolutions? Are they primarily the product of rational deliberation, logical evaluation, and methodological principles or are they significantly shaped by historical circumstances, psychological commitments, political interests, and broader socio-economic forces?

These questions occupied philosophers of science throughout the twentieth century and remain central in contemporary debates concerning the nature of scientific progress. The crux of the inquiry is not merely how science changes but more fundamentally, how scientific rationality itself should be understood. If scientific revolutions occur solely through strict adherence to the scientific method, then science would rightly be regarded as a uniquely rational enterprise whose progress is governed by logic and empirical testing. Conversely, if scientific revolutions are substantially influenced by factors external to the scientific method, then the traditional rational image of science as an entirely objective and rational activity becomes considerably complex and open to question.

The debate has crystalized into two broad philosophical schools of thought. On one side stands the rationalists, represented most notably by Karl Popper, who argue that scientific progress is fundamentally governed by rational criticism, empirical testing, and methodological standards that enable scientists to choose among competing theories. Scientific revolutions, on this account, occur because existing theories fail rigorous empirical scrutiny and replaced by theories possessing greater explanatory power. Popper captures this conception succinctly, "The growth of knowledge depends entirely upon disagreement."[1]

On the other side are philosophers who, largely because of their criticism of rationalist accounts, have often been described as irrationalists. Since this designation is neither entirely accurate nor philosophically satisfactory, they will, for lack of a better term, be referred to as non-rationalists in this study. These philosophers question whether scientific change can be adequately explained by rational criteria alone. One of the advocates of this position, Thomas S. Kuhn, in his influential analysis of paradigm shifts argued that:

> The transfer of allegiance from paradigm to paradigm is a conversion experience that cannot be forced. Lifelong resistance, particularly from those whose productive careers

> have committed them to an older tradition of normal science, is not a violation of scientific standards but an index to the nature of scientific research itself. The source of the resistance is the assurance that the older paradigm will ultimately solve all its problems.[2]

Kuhn's characterization suggests that revolutionary scientific change cannot always be explained solely in terms of formal logic or empirical evidence. Instead, shifts between competing paradigms frequently involve psychological commitments, professional judgments, educational traditions, and historical circumstances that resist complete rational reconstruction.

Taking together, the disagreement between the rationalists and the non-rationalists concerns how scientific changes are to be explained. While the former argue that it can be explained on purely rational grounds, the latter insist that rational criteria alone are insufficient to account for scientific progress. To address the disagreement, this paper argues that neither the rationalist nor the non-rationalist account provides a sufficient explanation for scientific revolution. While rational evaluation remains indispensable in assessing competing theories, historical evidence demonstrates that extra-rational factors play important roles also. Scientific revolutions are therefore best understood as products of dynamic integration of rational evaluation and extra-rational historical forces. This interpretation preserves the objectivity of scientific inquiry without overlooking the complex human realities that shape the objectivity.

The paper is organized into five parts. Part, one provides a conceptual clarification of key terms used in the paper. The second examines the rationalist interpretation of scientific revolution, while the third part analyses the non-rationalist account, highlighting the arguments of philosophers who emphasize extra-rational dimensions of scientific change. The fourth critically evaluates the strengths and limitations of both perspectives and argues for an integrative understanding that transcends the traditional opposition between rationalism and non-rationalism. The paper concludes by reaffirming that scientific revolutions are best understood as products of the interaction between rational appraisals and extra-rational conditions within which scientific inquiry develops.

Conceptual Clarification

The concepts of revolution, rationality, and the history of science are indispensable for analyzing whether scientific revolutions are products of rational deliberation or are fundamentally influenced by historical and social forces. Therefore, these concepts will be discussed in this section.

