Park, S. (2022). *Embracing scientific realism*. Cham: Springer.

<https://link.springer.com/book/9783030878139>

My videos on each chapter of this book:

<https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjOMOQyQ8WxfvEVBGW1hzLw>

Chapter 1 In Defense of the No-Miracles Argument

Chapter 2 Critiques of the Pessimistic Induction

Chapter 3 Critiques of Scientific Antirealism

Chapter 4 Six New Arguments for Scientific Realism

Chapter 5 Critiques of Five Variants of Putative Realism

Chapter 6 Formulating Scientific Realism and Antirealism

Chapter 7 Scientific Realism and Scientific Understanding


Chapter 8 Scientific Realism and Scientific Progress

Chapter 9 Scientific Realism and Mathematical Realism

Chapter 10 Scientific Realism and Scientific Practice

Chapter 11 New Topics for Future Debates

This book provides philosophers of science with new theoretical resources for making their own contributions to the scientific realism debate. Readers will encounter old and new arguments for and against scientific realism. They will also be given useful tips for how to provide influential formulations of scientific realism and antirealism. Finally, they will see how scientific realism relates to scientific progress, scientific understanding, mathematical realism, and scientific practice.



**References**

Achinstein, P. (2002). Is there a valid experimental argument for scientific realism? *The Journal of Philosophy*, 99(9), 470–495.

Akins, K. (1996). Of sensory systems and the ‘aboutness’ of mental states. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 93(3), 337–372.

Alai, M. (2017). Resisting the historical objections to realism: Is Doppelt’s a viable solution? *Synthese*, 194(9), 3267–3290.

Allen, C. and Neal, J. (2020). Teleological notions in biology. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2020/entries/teleology-biology/>.

Asay, J. (2019). Going local: A defense of methodological localism about scientific realism. *Synthese*, 196(2), 587–609.

Baker, A. (2005). Are there genuine mathematical explanations of physical phenomena? *Mind*, 114(454), 223–237.

Baker, A. (2009). Mathematical explanation in science. *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 60(3), 611–633.

Baker, A. (2012). Science-driven mathematical explanation. *Mind*, 121(482), 243–267.

Baker, A. (2016). Parsimony and inference to the best mathematical explanation. *Synthese*, 193(2), 333–350.

Balaguer, M. (2018). Fictionalism in the philosophy of mathematics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/fictionalism-mathematics/>.

Benacerraf, P. (1973). Mathematical truth. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 70(19), 661–679.

Bird, A. (2007). What is scientific progress? *Noûs*, 41(1), 92–117.

Bird, A. (2019). The aim of belief and the aim of science. *Theoria: International Journal for Theory, History and Foundations of Science*, 34(2), 171–193.

Bromberger, S. (1966). Why-questions. In R. Colodny (Ed.), *Mind and cosmos: Essays in contemporary science and philosophy*. (pp. 86–111). Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Busch, J. (2012). The indispensability argument for mathematical realism and scientific realism. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 43(1), 3–9.

Byrant, A. (2018). Each Kuhn mutually incommensurable. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 7(6), 1–7.

Callard, B. (2007). The conceivability of platonism. *Philosophia Mathematica*, 15(3), 347–356.

Callard, B. (2018). Can math move matter? *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0020174X.2018.1533886>.

Chakravartty, A. (2008). What you don’t know can’t hurt you: Realism and the unconceived. *Philosophical Studies* 137(1), 149–158.

Chakravartty, A. (2017). Scientific realism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/scientific-realism/>.

Chang, H. (2001). How to take realism beyond foot-stomping. *Philosophy*, 76(1), 5–30.

Chang, H. (2003). Preservative realism and its discontent: Revisiting caloric. *Philosophy of science*, 70(5), 902–912.

Chang, H. (2016). Who cares about the history of science? *The Royal Society Journal of the History of Science*, 71(1), 91–107.

Cohen, J. (1992). *An essay on belief and acceptance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Colyvan, M. (2001). *The indispensability of mathematics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Colyvan, M. (2006). Scientific realism and mathematical nominalism: A marriage made in hell. In C. Cheyne and J. Worrall (Eds.), *Rationality and reality: Conversations with Alan Musgrave* (pp. 225–237). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer.

