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**Final Argument Paper Outline**

**1) Claim:**

The argument proposed in this paper is that it is not possible to create a universal rule founded on several incomplete experiences (argument against induction).

**2) Views of other philosophers:**

1. **Hume’s argument against induction**

By focusing on Nature’s Uniformity, Hume argues that people endure a continued power with similar object, just like the way objects are bequeathed with similar powers (Hume 81 in Stroud 1991).

**b) Goodman’s argument against induction**

Goodman focuses on the “new riddle of induction” (Goodman, 1983, p. 83) by positing a novel setback to inductive reasoning, by significantly ignoring the variations under Hume’s older version.

1. **Musgrave’s argument against induction**

In defending Hume’s argument, Musgrave (2004) argues that People are inclined to justify the conception that the future will have a similarity with the past.

**3) Arguments in support of the proposed claim**

**a) Karl Popper’s Supportive Argument**

Popper supports the claim that it is not possible to create a universal rule founded on several incomplete experiences, or rather the argument against induction by proposing different solutions over the dilemma facing Hume’s argument against induction.

**b) Goodman’s supportive argument**

Goodman upholds the above claim by arguing against induction. According to Goodman, “….Predictions founded on certain regularities remain valid while those founded on other regularities are not” (Goodman, 1983, p. 180), thus concluding that “arguing that valid predictions are those based on past regularities, devoid of ,mentioning these regularities, remains pointless….”(Goodman, 1983, p.180). This is indicative of the fact that formation of predictions is not simply based on regularities since such regularities remain easy to come by but this is not an assurance to predict from them.

**c) Hume’s supportive argument**

According to Hume, there is no any rational justification of induction since human beings process inductively thus this would make it quit hard offering an explanation of anything in a manner not considered inductive. In arguing so, Hume supports the claim that it is not possible to create a universal rule founded on several incomplete experiences.

4) **Counter opinions**

***Kail’s and Strawson’s Counter opinions:***

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. In his study on “Introduction to Logical Theory,” Peter Strawson argues in favour of induction. According to Strawson (2012), invalidation of induction would mean invalidation of humankind’s entire belief system. The philosopher argues that people interpret events based on their sense of mind, and regardless of being aware of it or not, assumptions are considered in interpreting the rest of the outcome. Thus, it is worthy arguing that both Kail’s and Strawson’s arguments remain invalid. This is so since 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. Therefore, Kail’s counter argument remains invalid.
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