Revolution

In ordinary conversation, the term revolution and change are normally used interchangeably to denote transformation. In their specialized usage, however, an important distinction is made between ordinary change and revolutionary change. Ordinary change refers to a transformation that modifies certain aspects of an object, institution, or process while leaving its essential identity intact. For example, the change of water from solid to liquid or from liquid to gas represents a transformation of physical state without altering its chemical composition. Revolution by contrast, denotes a radical, fundamental, and often irreversible transformation that restructures the very nature, organization, or guiding principles of reality undergoing change. Rather than merely modifying existing conditions, a revolution replaces or reconstitutes them, thereby establishing a new order.[3]

Although, the concept of revolution originated within political discourse, it has over time acquired wider application in order fields such as philosophy, sociology, and the history of science. Consequently, one may speak of different kinds of revolutions including political revolution, economic revolution, technological revolution and scientific revolutions. In each of these contexts, the concept assumes distinct meanings and connotations shaped by the nature of the transformations it seeks to describe. Nevertheless, despite their contextual differences, all revolutions share a common characteristic: they involve the displacement of an established order by a new framework that redefines prevailing structures, norms, and practices.[4] Since the concern of this paper is scientific revolution, attention now turns to an examination of that concept.

Scientific Revolution

Revolution as seen above is the radical transformation of any system. The concept of scientific revolution applies this idea to the system of scientific knowledge. Accordingly, a scientific revolution occurs when an existing theoretical framework becomes incapable of resolving persistent scientific problems and is replaced by a new framework that reorganizes the fundamental concepts, methods, standards of explanation, and practice of scientific inquiry.

One of the most authoritative definitions of scientific revolution was offered by Kuhn who argues that scientific progress alternates between periods of "normal science" and "revolutionary science." According to Kuhn,

"Scientific revolutions are here taken to be those non-cumulative development episodes in which an older paradigm is replaced in whole or part by an incompatible new one".[5]
Scientific revolutions therefore involve more than the acceptance or rejection of new theories. They reshape concepts, redefine legitimate research questions, introduce new experimental techniques, and alter the criteria by which scientific explanations and evaluated. In this sense, a scientific revolution transforms not only the content of scientific knowledge but also the conceptual and methodological framework within which scientific inquiry is conducted.

Scientific Rationality
Although philosophers of science employ the concept of rationality in different senses, it generally refers to the capacity to form beliefs or make decisions based on appropriate reasons rather than arbitrary preference or mere authority. In science, these reasons are understood in terms of standards of justification recognized by the scientific community.

As noted in the introduction to this paper, the rationalists regard the scientific method as the principal standard by which the rationality of scientific theories and scientific change should be assessed. The non-rationalists however, dispute this claim arguing that an adequate account of scientific development must also take into consideration extra-rational factors. Larry Laudan for instance maintains that "…scientific rationality is best understood in terms of problem-solving effectiveness rather than absolute methodological rules. Scientific theory are rational insofar as they successfully resolve empirical and conceptual problems more effectively than their competitors".[6]
The debate over scientific revolution therefore, centres largely on whether scientific progress can be adequately explained by the rationalist standard embodied in the scientific method or whether it is fundamentally shaped by extra-rational factors as the non-rationalists contend. This diversity in the conception of rationality underscores why philosophers disagree on the nexus between revolution and rationality in the historical development of science.

History of Science
General history and history of science are similar in some respects but differ in others. Firstly, general history is the chronological account of events, whereas the history of science is the chronological account of scientific discoveries, theories and developments. Beyond recording events, general history provides a basis for examining and evaluating human decisions, actions, and their consequences. Similarly, history of science provides the empirical record upon which philosophical theories of scientific knowledge are tested and addressed. Just like natural scientists rely upon observational evidence to assess hypotheses, philosophers examine history of science to determine whether accounts of scientific development adequately explain scientific practice. In this way, the history of science serves not only as a record of scientific progress but also as a critical source of evidence

This close relationship between philosophy and history was succinctly captured by Kuhn:

> History, if viewed as a repository for more than anecdote or chronology, could produce a decisive transformation in the image of science by which we are now possessed. That image has previously been drawn even by scientists themselves, mainly from the study of finished scientific achievements as these are recorded in the classics and, more recently, in the textbooks from which each new scientific generation learns to practice its trade.[7]

The history of science therefore performs a dual function. It simultaneously chronicles the evolution of scientific knowledge and provides the historical evidence through which the rationality of scientific theories are critically assessed. Any adequate account of scientific revolution must therefore remain faithful not only to logical and methodological principles but also to the complexities revealed by the actual historical development of science.

