The Simulation Hypothesis and the Crisis of Epistemological Certainty

STEPHEN LEONARD CARR* Independent Scholar

* Email: stephencarr@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper examines how accepting the simulation hypothesis as a serious philosophical proposition forces a fundamental reconsideration of epistemological certainty. While previous work has focused on the probability of living in a simulation or the nature of consciousness within simulations, we demonstrate that the mere possibility of simulated reality creates a unique crisis for knowledge hierarchies that differs fundamentally from traditional sceptical arguments. Unlike Cartesian doubt, which preserves the notion of an objective reality while questioning our access to it, the simulation hypothesis suggests reality itself might be programmatically mutable. We argue this undermines traditional distinctions between scientific and religious epistemology, creates an insoluble verification paradox for scientific methodology, and requires a radical reimagining of knowledge and truth. While we suggest that complete epistemological scepticism might be avoided through appeal to necessary logical primitives, we conclude that accepting the possibility of simulated reality requires a fundamental reconstruction of how we understand knowledge, scientific practice, and the relationship between competing explanatory frameworks.

I. Introduction

Recent philosophical discourse surrounding the simulation hypothesis has focused primarily on probabilistic arguments regarding our likely existence within a simulated reality (Bostrom 2003) or questions about the possibility of conscious experience within simulations (Chalmers 2017). While these investigations have yielded valuable insights, they have largely overlooked a more fundamental philosophical problem: how accepting even the possibility of a simulated reality forces us to confront deep questions about epistemological certainty, the nature of logic and mathematics, and the relationship between scientific and religious modes of understanding reality.

Traditional philosophical scepticism, from Descartes' evil demon to contemporary brain-in-a-vat scenarios, has generally preserved the notion of an objective reality while questioning our ability to access it (Williams 2015). The simulation hypothesis presents a fundamentally different challenge. Rather than merely questioning our ability to know reality, it suggests that reality itself might be malleable and programmatic rather than objective and law-governed. This distinction proves crucial for understanding why the simulation hypothesis creates a unique crisis for epistemological hierarchies that differs fundamentally from traditional sceptical arguments.

The implications of this crisis extend far beyond questions of metaphysical reality. If we accept even the possibility that our reality might be simulated, we must confront several profound philosophical challenges. First, the traditional distinction between natural and supernatural explanations becomes increasingly difficult to maintain. When reality itself might be programmatic, the difference between a natural law and a programmer's intervention becomes philosophically unclear. Second, our understanding of scientific methodology requires radical revision. If physical constants might be variable parameters and causation itself might be programmatically mutable, how can we maintain traditional concepts of scientific verification?

These questions intersect with but importantly differ from existing challenges to scientific realism. Van Fraassen's (1980) constructive empiricism, for instance, questions our ability to know unobservable aspects of reality while maintaining the reliability of empirical observation itself. The simulation hypothesis goes further, suggesting that even our most basic empirical observations might be programmatically generated or altered. Similarly, while Kuhn (1962) argued that scientific paradigms shape our understanding of reality, the simulation hypothesis suggests that reality itself might be shaped by parameters beyond our ability to detect or understand.

This paper develops these implications through several interconnected arguments. First, we demonstrate how the simulation hypothesis fundamentally undermines traditional hierarchies of explanatory frameworks, collapsing the distinction between scientific and religious epistemology in novel ways. Second, we examine the crisis this creates for scientific practice, particularly focusing on what we term the "verification paradox" - the impossibility of empirically investigating the nature of a reality that might be programmatically mutable. Finally, we explore potential philosophical responses to this crisis, arguing that while complete epistemological scepticism might be avoided through appeal to necessary logical primitives, accepting the possibility of simulated reality requires a fundamental reimagining of knowledge, truth, and scientific practice.

The argument proceeds as follows. Section II examines the levelling of explanatory frameworks, demonstrating how simulation theory undermines traditional hierarchies of knowledge. Section III explores the crisis this creates for scientific practice, focusing particularly on problems of verification and replication. Section IV examines the status of logical and mathematical knowledge under simulation theory, investigating whether even these abstract domains can provide reliable epistemological foundations, or whether they too must be understood as potentially arbitrary parameters of our simulated reality. While Section V examines the broader implications for human knowledge and practice. We conclude by suggesting new frameworks for understanding knowledge and truth in a potentially simulated reality.

