

## Problems with Popper

1. Science does not always work like this. Major theories do not get overturned when falsified.

Popper's response: His is a prescriptive theory, not a descriptive one. He is not describing *how* science works, but is instead stating how it *should* work.

2. If Popper's method had been followed, the Copernican Revolution (1543) would not have taken place. Dropping a stone from a tower and watching it land directly beneath would be a falsification of the conjecture that the Earth moves

3. If an observation falsifies a theory, is it the theory that has actually been falsified? Could it be some assumption made in the observation e.g. the validity of the test or equipment used?

4. We never actually get to the truth.

5. Does Popper's theory mean that Darwinian Evolution is unscientific? Perhaps Darwinian Evolution is unfalsifiable?

## Strengths

1. Popper provides us with a clear demarcation between science and non-science (falsifiability).
2. The theory solves problem of induction whilst retaining the high epistemological status of science.