Revolution and Rationality in the History of Science: The Rationalist Position
At the centre of the debate on the rationality of scientific revolution is the question of whether scientific change occurs through rational deliberation or is significantly influenced by non-rational factors. Before the emergence of historical and sociological approaches to science in the second half of the twentieth century, the dominant conception of scientific development was fundamentally rationalistic. Rationalists saw science as the paradigm of human reason, arguing that scientific progress results from the application of logic, empirical observation, and methodological rules. Scientific revolutions on this account are neither accidental nor sociological but represent rationally transition from less adequate theories to more comprehensive empirically successful ones.

The two most influential schools in the rationalist tradition are verificationism of logical empiricists and Popper's falsificationism or critical rationalism. According to the verificationists, rationality of science rests on empirical verification and logical analysis. Central to their position was the verification principle, which holds that the

meaning of a scientific statement depends upon the possibility of its empirical verification. Hence, scientific theories are considered cognitively significant only insofar against observable experience. As A. J. Ayer explains that "a sentence is factually significant to any given person if, and only if, he know how to verify the proposition which it purports to express, that is, if he knows what observations would lead him, under certain conditions, to accept the proposition as being true, or as being false."[8]

The verification principle shaped the verificationists' conception of scientific rationality by making empirical evidence the ultimate standard for evaluating scientific theories. Scientific progress was therefore understood as the cumulative growth of verified knowledge, with new theories extending and refining the empirical achievements of their predecessors. From this stance, what later comes to be described as scientific revolution would be regarded as rational episodes in which theories enjoying stronger empirical confirmation replaces less adequate ones through objective evaluation rather than psychological, or political influences. As Moritz Schlick stated, "Empirical science … consists in the logical ordering of experience by means of concepts and propositions whose validity is tested by experience."[9]

Unlike the verificaationists, Popper argued that the rationality of science does not depend on the verification of theories but on their exposure to critical testing and possible refutation. He rejected the view that scientific knowledge advances through the accumulation of verified truths, maintaining instead that universal scientific laws can never be conclusively verified. The hallmark of scientific theory is therefore not its verifiability but its falsifiability, that is, its capacity to be tested in ways that could prove it false. As Popper famously stated, "The criterion of the scientific status of a theory is its falsifiability, or refutability, or testability."[10]

For Popper and advocates of falsifiability therefore, scientific revolutions are rational because they result from the critical replacement of theories that fail empirical tests with theories possessing greater explanatory power and stronger resistance to falsification. In this context, scientific progress is achieved not by confirming existing theories but by eliminating error through rigorous criticism and continual testing. Thus, scientific rationality consists in the wiliness to subject every theory to severe scrutiny, while revolutionary change reflects the self-correcting character of science rather than irrational or extra-scientific influences. As Popper explains "the way in which knowledge progresses, and especially our scientific knowledge, is by unjustified (and unjustifiable) anticipations, by bold guesses, by tentative solutions to our problems, by conjectures. These conjectures are controlled by criticism; that is, by attempted refutations".[11]

What emerges from the forgoing discussion is that although the verificationists and falsificationists differed in their understanding of scientific methodology, both shared that science is fundamentally governed by objective standards of rational inquiry. The verificationists regarded empirical verification as the principal criterion for distinguishing scientific knowledge from metaphysics, whereas Popper rejected verification in favour of falsification as the defining mark of scientific inquiry. Despite these methodological differences, both traditions maintained that scientific knowledge advances through objective standards of rational evaluation rather than through psychological persuasion, sociological influences, political interests, or mere consensus. In this senses, scientific revolutions, when they occur, are understood as rational developments because they are guided by logical criticism and evidential assessments. It is precisely this conception of scientific rationality that came under sustained criticism from the non-rationalists, most notably in the works of Kuln and Feyerabend to whom we now turn.