Cordero, A. (2017). Retention, truth-content and selective realism. In E. Agazzi (Ed.), *Varieties of scientific realism: Objectivity and truth in science* (pp. 245–256). Cham: Springer.

Cummins, R. (1975). Functional analysis. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 72(20), 741–765.

Darwin, C. (1859/1993). *The portable Darwin*. P. Graham (Ed.), Duncan Porter and Paris: Penguin Books.

Dawes, G. (2013). Belief is not the issue: A defence of inference to the best explanation. *Ratio: An International Journal of Analytic Philosophy*, 26(1), 62–78.

Dellsén, F. (2016). Scientific progress: Knowledge vs. understanding. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 56, 72–83.

Dellsén, F. (2017a). Understanding without justification or belief. *Ratio: An International Journal of Analytic Philosophy*, 30(3), 239–254.

Dellsén, F. (2017b). Reconstructed empiricism. *Acta Analytica*, 32(1), 95–113.

Dellsén, F. (2018). Scientific progress: Four accounts. *Philosophy Compass*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/phc3.12525>.

Dellsén, F. (2019). Should scientific realists embrace theoretical conservatism? *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 76, 39–38.

de Regt, H. (2015). Scientific understanding: Truth or dare? *Synthese*, 192(12), 3781–3797.

Devitt, M. (2011). Are unconceived alternatives a problem for scientific realism? *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 42(2), 285–293.

Doppelt, G. (2007). Reconstructing scientific realism to rebut the pessimistic meta-induction, *Philosophy of Science*, 74(1), 96–118.

Doppelt, G. (2014). Best theory scientific realism. *European Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 4(2), 271–291.

Duhem, P. (1905/1954). *The aim and structure of physical theories*. Trans. P. Wiener. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Einstein, A. (1905/1956). *Investigations on the theory of the Brownian movement*. Trans. A. Cowper. New York: Dover.

Elgin, C. (2004). True enough. *Philosophical Issues*, 14(1), 113–131.

Elgin, C. (2012). Understanding’s tethers. In C. Jäger and W. Löffler (Eds.), *Epistemology: Contexts, values, disagreement* (pp. 245–256). Frankfurt: Ontos Verlag.

Enfield, P. (2008). Review. *Exceeding our grasp: Science, history, and the problem of unconceived alternatives*. K. Stanford, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 59(4), 881–895.

Eronen, M. (2019). Robust realism for the life sciences. *Synthese*, 196(6), 2341–2354.

Fahrbach, L. (2011a). How the growth of science ends theory change. *Synthese*, 180(2), 139–155.

Fahrbach, L. (2011b). Theory change and degrees of success. *Philosophy of Science*, 78(5), 1283–1292.

Feynman, R. (1963). *Six easy pieces: Essentials of physics explained by its most brilliant teacher*. New York: Basic Books.

Field, H. (1980). *Science without numbers*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fine, A. (1986). Unnatural attitudes: Realist and instrumentalist attachments to science. *Mind*, 95(378), 149–179.

Fine, A. (1991). Piecemeal realism. *Philosophical Studies*, 61(1–2), 79–96.

Fitzpatrick, S. (2013). Doing away with the no miracles argument. In V. Karakostas and D. Dieks (Eds.), *EPSA11 Perspectives and foundational problems in philosophy of science* (pp. 141–151). The European Philosophy of Science Association Proceedings, Vol 2, Cham: Springer.

Friedman, M. (1974). Explanation and scientific understanding. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 71(1), 5–19.

Friedman, M. (1981). Theoretical explanation. In R. Healey (Ed.), *Reduction, time & reality: Studies in the philosophy of natural science* (pp. 1–16). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frost-Arnold, G. (2010). The no-miracles argument: Inference to an unacceptable explanation. *Philosophy of Science*, 77(1), 35–58.

Frost-Arnold, G. (2019). How to be a historically motivated antirealist: The problem of misleading evidence. *Philosophy of Science*, 86(5), 906–917.

Giere, R. (2006). *Scientific perspectivism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Goldman, A. (1979). What is justified belief? In G. S. Pappas (Ed.), *Justification and knowledge: New studies in epistemology* (pp. 1–23). Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Goldman, A. (1999). *Knowledge in a social world*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Goldman, A. and Beddor, B. (2016). Reliabilist epistemology. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/reliabilism/>.