II. The Paradox of Predictability

The most formidable challenge to our argument appears to arise from science's remarkable predictive success. When we can predict the motion of celestial bodies centuries in advance or manipulate quantum states to build functioning technologies, how can we maintain that scientific knowledge rests on arbitrary foundations? This challenge echoes Putnam's (1975) "no miracles" argument for scientific realism: the predictive success of science would be miraculous if our theories didn't track truth. This seems particularly acute when comparing scientific prediction to religious or supernatural frameworks, which typically offer less precise predictive power. However, careful examination reveals that scientific predictability not only fails to undermine simulation theory but actually provides additional support for it.

Consider first the nature of predictability in designed systems. As Wolfram (2002) demonstrates in his analysis of computational systems, behavioural consistency within defined parameters is not merely common but necessary for complex systems to function. This aligns with Chalmers' (2017, p. 314) observation that any conscious simulation must maintain certain computational consistencies to remain stable. Just as Dennett (1991) argues that consciousness emerges from the consistent operation of simpler processes, our reality's consistent physical laws might represent essential operational parameters rather than fundamental truths.

This perspective helps resolve the apparent asymmetry between scientific and religious epistemologies. Building on Barbour's (1974) analysis of the relationship between scientific and religious knowledge, we can understand scientific predictability as domain-specific consistency within a programmed system. This aligns with Plantinga's (2011) argument that scientific and religious knowledge need not conflict because they operate in different domains, though we extend this beyond his theological framework to suggest these domains might represent different aspects of simulated reality.

The domain-specificity of scientific prediction becomes particularly apparent when we examine its boundaries. While quantum mechanics offers precise probabilistic predictions, it famously resists deterministic interpretation (Heisenberg 1958). Wheeler (1983) suggests that the observer-dependent nature of quantum phenomena might indicate a deeper relationship between consciousness and reality, which our simulation framework helps explain. Following Bostrom's

(2003) logic, these limitations might represent fundamental computational boundaries rather than temporary gaps in understanding.

This interpretation gains further support from Tegmark's (2014) mathematical universe hypothesis, though we diverge from his Platonic implications. Rather than viewing mathematical structures as fundamental, we suggest they represent efficient computational implementations, similar to Lloyd's (2006) analysis of the universe as a quantum computer. This aligns with Aaronson's (2013) observations about computational complexity as a fundamental constraint on physical reality.

Furthermore, the success of scientific prediction within its domain might serve essential functional purposes. This builds on Wright's (2000) analysis of functional emergence in complex systems, suggesting that predictability itself might be an emergent requirement for generating complexity. As Dawkins (1986) notes in his analysis of biological complexity, consistent physical laws enable the development of complex adaptive systems.

This reframing resolves the apparent tension between scientific success and epistemological uncertainty. We extend van Fraassen's (1980) constructive empiricism by suggesting that science works not because it accesses fundamental truth but because it successfully models operational parameters of our local simulation space. This aligns with Kuhn's (1962) analysis of scientific paradigms, though we suggest the paradigms reflect simulation parameters rather than mere social constructions.

The analysis strengthens rather than weakens our broader argument about epistemological hierarchies. Building on Goldman's (1999) social epistemology, we suggest that scientific prediction reveals one set of operational parameters within simulated reality. This approaches, but differs from Latour's (1987) analysis of scientific practice, as we maintain the reality of these parameters while questioning their fundamentality.

This interpretation has profound implications for how we understand both scientific and religious knowledge. Rather than competing claims about fundamental reality, as Gould (1997) suggests with his "non-overlapping magisteria," they might represent different interfaces with different aspects of our simulated environment. This builds on Wilber's (2000) integral theory while providing a novel philosophical foundation for understanding the relationship between different knowledge systems.

III. The Crisis in Scientific Practice

The implications of simulation theory for scientific practice extend far beyond questions of predictability into the fundamental methodology of science itself. While Popper (1959) established falsifiability as a cornerstone of scientific method, simulation theory presents us with what we might call the verification paradox: any attempt to verify or falsify the simulated nature of our reality necessarily presupposes the reliability of the very systems whose fundamental nature we seek to test.

This paradox proves more devastating than traditional sceptical challenges to scientific methodology. Where Hume (1748/2007) questioned our ability to verify causation while accepting the reliability of observation, and Berkeley (1710/1982) questioned the existence of matter while maintaining the consistency of perception, simulation theory calls into question the stability of observation, causation, and physical law simultaneously. This creates what Quine (1951) might recognize as an extreme form of underdetermination, where not only theories but reality itself might be mutable.

