Is the Scientific Realism Debate Irredeemably Mired?

Ioannis Votsis
(New College of the Humanities and London School of Economics)
ioannis.votsis@nchlondon.ac.uk / i.votsis@lse.ac.uk
www.votsis.org

Several philosophers have questioned the value of the scientific realism debate. Although the accusations are varied in content, they have been trickling in at a constant rate. The aim of this chapter is to take part in the debate over whether the scientific realism debate is worth having. I begin with a short introduction of the scientific debate, distinguishing between broad and narrow construals as well as outlining the main positions, arguments and players. I then proceed to canvass the various accusations that have been launched against it, focusing on three in particular. I argue that although all three, and indeed the whole meta-debate, should be taken seriously, their proponents are rushing in their attempt to seal the debate's fate.