Revolution and Rationality in the History of Science: The Non-Rationalists

The rationalist conception of scientific revolution came under sustained attack during the second half of the twentieth century from philosophers who argued that the actual history of science does not conform to the logical models advanced by the verificationists and falsificationists. Before proceeding however, it is important to clarify that the philosophers discussed in this section are referred to collectively as the non-rationalists, not because they rejected the use of reason in science, but because they challenged the classical rationalist claim that scientific revolution can be adequately explained by universal logical and methodological rules. Rather than denying the role of reason in scientific inquiry, they argued that scientific change cannot be fully understood apart from its historical, social, psychological, and institutional contexts. Consequently, their analyses shifted attention from abstract methodological prescriptions to the complex historical processes through which scientific revolutions occur.

The most important among these critics was Kuhn, who argued that scientific development is best explained through the historical practices of the scientific community rather than through abstract methodological prescriptions. According to Kuhn, scientists conduct their research within a paradigm (shared framework of analysis, methods, and standard), that determines what constitutes legitimate scientific inquiry. Consequently,

revolutionary change does not occur simply because one theory has been logically refuted by another but because confidence in an existing paradigm gradually gives way to an alternative framework capable of addressing anomalies. As Kuhn famously observes that "scientific revolutions are here taken to be those non-cumulative developmental episodes in which an older paradigm is replaced in whole or in part by an incompatible new one."[12] This conception departs significantly from the rationalist understanding of scientific progress as a cumulative enterprise governed by universal standards of verification or falsification. Kuhn further contends that competing paradigms are often incommensurable because they embody different concepts, standards of evidence, and modes of explanation, making theory choice more historically and socially conditioned than the classical rationalists were willing to admit.[13]

Lakatos accepted Kuhn's insistence that the history of science should inform philosophical reflection, but he rejected the implication that scientific revolutions aree primarily matters of sociological commitment or psychological conversion. Seeking a middle position between Popper's falsificatioism and Kuhn's historical analysis, Lakatos developed his methodology of scientific research programmes. He argued that scientific theories are not abandoned merely because anomalous evidence appears, rather, they are evaluated within broader research traditions whose success depends upon their long-term explanatory and predictive achievements. As Lakatos argues "no experiment, experimental report, observation statement or well-corroborated low-level falsifying hypothesis alone can lead to falsification. There is no falsification before the emergence of a better theory."[14] Lakatos' theorization preserves the rationalists' important emphasis on rational evaluation while recognizing that scientists ordinarily protect the fundamental assumptions of a research programme by modifying auxiliary hypotheses.[15] Scientific revolutions therefore become rational only in a comparative sense: a research programme is abandoned when a rival programme proves more progressive in generating novel predictions and solving empirical problems than its predecessor.[16]

Paul Feyerabend carried the critique of methodological rationalism to a new level by denying that scientific development can be governed by any universal methodological rules. Drawing extensively upon the history of science, he argued that many of the greatest scientific breakthroughs occurred precisely because scientists departed from accepted procedure rather than obeyed them. His doctrine of epistemological anarchism therefore rejects methodological monism in favour of theoretical pluralism and intellectual freedom. In his well-known formulation, Feyerabend states that "the idea of a method that contains firm, unchanging, and absolutely binding principles for conducting the business of science meets considerable difficulties when confronted with the results of historical research".[17]

This historical insight leads to his equally famous conclusion that "the only principle that does not inhibit progress is anything goes."[18] Although often misunderstood as an endorsement of irrationality, Feyerabend intended this slogan as a rejection of rigid methodological prescriptions rather than of reason itself. Taken together, the contributions of Kuhn, Lakatos, and Feyerabend transformed the debate on scientific rationality by demonstrating that scientific revolution are shaped not only by logic and empirical evidence but also by historical context, professional traditions, methodological flexibility, and practices of scientific communities.[19]

Critical Evaluation: Beyond Rationalism and Irrationalism

The Foregoing sections demonstrate that both the rationalists and the non-rationalists made indispensable contributions to understanding the relationships between rationality and scientific revolutions. Specifically, the verificationists and falsificationists in their contributions showed that scientific progress is governed by reason, empirical evidence, logical coherence, and methodological discipline. This perspective preserved the objectivity of scientific inquiry by emphasizing that scientific theories are accountable to evidence and rational criticism.