The problem becomes particularly acute when we consider the nature of experimental replication, which Popper and subsequent philosophers of science have considered essential to scientific practice. Collins (1985) has demonstrated the complex social nature of replication even under normal circumstances. Simulation theory suggests an even deeper problem: what we consider "identical conditions" for replication purposes might represent fundamentally different parameter spaces within the simulation. This extends beyond Collins's sociological analysis to suggest that the very possibility of genuine replication becomes questionable.

Hacking's (1983) argument for scientific realism based on our ability to manipulate unobservable entities requires particular attention here. While we can indeed manipulate quantum states to build functioning technologies, simulation theory suggests this demonstrates mastery of local parameters rather than access to fundamental reality. This aligns with Cartwright's (1999) analysis of the patchwork nature of scientific laws, though we propose a more radical interpretation: the patches might represent different computational optimizations rather than merely different phenomenological domains.

The methodological implications extend to our understanding of measurement and instrumentation. As Galison (1997) demonstrates, scientific practice depends heavily on the reliable operation of increasingly complex measuring devices. Under simulation theory, these devices and their calibration standards might be subject to the same programmatic variability they attempt to measure. This creates what we might call, building on Pickering's (1995) analysis, a "mangle of practice" that extends beyond social construction to the very nature of physical reality.

Moreover, the crisis extends to statistical methodology and meta-analysis. While Suppes (1969) argued for probability as the foundation of empirical science, simulation theory suggests that statistical regularities themselves might be programmed parameters rather than fundamental features of reality. This aligns with but extends beyond Mayo's (1996) error-statistical philosophy, suggesting that our very concept of statistical error might reflect computational limitations rather than epistemic uncertainty.

This methodological crisis forces us to confront what Lakatos (1970) called the problem of demarcation in a new way. If we cannot trust the stability of physical laws or the consistency of experimental results across different domains of the simulation, how can we maintain traditional boundaries between science and non-science? This question becomes particularly pressing when we consider Feyerabend's (1975) arguments against method, though our analysis suggests the problem lies not in methodology itself but in the potentially mutable nature of the reality it attempts to investigate.

The implications for scientific practice are profound. Following Longino's (1990) analysis of the social nature of scientific knowledge, we might need to reconceptualize scientific practice as an attempt to map local consistencies rather than uncover universal truths. This aligns with Dupré's (1993) arguments for pluralistic realism, though we suggest the plurality might reflect different simulation domains rather than different aspects of a unified reality.

These considerations lead us to what we might call, building on Laudan's (1977) analysis, a pragmatic crisis in scientific practice. The traditional goal of science – discovering fundamental laws of nature – may be not merely practically difficult but theoretically impossible if those laws represent mutable parameters rather than fundamental truths. This extends beyond Cartwright's (1983) arguments against laws of nature to suggest that the very concept of natural law might need radical reconceptualization.

The verification paradox thus reveals not merely a practical limitation of scientific investigation but a fundamental boundary of knowledge itself. This conclusion aligns with but extends beyond van Fraassen's (1980) constructive empiricism, suggesting that the limits of scientific knowledge might reflect not merely human epistemic limitations but fundamental features of our simulated reality.

IV. The Status of Mathematical and Logical Knowledge

Having established the profound challenges simulation theory presents to empirical knowledge and scientific methodology, we must now confront an even more fundamental question: what becomes of mathematical and logical knowledge? Traditionally, following Plato, philosophers have viewed mathematical and logical truths as existing in a realm independent of physical reality. Even radical sceptics like Descartes (1641/1984) preserved mathematical knowledge as a foundation of certainty. However, simulation theory forces us to question whether even these apparently necessary truths might be mere parameters of our simulated existence.

Consider the most basic mathematical truth: 2 + 2 = 4. Kant (1781/1998) argued that such arithmetic truths are synthetic a priori knowledge, necessary features of any possible experience. Mill (1843/1974) countered that mathematical knowledge derives from empirical observation, making it contingent rather than necessary. Simulation theory suggests a third possibility: mathematical truths might be necessary within our simulation while remaining contingent from the perspective of base reality. This aligns with but extends beyond Benacerraf's (1973) famous challenge to mathematical Platonism, suggesting that mathematical objects might be neither abstract entities nor empirical generalisations, but computational parameters.