Grimm, S. (2006). Is understanding a species of knowledge? *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 57(3), 515–535.

Grimm, S. (2014). Understanding as knowledge of causes. In A. Fairweather (Ed.), *Virtue epistemology naturalized: Bridges between virtue epistemology and philosophy of science* (Synthese Library, vol. 366). Cham: Springer: 329–345.

Hacking, I. (1983). *Representing and intervening: Introductory topics in the philosophy of science.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hafele, J. and Keating, R. (July 1972). Around-the-world atomic clocks: Predicted relativistic time gains. *Science*, 177(4044), 166–168.

Harker, D. (2008). P. Kyle Stanford, *Exceeding our grasp: Science, history, and the problem of unconceived alternatives*. *Philosophy of Science*, 75(2), 251–253.

Healey, R. (2019a). Four points in response to Seungbae Park. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 8(12), 43–45.

Healey, R. (2019b). The aims of reliable knowledge: Reply to Seungbae Park. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 8(9), 25–30.

Hempel, C. (1966). *Philosophy of natural science*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Hendry, R. (2001). Are realism and instrumentalism methodologically indifferent? *Philosophy of Science*, 68(Proceedings), S25–S37.

Hume, D. (1888/1978). *A treatise of human nature*. L. A. Selby-Bigge and P. H. Nidditch (Eds.), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hume, D. (1977). *An enquiry concerning human understanding*. Indianapolis, Indiana: Hackett Publishing Company.

Jones, T. (1970). *A history of Western Philosophy: The classical mind*. Belmont: Wadsworth.

Kant, I. (1785/2011). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals*. J. Timmermann (Ed.), New York: Cambridge University Press.

Khalifa, K. (2010). Default privilege and bad lots: Underconsideration and explanatory inference. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 24(1), 91–105.

Kitcher, P. (1993). *The advancement of science: Science without legend, objectivity without illusions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Kosso, P. (1992). *Reading the book of nature: An introduction to the philosophy of science*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kuhn, T. (1962/1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kukla, A. (1998). *Studies in scientific realism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ladyman, J. (1999). Review. *A novel defense of scientific realism*. J. Leplin, *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science*, 50(1), 181–188.

Ladyman, J. (2014). Structural realism. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/structural-realism/>.

Ladyman, J., Douven, I., Horsten, L., and van Fraassen, B. (1997). A defense of van Fraassen’s critique of abductive inference: Reply to Psillos. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 47(188), 305–321.

Lange, M. (2002). Baseball, pessimistic inductions and the turnover fallacy. *Analysis*, 62(4), 2881–2885.

Laudan, L. (1977). *Progress and its problems: Towards a theory of scientific growth*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Laudan, L. (1981a). A confutation of convergent realism. *Philosophy of Science*, 48(1), 19–49.

Laudan, L. (1981b). A problem-solving approach to scientific progress. In I. Hacking (Ed.), *Scientific revolutions* (pp. 144–155). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Laudan, L. (1984a). Explaining the success of science: Beyond epistemic realism and relativism. In J. Cushing, C. Delaney, and G. Gutting (Eds.), *Science and reality* (pp. 83–105). Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.

Laudan, L. (1984b). *Science and values*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Leplin, J. (1987). Surrealism. *Mind*, 97(384), 519–524.

Leplin, J. (1997). *A novel defense of scientific realism.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Linnebo, Ø. (2018). Platonism in the philosophy of mathematics. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/platonism-mathematics/>.

Lipton, P. (2001). Quests of a realist. *Metascience*, 10(3), 347–353.

Long, D. (1992). The self-defeating character of skepticism. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 52(1), 67–84.

Lyons, T. (2003). Explaining the success of a scientific theory. *Philosophy of Science*, 70(5), 891–901.

Lyons, T. (2005). Toward a purely axiological scientific realism. *Erkenntnis*, 63(2), 167–204.

Lyons, T. (2016). Scientific realism. In P. Humphreys (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of philosophy of science*. (pp. 564–584). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lyons, T. (2016). Structural realism versus deployment realism: A comparative evaluation. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 59, 95–105.

Lyons, T. (2017). Epistemic selectivity, historical threats, and the non-epistemic tenets of scientific realism. *Synthese*, 194(9), 3203–3219.

Lyons, T. (2018). Four challenges to epistemic scientific realism. *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 9(1), 146–150.