Nevertheless, the actual history of science reveals that scientific revolution cannot be explained by universal methodological rules alone. The Copernican Revolution failed because the heliocentric theory immediately possessed superior empirical accuracy; its eventual acceptance depended upon successive contributions by Kepler, Galileo and Newton, which gradually enhanced its explanatory power. Likewise, Newtonian mechanics survived persistent anomalies until Einstein's theory of relativity provided a more comprehensive explanatory framework, while competing interpretations of quantum mechanics coexisted despite sharing essentially the same experimental evidence. These historical events demonstrate that evidence rarely functions as an autonomous decision procedure independent of broader theoretical commitments. As Kuhn observes that "the decision to reject one paradigm is always simultaneously the decision to accept another, and the judgment leading to that decision involves the comparison of both paradigms with nature and with one other".[20] In other words, scientific revolutions require not merely the falsification of existing theories but the availability of intellectually superior alternatives capable of resolving outstanding anomalies. The rationalists were therefore correct in affirming that

scientific inquiry is fundamentally rational, but they overstated the capacity of formal methodological rules to explain the complex historical process through which revolutionary scientific change occurs.

The non-rationalists corrected this deficiency by demonstrating that scientific revolutions unfold with historically situated scientific communities rather than in abstract logical space. Kuhn's conception of paradigms, Feyerabend's critique of methodological monism, and Lakatos' conception of the historical evolution of research programmes collectively shifted philosophical attention from idealized reconstructions of science to its actual historical development. Their analyses convincingly reveal that institutional traditions, professional commitments, psychological dispositions, cultural values, and political circumstances frequently shape scientific judgment. The history of science lends considerable support to this perspective. The prolonged resistance to Alfred Wegener's theory of continental drift, despite the considerable explanatory power of his proposal, illustrates that the acceptance of revolutionary theories depends not only upon empirical and logical considerations but also upon the willingness of the scientific community to reconsider entrenched assumptions and established research traditions.

Similarly, the eventual emergence of plate tectonics as the dominant geological paradigm required not only new empirical discoveries but also a transformation in the conceptual outlook of the geological community. Yet these same historical developments also expose the limitations of radical contextualization. Although the scientific community initially resisted Wegener's proposal, plate tectonics and paleomagnetic evidence provided a more comprehensive and empirically successful explanation of the Earth's structure and dynamics. Consequently, although extra-rational factors influence the pace and direction of scientific change, they cannot replace rational evaluation. According to Popper, "the scientific tradition is distinguished from the pre-scientific tradition in having two layers. Like the latter it passes on its theories; but it also passes on a critical attitude towards them".[21] This Popperian observation identifies what fundamentally distinguishes science from other intellectual traditions. Like pre-scientific traditions science transmits established theories from one generation to the next; unlike them, however, it also institutionalizes a critical attitude towards those theories, treating them not as unquestionable doctrines but as tentative explanations that remains open to revision, modification, or rejection in the light of evidence and criticism. Scientific community may therefore temporarily resist revolutionary ideas because of prevailing paradigms or entrenched commitments, but enduring scientific acceptance ultimately depends on the capacity of new theories to withstand critical scrutiny, accommodate empirical evidence, and provide greater explanatory and predictive power than their predecessors. Accordingly, the non-rationalists successfully exposed the historical inadequacies of classical rationalism by demonstrating that scientific change is influenced by social and historical factors. Nevertheless, their critique does not justify abandoning rational standards as the normative foundation of scientific inquiry, for it is precisely the institutionalization of criticism that enables science to distinguish genuine theoretical progress from mere shifts in scientific opinion.