Gödel's (1947) Platonistic argument for the objective existence of mathematical truth requires particular attention here. While Gödel argued that our ability to develop new mathematical axioms demonstrates access to objective mathematical reality, simulation theory suggests our mathematical insights might be constrained by programmed parameters. This extends beyond Putnam's (1967) argument against mathematical Platonism to suggest that even the rules of proof themselves might be simulation-dependent.

The status of logic proves equally problematic. Quine (1970) suggested that even logical truths might be revised in light of empirical evidence. Simulation theory offers a more radical perspective: what we consider logical necessity might reflect computational constraints rather than fundamental truth. This aligns with Dummett's (1991) questioning of classical logic's privileged status, though for different reasons. Where Dummett argued from semantic considerations, we suggest logical rules might be implementation details of our simulated reality.

However, a potential foundation for certain knowledge emerges when we consider the requirements for any simulation to function. Following Turing's (1936) analysis of computation, certain logical primitives appear necessary for any computational system to operate. The law of non-contradiction, for instance, seems required not just within our simulation but for any simulation to function coherently. This suggests what we might call "computational primitives" - logical requirements that transcend particular simulations while perhaps remaining contingent from some ultimate perspective we cannot access.

This position differs from both traditional Platonism and radical scepticism. Where Maddy (1990) argues for a naturalised Platonism based on mathematical practice, we suggest mathematical practice might reveal simulation constraints rather than ultimate truth. This extends beyond Field's (1980) nominalistic program to question whether even logical consistency represents fundamental rather than implemented necessity.

The implications for mathematical and logical practice prove profound. Following Lakatos's (1976) analysis of mathematical discovery, we might need to reconceptualize mathematical progress not as uncovering eternal truths but as exploring the parameters of our simulation. This aligns with but extends beyond Kitcher's (1984) social analysis of mathematical knowledge to suggest that mathematical consensus might reflect shared computational constraints rather than objective truth.

More radically, this analysis suggests that even the rules of logical inference might vary between different simulated realities. While this seems to risk radical relativism, our earlier analysis of computational primitives provides a minimal foundation for rational discourse. This creates what we might call, building on Putnam's (1981) internal realism, a form of "simulation realism" where certain truths hold necessarily within our simulation while remaining ultimately contingent.

This framework helps resolve apparent tensions in foundations of mathematics. The competing intuitions that motivate classical and constructive mathematics, which Brouwer (1981) and others have debated, might reflect different possible implementation strategies for simulated realities. This extends beyond Hellman's (1989) modal structuralism to suggest that mathematical structures might be neither abstract nor concrete but computational.

The profound implication is that even our most secure knowledge claims might reflect simulation parameters rather than ultimate truth. However, unlike the crisis in scientific practice, this need not paralyse mathematical and logical investigation. Rather, it suggests a new way of understanding such investigation: as exploration of our simulation's fundamental parameters rather than discovery of transcendent truth.

V. Broader Implications for Knowledge and Society

The epistemological crisis revealed by simulation theory extends beyond purely philosophical concerns into profound implications for human knowledge institutions and social organisation. While Kuhn (1962) demonstrated how scientific revolutions reshape our understanding of reality, simulation theory suggests a meta-paradigm shift that transforms not just scientific knowledge but the very nature of knowledge claims across all domains.

Consider first the implications for scientific institutions. Following Latour and Woolgar's (1979) analysis of scientific practice, we must recognize that scientific institutions are built upon assumptions about the stability and universality of natural law. When these assumptions become questionable, as our analysis suggests, the institutional foundations of science require radical reconceptualization. This extends beyond Ravetz's (1971) analysis of scientific knowledge production to suggest that the very mission of scientific institutions might need reframing from discovering universal truth to mapping local consistencies within our simulation parameters.

The implications for religious and cultural institutions prove equally profound. Weber's (1919/1946) analysis of the disenchantment of the modern world through scientific rationalisation requires revision when science itself can no longer claim privileged access to fundamental reality. This aligns with Taylor's (2007) analysis of secular age conditions but suggests that rather than choosing between scientific and religious worldviews, we might need frameworks capable of recognizing both as potentially valid interfaces with different aspects of simulated reality.

