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**Introduction**

The proposed argumentative paper will focus on three major arguments as follows. The first argument is Hume’s Argument against Induction (Okasha’s Simple Version). The second argument is Goodman’s Argument against Induction. The third argument is Hume’s Argument against Induction (Circularity Version).

**Thesis statements**

My first view is that Hume’s argument against induction is among the key issues highlighted in the theory of knowledge. Specifically, I will justify that people are inclined to justify the conception that the future will have a similarity with the past. Nature’s uniformity is indefinite via both experience and reason. Hume explains what he perceives as the main hindrances in justifying inductive knowledge. The philosopher focuses mainly on the issue of Nature’s Uniformity by arguing that people endure a continued power with similar object, just like the way objects are bequeathed with similar powers (Hume 81 in Stroud 1991). The philosopher is astonished why people come up with conclusions from such experiences of life. To support this argument, I will engage the thoughts of other philosophers on this issue such as Karl Popper who proposes different solutions over the dilemma facing Hume’s argument against induction. Nevertheless, contrary opinions held by other scholars, such as Kail who nullify the above claims by Hume, will equally be examined and responded to accordingly. Kail considers Hume being non-sceptic towards induction, and goes forth to mention that people are not justified through inductive inferences owing to the different wiring of human brains and senses.

My second view is about Goodman’s argument against induction by focusing on the “new riddle of induction” (Goodman, 83) who posits a novel setback to inductive reasoning, by significantly ignoring the variations under Hume’s older version. My position on this argument is that while future events are predicted, inferences concerning ‘what will generate what’ remains evident, indicating that inductive reasoning remains unfounded in the precedence of future events. Again, the objections offered by Kail will be engaged as well as supportive opinions of Karl Popper.

**Conclusion**

The proposed paper will thus explain whether or not people are reasonably justified in coming up with inductive inferences used in science. This will be done by specifically focusing on the induction issues put forth by both Goodman and Hume, while integrating the solutions proposed by other philosophers like Karl Popper as well as contrary arguments against these views by Hume and Goodman.
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