Lyons, T. (2019). Systematicity theory meets Socratic scientific realism: The systematic quest for truth. *Synthese*, 196(3), 833–861.

Mach, E. (1911/2015). *History and root of the principle of the conservation of energy*. Trans. P. Jourdain. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company.

Maddy, P. (1992). Indispensability and practice. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 89(6), 275–289.

Markram, H. (2006). The blue brain project. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, 7(2), 153–160.

Mizrahi, M. (2012). Why the ultimate argument for scientific realism ultimately fails. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 43(1), 132–138.

Mizrahi, M. (2013a). The pessimistic induction: A bad argument gone too far. *Synthese*, 190(15), 3209–3226.

Mizrahi, M. (2013b). The argument from underconsideration and relative realism. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 27(4), 393–407.

Mizrahi, M. (2015). Historical inductions: New cherries, same old cherry-picking. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 29(2), 129–148.

Mizrahi, M. (2016). The history of science as a graveyard of theories: A philosophers’ myth. *International Studies in Philosophy of Science*, 30(3), 263–278.

Mizrahi, M. (2018). The (lack of) evidence for the Kuhnian image of science. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 7(7), 19–24.

Mizrahi, M. (2020). *The relativity of theory: Key positions and arguments in the contemporary scientific realism/antirealism debate*. Cham: Springer.

Moore, G. (1993). Moore’s paradox. In T. Baldwin (Ed.), *G.E. Moore: Selected writings*. (pp. 207–212). London: Routledge.

Morrison, M. (1990). Theory, intervention and realism. *Synthese*, 82(1), 1–22.

Müller, F. (2015). The pessimistic meta-induction: Obsolete through scientific progress? *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 29(4), 393–412.

Musgrave, A. (1985). Realism vs. constructive empiricism. In P. Churchland & C. Hooker (Eds.), *Images of science: Essays on realism and empiricism* (pp. 197–221). Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Musgrave, A. (1988). The ultimate argument for scientific realism. In R. Nola (Ed.), *Relativism and realism in science* (pp. 229–252). Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Musgrave, A. (2017). Strict empiricism versus explanation in science. In E. Agazzi (Ed.), *Varieties of scientific realism: Objectivity and truth in science* (pp. 71–93). Cham: Springer.

Nagel, E. (1979). *The structure of science: Problems in the logic of scientific explanation*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company.

Nickles, T. (2016). Perspectivism versus a completed Copernican revolution. *Axiomathes* 26(4), 367–382.

Nickles, T. (2017). Cognitive illusions and nonrealism: Objections and replies. In E. Agazzi (Ed.), *Varieties of scientific realism: Objectivity and truth in science* (pp. 151–163). Cham: Springer.

Niiniluoto, I. (1984). *Is science progressive?* Dordrecht: Reidel.

Niiniluoto, I. (1995). Is there progress in science? In H. Stachowiak (Ed.), Pragmatik, Handbuch pragmatischen Denkens (pp. 30–58). Band V, Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag.

Niiniluoto, I. (2014). Scientific progress as increasing verisimilitude. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 46, 73–77.

Niiniluoto, I. (2015). Scientific progress. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/scientific-progress/>.

Papineau, D. (1996). *The philosophy of science*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Park, S. (2001). *Scientific realism vs. scientific antirealism*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Arizona.

Park, S. (2011a). Coherence of our best scientific theories. *Foundations of Science*, 16(1), 21–30.

Park, S. (2011b). A confutation of the pessimistic induction. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 42(1), 75–84.

Park, S. (2014a). A pessimistic induction against scientific antirealism. *Organon F*, 21(1), 3–21.

Park, S. (2014b). The doxastic requirement of scientific explanation and understanding. *Prolegomena*, 13(2), 279–290.

Park, S. (2014c). Approximate truth vs. empirical adequacy. *Epistemologia*, 37(1), 106–118.

Park, S. (2014d). On the evolutionary defense of scientific antirealism. *Axiomathes*, 24(2), 263–273.

Park, S. (2015a). Against motivational efficacy of beliefs. *Coactivity: Philosophy. Communication*, 23(1), 86–95.

Park, S. (2015b). Explanatory failures of relative realism. *Epistemologia*, 38(1), 16–28.