Educational institutions face particular challenges. Following Dewey's (1916) pragmatic approach to education, we might need to shift focus from transmitting supposedly universal truths to developing skills for navigating potentially mutable realities. This extends beyond Freire's (1970) critical pedagogy to suggest that education must prepare individuals for a reality where even basic physical laws might prove locally variable.

The implications for epistemological authority structures prove especially significant. Foucault's (1980) analysis of knowledge-power relationships takes on new dimensions when knowledge claims themselves become radically contingent. This suggests what we might call, building on

Haraway's (1988) situated knowledges, a form of "simulation-aware epistemology" that recognizes all knowledge as potentially parameter-dependent while maintaining pragmatic utility within local domains.

Social institutions more broadly require reconsideration. Following Berger and Luckmann's (1966) analysis of the social construction of reality, we must now consider how social institutions might adapt to explicitly recognize their potentially simulated nature. This extends beyond Giddens's (1990) analysis of institutional reflexivity to suggest that institutions themselves might need to become adaptive to potentially varying reality parameters.

The philosophical implications extend to ethics and value theory. MacIntyre's (1981) argument for tradition-based rationality takes on new significance when all traditions might reflect different simulation parameters rather than competing access to ultimate truth. This suggests what we might call, building on Williams's (1985) ethical realism, a form of "simulation ethics" that recognizes moral truths as potentially parameter-dependent while maintaining their binding force within local domains.

These considerations lead to what we might call, following Rorty's (1979) critique of foundationalism, a "post-simulation pragmatism." Rather than seeking ultimate foundations for knowledge or value, this approach would focus on developing robust strategies for navigating potentially mutable realities. This aligns with but extends beyond Putnam's (2004) pragmatic pluralism to suggest that different knowledge frameworks might reflect different aspects of our simulated condition.

The practical implications for human society prove both challenging and liberating. While the loss of certainty about fundamental reality might seem devastating, it also opens possibilities for more nuanced and inclusive approaches to knowledge and truth. Following Sen's (2009) analysis of justice, we might develop frameworks that recognize multiple valid perspectives while maintaining pragmatic criteria for evaluation within local domains.

This analysis suggests not nihilism but a sophisticated form of pragmatic realism. Building on Sellars's (1963) scientific realism and manifest image distinction, we might develop frameworks that recognize both the practical validity of our knowledge within local domains and its ultimate contingency as simulation parameters. This creates what we might call, extending James's (1907) pragmatism, a "simulation-aware pragmatism" that maintains practical engagement while acknowledging fundamental uncertainty.

VI. Conclusion

The simulation hypothesis forces us to confront fundamental questions about the nature of knowledge, truth, and reality that extend beyond traditional skeptical arguments. While previous philosophical challenges to knowledge, from Cartesian doubt to quantum uncertainty, have preserved some notion of fundamental reality, our analysis suggests that the very concept of "fundamental reality" might be meaningless from within our potentially simulated condition.

This epistemological crisis proves more profound than previous philosophical challenges in several key ways. First, as we have demonstrated, it undermines not just our access to truth but the very stability of truth itself. Where Kant (1781/1998) could maintain the thing-in-itself as an unknowable but stable reality, simulation theory suggests that reality itself might be mutable and parameter-dependent. This extends beyond Nietzsche's (1873/1976) critique of truth to suggest that even the parameters of reality might be subject to programmatic variation.

Second, our analysis reveals that scientific predictability, rather than providing evidence against simulation theory, aligns precisely with what we would expect from a well-designed computational system. This reframing of scientific success proves crucial for understanding the relationship between scientific and religious epistemologies. Following but extending beyond Plantinga's (2011) arguments about the compatibility of science and religion, we suggest that different epistemological frameworks might interface with different aspects of our simulated condition.

Third, the examination of mathematical and logical knowledge reveals that even these supposedly necessary truths might reflect computational parameters rather than fundamental reality. This conclusion, while radical, provides a novel framework for understanding the surprising effectiveness of mathematics in describing physical reality that Wigner (1960) found so unreasonable.

The implications of this analysis extend far beyond philosophical speculation. As we have shown, accepting even the possibility of simulated reality requires fundamental reconceptualization of scientific practice, educational institutions, and knowledge claims across all domains. This suggests new directions for epistemological investigation that recognize both the local validity and ultimate contingency of knowledge.