What the foregoing analysis has shown is that the apparent opposition between rationalism and non-rationalism is best understood as a false dichotomy. The historical development of science demonstrates that scientific evolutions are neither purely logical events determined by fixed methodological rules nor merely sociological occurrences driven by historical contingency. Rather, they are rational historical processes in which evidence, experimentation, logical analysis, theoretical innovation, institutional structures, scientific communities and historical circumstances continually interact. The Copernican Revolution, the transition from Newtonian Mechanics to relativity, the competing integrations of quantum mechanics, and emergence of plate tectonic all exhibit this common pattern. None can be adequately explained through logical and empirical testing alone, yet none can be satisfactorily understood by appealing exclusively to psychological, political, or sociological influences.

Scientific rationality is therefore not a timeless methodological algorithm but an evolving practice exercised within historically situated communities of inquiry. This study accordingly proposes a dynamic conception of scientific rationality that preserves the rationalists' commitment to objective criticism while incorporating the non-rationalists' insight that scientific reasoning is always embedded within particular historical and institutional contexts.

Conclusion

One of the enduring controversies that has dominated twentieth-and twenty first century philosophy of science is the debate over the logic of scientific revolutions. The central question in the controversy is whether scientific revolutions can be adequately explained on a purely rational ground or whether extra-rational factors, such as psychological, sociological as well as institutional influences contribute significantly to explaining scientific development. The two major participants in this debate are the rationalists and non-rationalists. While the rationalists, both the verificationist and falsificationist schools maintain that scientific progress can be explained

solely on rational grounds, the non-rationalist argue that extra-rational factors and indispensible for understanding scientific revolutions.

This paper investigates the rationalist-non-rationalist impasse with them aim of reconciling the tension between schools. It contends that the rationalists were correct in insisting that scientific inquiry is fundamentally committed to logical and methodological accountability. Equally, the non-rationalists were correct in arguing that these rational standards are neither applied nor developed in historical vacuum but within scientific communities shaped psychological, socio-economic and institutional influences. The history of science supports both insights demonstrating that scientific revolutions are neither the mechanical consequence of universal methodological rules nor the arbitrary products of social and political forces. Rather scientific revolutions are best understood as dynamic historical process in which rational evaluation and historical circumstance continuously interact.

References

1. Karl R. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations: The Growth of Scientific Knowledge* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 293.
2. Thomas S. Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 2nd ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970), 151.
3. Jack A. Goldstone, *Revolutions: A Very Short Introduction*, 2nd ed. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2023).
4. George Lawson, *Anatomies of Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019).
5. Kuhn, *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 92.
6. Larry Laudan, *Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977), 66-68.
7. Kuhn, *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 1.
8. A. J. Ayer, *Language, Truth and Logic*, 2nd ed. (London: Victor Gollancz, 1946), 35.
9. Moritz Schlick, "Positivism and Realism," in *Logical Positivism*, ed. A. J. Ayer (Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1959), 82.
10. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*, 280.
11. Karl Popper, The Logic of Scientific Discovery, (London: Hutchinson, 1959), 40.
12. Kuhn, *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 92.
13. Kuhn, *Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, 148-50
14. Imre Lakatos, "Falsification and Methodology of Scientific Research Programme," in *Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge*, ed. Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970), 116.
15. Lakatos, "Falsification and Methodology of Scientific Research Programme," 133-38.
16. Lakatos, "Falsification and Methodology of Scientific Research Programme," 154-55.
17. Paul Feuerabend, *Against Method*, 3rd ed. (London: Vero, 1993), 14.
18. Feuerabend, *Against Method*, 27.
19. Feuerabend, *Against Method*, 19-32.
20. Kuhn, *Structure of Scientific Revolution*, 77.
21. Popper, *Conjectures and Refutations*, 27.