Park, S. (2015c). Accepting our best scientific theories. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 26(3), 218–227.

Park, S. (2016a). Extensional scientific realism vs. intensional scientific realism. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science*, 59, 46–52.

Park, S. (2016b). Realism versus surrealism. *Foundations of Science*, 21(4), 603–614.

Park, S. (2016c). Refutations of the two pessimistic inductions. *Philosophia*, 44(3), 835–844.

Park, S. (2016d). How to foster scientists’ creativity. *Creativity Studies*, 9(2), 117–126.

Park, S. (2016e). Scientific realism and antirealism in science education. *Coactivity: Philosophy. Communication*, 24(1), 72–81.

Park, S. (2016f). Against mathematical convenientism. *Axiomathes*, 26(2), 115–122.

Park, S. (2017a). Scientific antirealists have set fire to their own houses. *Prolegomena*, 16(1), 23–37.

Park, S. (2017b). Defense of epistemic reciprocalism. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 28(1), 56–64.

Park, S. (2017c). Problems with using evolutionary theory in philosophy. *Axiomathes*, 27(3), 321–332.

Park, S. (2017d). The unificatory power of scientific realism. *Disputatio*, 9(44), 59–73.

Park, S. (2017e). The uniformity principle vs. the disuniformity principle. *Acta Analytica*, 32(2), 213–222.

Park, S. (2017f). Why should we be pessimistic about antirealists and pessimists? *Foundations of Science*, 22(3), 613–625.

Park, S. (2017g). Selective realism *versus* individual realism for scientific creativity. *Creativity Studies*, 10(1), 97–107.

Park, S. (2017h). Critiques of minimal realism. *Problemos*, 92, 102–114.

Park, S. (2017i). Understanding without justification and belief? *Principia: An International Journal of Epistemology*, 21(3), 379–389.

Park, S. (2017j). Does scientific progress consist in increasing knowledge or understanding? *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 48(4), 569–579.

Park, S. (2017k). In defense of mathematical inferentialism. *Analysis and Metaphysics*, 16, 70–83.

Park, S. (2017l). Two criticisms against mathematical realism. *Diametros: An Online Journal of Philosophy*, 52, 96–106.

Park, S. (2018a). Justifying the special theory of relativity with unconceived methods. *Axiomathes*, 28(1), 53–62.

Park, S. (2018b). The grand pessimistic induction. *Review of Contemporary Philosophy*, 17, 7–19.

Park, S. (2018c). In defense of the epistemic imperative. *Axiomathes*, 28(4), 435–446.

Park, S. (2018d). Philosophers and scientists are social epistemic agents. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 7(6), 31–43.

Park, S. (2018e). The problem of unobserved anomalies. *Filosofija. Sociologija*, 29(1), 4–12.

Park, S. (2018f). The pessimistic induction and the Golden Rule. *Problemos*, 93, 70–80.

Park, S. (2018g). The anti-induction for scientific realism. *Grazer Philosophische Studien*, 95(3), 329–342.

Park, S. (2018h). Rejecting mathematical realism while accepting interactive realism. *Analysis and Metaphysics*, 17, 7–21.

Park, S. (2019a). The descriptive and normative versions of scientific realism and pessimism. *Filozofia: Journal for Philosophy*, 74(4), 278–290.

Park, S. (2019b). In defense of realism and selectivism from Lyons’s objections. *Foundations of Science*, 24(4), 605–615.

Park, S. (2019c). Scientific realism and the future development of science. *Diametros: An Online Journal of Philosophy*, 60, 61–71.

Park, S. (2019d). Surrealism is not an alternative to scientific realism. *Logos & Episteme: An International Journal of Epistemology*, 10(4), 379–393.

Park, S. (2019e). The absolute and relative pessimistic inductions. *Problemos*, 95, 94–104.

Park, S. (2019f). Should scientists embrace scientific realism or antirealism? *Philosophical Forum*, 50(1), 147–158.

Park, S. (2019g). Constructive empiricism in a social world: Reply to Richard Healey. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 8(10), 146–154.

Park, S. (2019h). The disastrous implications of the ‘English’ view of rationality in a social world. *Social Epistemology*, 33(1), 88–99.

Park, S. (2019i). Optimistic realism over selectivism. *Kriterion: Journal of Philosophy*, 31(1), 89–106.