However, rather than leading to epistemological nihilism, our analysis suggests what we might call "simulation-aware pragmatism." This framework, building on James (1907) while extending beyond traditional pragmatism, maintains the practical utility of knowledge within local domains while acknowledging its potentially programmatic nature. This creates possibilities for more sophisticated approaches to knowledge that transcend traditional divisions between scientific and religious epistemologies.

The path forward requires developing new conceptual frameworks capable of maintaining pragmatic engagement with reality while acknowledging fundamental uncertainty about its nature. This suggests several directions for future philosophical investigation:

First, we need new approaches to scientific practice that recognize both the local reliability and ultimate contingency of natural law. Second, we require educational frameworks that can prepare individuals for navigating potentially mutable realities. Third, we must develop ethical frameworks that maintain normative force while acknowledging their potentially programmatic nature.

Ultimately, the simulation hypothesis reveals not just limitations on human knowledge but new possibilities for understanding the relationship between knowledge, reality, and truth. Rather than undermining the enterprise of human knowledge, it suggests more nuanced and inclusive approaches to understanding our condition. In this light, the simulation hypothesis might prove not merely a philosophical challenge but an opportunity for developing more sophisticated frameworks for human knowledge and practice.

The profound conclusion is that while we might never know whether we exist in a simulation, considering this possibility transforms our understanding of knowledge itself. This transformation, while challenging, opens new horizons for philosophical investigation and human understanding. Rather than ending philosophical inquiry, it suggests new beginnings.

REFERENCES

Aaronson, Scott. Quantum Computing Since Democritus (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

Barbour, Ian G. Myths, Models and Paradigms: A Comparative Study in Science and Religion (New York: Harper & Row, 1974).

Benacerraf, Paul. "Mathematical Truth." The Journal of Philosophy, LXX, 19 (November 1973): 661-679.

Berkeley, George. A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge (1710), Kenneth Winkler, ed. (Indianapolis: Hackett, 1982).

Berger, Peter L., and Thomas Luckmann. The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge (New York: Doubleday, 1966).

Bostrom, Nick. "Are You Living in a Computer Simulation?" Philosophical Quarterly, LIII, 211 (2003): 243-255.

Brouwer, L.E.J. Brouwer's Cambridge Lectures on Intuitionism, D. van Dalen, ed. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Cartwright, Nancy. How the Laws of Physics Lie (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983).

Cartwright, Nancy. The Dappled World: A Study of the Boundaries of Science (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Chalmers, David J. "The Virtual and the Real." Disputatio, IX, 46 (2017): 309-352.

Collins, Harry M. Changing Order: Replication and Induction in Scientific Practice (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985).

Dawkins, Richard. The Blind Watchmaker (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1986).

Dennett, Daniel C. Consciousness Explained (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1991).

Descartes, René. The Philosophical Writings of Descartes (1641), John Cottingham, Robert Stoothoff, and Dugald Murdoch, trans. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984).

Dewey, John. Democracy and Education (New York: Macmillan, 1916).

Dummett, Michael. The Logical Basis of Metaphysics (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991).

Dupré, John. The Disorder of Things: Metaphysical Foundations of the Disunity of Science (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993).

Field, Hartry. Science Without Numbers: A Defence of Nominalism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1980).

Feyerabend, Paul. Against Method (London: New Left Books, 1975).

Foucault, Michel. Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings 1972-1977, Colin Gordon, ed. (New York: Pantheon, 1980).

Freire, Paulo. Pedagogy of the Oppressed (New York: Continuum, 1970).

Galison, Peter. Image and Logic: A Material Culture of Microphysics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997).

Giddens, Anthony. The Consequences of Modernity (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1990).

Gödel, Kurt. "What is Cantor's Continuum Problem?" The American Mathematical Monthly, LIV, 9 (1947): 515-525.

Goldman, Alvin I. Knowledge in a Social World (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999).

Gould, Stephen Jay. "Nonoverlapping Magisteria." Natural History, CVI, 2 (1997): 16-22.

Hacking, Ian. Representing and Intervening: Introductory Topics in the Philosophy of Natural Science (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983).

Haraway, Donna. "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective." Feminist Studies, XIV, 3 (1988): 575-599.

Heisenberg, Werner. Physics and Philosophy: The Revolution in Modern Science (New York: Harper & Row, 1958).

Hellman, Geoffrey. Mathematics Without Numbers: Towards a Modal-Structural Interpretation (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989).

