

1. **Either** (a) Is it true that only scientific realism can adequately explain the (predictive) successes of scientific theories?
Or (b) What is the thesis of the underdetermination of theory by data and does it give good grounds for rejecting realism?
2. **Either** (a) What were the constraints that grounded the positivists' search for a criterion of empirical significance and can they be met?
Or (b) Does Popper's falsificationism provide an adequate solution to the demarcation problem?
3. **Either** (a) 'All good explanation is causal explanation.' Discuss.
Or (b) 'All explanations involve laws'. Discuss.
4. What is a law of nature?
5. 'Hypothetico-deductivism is hopeless.' Discuss.
6. **Either** (a) What is the Unity of Science hypothesis? Is it plausible?
Or (b) What versions of physicalism, if any, are plausible? How do they relate to the Unity of Science hypothesis?
7. 'Since observation is theory laden it cannot act as the theory neutral arbiter between competing scientific theories.' Discuss.
8. Critically discuss at least one solution to Hempel's Paradox.
9. What is the philosophical import of Goodman's Paradox?
10. **Either** (a) Does Kuhn's account of paradigm shift show that such shifts are essentially irrational?
Or (b) What and how plausible is Kuhn's incommensurability thesis?
11. 'Hempel's special consequence condition is plausible but ultimately unacceptable'. Discuss.
12. 'e confirms h iff $P(h/e) > P(h)$ '. Discuss.

END OF PAPER