Park, S. (2019j). The coherence of evolutionary theory with its neighboring theories. *Acta Biotheoretica*, 67(2), 87–102.

Park, S. (2019k). Localism vs. individualism for the scientific realism debate. *Philosophical Papers*, 48(3), 359–377.

Park, S. (2019l). How to formulate scientific realism and antirealism. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 50(4), 477–488.

Park, S. (2019m). Can mathematical objects be causally efficacious? *Inquiry: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Philosophy*, 62(3), 247–255.

Park, S. (2019n). New objections to the problem of unconceived alternatives. *Filosofia Unisinos*, 20(2), 138–145.

Park, S. (2020a). Critiques of axiological realism and surrealism. *Acta Analytica*, 35(1), 61–74.

Park, S. (2020b). How to overcome antirealist objections to scientific realism. *Axiomathes*, 30(1), 1–12.

Park, S. (2020c). Formulational vs. epistemological debates concerning scientific realism. *Dialogue: Canadian Philosophical Review*, 59(3), 479–496.

Park, S. (2020d). Replies to Healey’s comments regarding van Fraassen’s positions. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 9(1), 38–47.

Park, S. (2020f). Scientific understanding, fictional understanding, and scientific progress. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 51(1), 173–184.

Park, S. (2020). The appearance and the reality of a scientific theory. *Social Epistemology Review and Reply Collective*, 9(11), 59–69.

Parsons, C. (1983). *Philosophy in mathematics: Selected essays*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

Plettner, T., Byer, R., and Siemann, R. (2005). The impact of Einstein’s theory of special relativity on particle accelerators. *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics*, 38: S741–S752.

Poincaré, H. (1905/1952). *Science and hypothesis*. New York: Dover.

Psillos, S. (1996). Scientific realism and the ‘pessimistic induction.’ *Philosophy of Science*, 63(Proceedings), S306–S314.

Psillos, S. (1997). How not to defend constructive empiricism: A rejoinder. *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 47(188), 369–372.

Psillos, S. (1999). *Scientific realism: How science tracks truth*. New York: Routledge.

Psillos, S. (2009). Grasping at realist straws. *Metascience*, 18(3), 363–370.

Psillos, S. (2011). Making contact with molecules: On Perrin and Achinstein. In G. Morgan (Ed.), *Philosophy of science matters: The philosophy of Peter Achinstein* (pp. 177–190) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Psillos, S. (2018). Tolstoy’s argument: Realism and the history of science. *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 9(1), 68–76.

Putnam, H. (1971). *Philosophy of logic*. New York: Harper and Row.

Putnam, H. (1975). *Mathematics, matter and method: Philosophical papers, volume 1*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Putnam, H. (1978). *Meaning and the moral sciences*. London: Routledge & K. Paul.

Putnam, H. (1979). *Mathematics, matter and method: Philosophical papers, volume 1*. 2nd edn. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Quine, W. (1948). On what there is. *Review of Metaphysics*, 2(5), 21–38.

Quine, W. (1951). Two dogmas of empiricism. *The Philosophical Review*, 60(1), 20–43.

Quine, W. (1980). *From a logical point of view*. 2nd ed., Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Quine, W. (1992). *Pursuit of truth*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Quoidbach, J., Gilbert, D., and Wilson, T (2013). The end of history illusion. *Science*, 339(6115), 96–98.

Resnik, M. (1997). *Mathematics as a science of patterns*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Rosen, G. (2018). Abstract Objects. In E. N. Zalta (Ed.), The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy. URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/abstract-objects/>.

Roush, S. (2010). Optimism about the pessimistic induction. In P. Magnus and J. Busch (Eds.), *New waves in philosophy of science* (pp. 29–58). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Ruhmkorff, S. (2013). Global and local pessimistic meta-inductions. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 27(4), 409–428.

Saatsi, J. (2019). Historical inductions, old and new. *Synthese*, 196(10), 3979–3993.

Sankey, H. (2009). Scientific realism and the semantic incommensurability thesis. *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part A*, 40(2), 196–202.

Sankey, H. (2017). Realism, progress and the historical turn. *Foundations of Science*, 22(1), 201–214.

Seeman, J. (2018). From ‘multiple simultaneous independent discoveries’ to the theory of ‘multiple simultaneous independent errors’: A conduit in science. *Foundations of Chemistry*, 20(3), 219–249.