Hume, David. An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding (1748), Peter Millican, ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).

James, William. Pragmatism: A New Name for Some Old Ways of Thinking (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1907).

Kant, Immanuel. Critique of Pure Reason (1781), Paul Guyer and Allen W. Wood, trans. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

Kitcher, Philip. The Nature of Mathematical Knowledge (New York: Oxford University Press, 1984).

Kuhn, Thomas S. The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962).

Lakatos, Imre. "Falsification and the Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes." In Criticism and the Growth of Knowledge, Imre Lakatos and Alan Musgrave, eds. (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1970): 91-196.

Lakatos, Imre. Proofs and Refutations (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1976).

Latour, Bruno. Science in Action: How to Follow Scientists and Engineers Through Society (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1987).

Latour, Bruno, and Steve Woolgar. Laboratory Life: The Construction of Scientific Facts (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

Laudan, Larry. Progress and Its Problems: Towards a Theory of Scientific Growth (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977).

Lloyd, Seth. Programming the Universe: A Quantum Computer Scientist Takes on the Cosmos (New York: Knopf, 2006).

Longino, Helen E. Science as Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990).

MacIntyre, Alasdair. After Virtue (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1981).

Maddy, Penelope. Realism in Mathematics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990).

Mayo, Deborah G. Error and the Growth of Experimental Knowledge (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996).

Mill, John Stuart. A System of Logic, Ratiocinative and Inductive (1843), J.M. Robson, ed. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974).

Nietzsche, Friedrich. "On Truth and Lies in a Nonmoral Sense" (1873), in Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870s, Daniel Breazeale, trans. (Atlantic Highlands: Humanities Press, 1976).

Pickering, Andrew. The Mangle of Practice: Time, Agency, and Science (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995).

Plantinga, Alvin. Where the Conflict Really Lies: Science, Religion, and Naturalism (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).

Popper, Karl R. The Logic of Scientific Discovery (London: Hutchinson, 1959).

Putnam, Hilary. "Mathematics Without Foundations." The Journal of Philosophy, LXIV, 1 (January 1967): 5-22.

Putnam, Hilary. "What is Mathematical Truth?" in Mathematics, Matter and Method: Philosophical Papers, Volume 1 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975): 60-78.

Putnam, Hilary. Reason, Truth and History (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

Putnam, Hilary. Ethics Without Ontology (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004).

Quine, Willard Van Orman. "Two Dogmas of Empiricism." The Philosophical Review, LX, 1 (January 1951): 20-43.

Quine, Willard Van Orman. Philosophy of Logic (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1970).

Ravetz, Jerome R. Scientific Knowledge and its Social Problems (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971).

Rorty, Richard. Philosophy and the Mirror of Nature (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979).

Sellars, Wilfrid. Science, Perception and Reality (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963).

Sen, Amartya. The Idea of Justice (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2009).

Suppes, Patrick. "A Probabilistic Theory of Causality." Acta Philosophica Fennica, XXIV (1969): 1-13.

Taylor, Charles. A Secular Age (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007).

Tegmark, Max. Our Mathematical Universe: My Quest for the Ultimate Nature of Reality (New York: Knopf, 2014).

Turing, Alan M. "On Computable Numbers, with an Application to the Entscheidungsproblem." Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, XLII, 2 (1936): 230-265.

van Fraassen, Bas C. The Scientific Image (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1980).

Weber, Max. "Science as a Vocation" (1919), in From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology, H.H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, trans. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1946): 129-156.

Wheeler, John A. "Law Without Law." In Quantum Theory and Measurement, John A. Wheeler and Wojciech H. Zurek, eds. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1983): 182-213.

Wigner, Eugene P. "The Unreasonable Effectiveness of Mathematics in the Natural Sciences." Communications on Pure and Applied Mathematics, XIII, 1 (1960): 1-14.

Wilber, Ken. A Theory of Everything: An Integral Vision for Business, Politics, Science, and Spirituality (Boston: Shambhala, 2000).

Williams, Bernard. Ethics and the Limits of Philosophy (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985).

Williams, Michael. Unnatural Doubts: Epistemological Realism and the Basis of Scepticism (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2015).

Wolfram, Stephen. A New Kind of Science (Champaign: Wolfram Media, 2002).

Wright, Robert. Nonzero: The Logic of Human Destiny (New York: Pantheon Books, 2000).