Shaw, J. (2018). Why the realism debate matters for science policy: The case of the human brain project. *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science* 9(1), 82–98.

Sober, E. (2018). *Philosophy of biology*. Colorado: Westview Press.

Stanford, K. (2000). An antirealist explanation of the success science. *Philosophy of Science*, 67(2), 266–284.

Stanford, K. (2006). *Exceeding our grasp: Science, history, and the problem of unconceived alternatives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Stanford, K. (2009). Grasping at realist straws. *Metascience*, 18(3), 379–390.

Stanford, K. (2015). Catastrophism, uniformitarianism, and a scientific realism debate that makes a difference. *Philosophy of Science*, 82(5), 867–878.

Stanford, K. (2018a). A fond farewell to ‘approximate truth’? *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 9(1), 78–81.

Stanford, K. (2018b). Unconceived alternatives and the strategy of historical ostension. In J. Saatsi (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of scientific realism*. New York, NY: Routledge, Ch. 17.

Shubin, N., Daeschler, E. & Jenkins, F. (2006). The pectoral fin of *Tiktaalik roseae* and the origin of the tetrapod limb. *Nature*, 440(7085), 764–771.

Trefil, J. and Hazen, R. (1998). *The Sciences: An integrated approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Trommler, F. and Hammann, M. (2020). The relationship between biological function and teleology: Implications for biology education. *Evolution: Education and Outreach*, 13(11). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12052-020-00122-y>

van der Well, A., van de Ven, G. Maseda, M., Rix, H. Rudnick, G., Grazian, A., Finkelstein, S., Koo, D., Faber, S., Ferguson, H., Koekernoer, A., Grogin, N., and Kocevski, D. (2013). Discovery of a quadruple lens in CANDELS with a record lens red shift Z=1.53. *Astrophysical Journal Letters*. arXiv:1309.2826.

van Fraassen, B. (1980). *The scientific image.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Fraassen, B. (1989). *Laws and symmetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Fraassen, B. (2007). Reply: From a view of science to a new empiricism. In B. Monton (Ed.), *Images of empiricism: Essays on science and stances, with a reply from Bas van Fraassen* (pp. 337–383). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

van Fraassen, B. (2017). Misdirection and misconception in the scientific realism debates. In E. Agazzi (Ed.), *Varieties of scientific realism: Objectivity and truth in science* (pp. 95–108). Cham: Springer.

Vickers, P. (2013). A confrontation of convergent realism. *Philosophy of Science*, 80(2), 189–211.

Vickers, P. (2017). Understanding the selective realist defence against the PMI. *Synthese*, 194(9), 3221–3232.

Vickers, P. (2018). Quo Vadis selective scientific realism. *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science*, 9(1), 118–121.

Votsis, I. (2011). The prospective stance in realism. *Philosophy of Science*, 78(5), 1223–1234.

Winther, R. (2009). A dialogue. *Metascience*, 18, 370–379.

Woodburne, M. and Zinsmeister, W. (1982). Fossil land mammal from Antarctica. *Science*, 218: 284–286.

Worrall, J. (1989). Structural realism: The best of both worlds. *Dialectica*, 43(1–2), 99–124.

Wray, B. (2007). A selectionist explanation for the success *and failures* of science. *Erkenntnis*, 67(1), 81–89.

Wray, B. (2008). The argument from underconsideration as grounds for anti-realism: A defence. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 22(3), 317–326.

Wray, B. (2010). Selection and predictive success. *Erkenntnis*, 72(3), 365–377.

Wray, B. (2011). *Kuhn’s evolutionary social epistemology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wray, B. (2012). Epistemic privilege and the success of science. *Noûs*, 46(3), 375–385.

Wray, B. (2013). The pessimistic induction and the exponential growth of science reassessed. *Synthese*, 190(18), 4321–4330.

Wray, B. (2015). Pessimistic inductions: Four varieties. *International Studies in the Philosophy of Science*, 29(1), 61–73.

Wray, B. (2016). Method and continuity in science. *Journal for General Philosophy of Science*, 47(2), 363–375.

Wright, L. (1976). *Teleological explanations: An etiological analysis of goals and functions*. Berkeley: University of California Press.