

# Computational philosophy of science

Short paper

Michał J. Gajda

## Abstract

Philosophy of science attempts to describe all parts of the scientific process in a general way in order to facilitate the description, execution and improvements of this process.

So far, all proposed philosophies have only covered existing processes and disciplines partially and imperfectly. In particular logical approaches have always received a lot of attention due to attempts to fundamentally address issues with the definition of science as a discipline with reductionist theories.

We propose a new way to approach the problem from the perspective of computational complexity and argue why this approach may be better than previous propositions based on pure logic and mathematics.

Many scientists call for distinguishing computational science as a new kind of science (Wolfram 2002; Angius, Primiero, and Turner 2021). It is extremely important to provide a sensible philosophical definition of computational science since the discipline is rooted in disciplines of data science and empirical modelling of nature. The search for a satisfactory definition leads us to a new approach to the philosophy of science. It suggests that computational science may not be a new formal method of program construction but also a new approach to the philosophy of science itself. And indeed allows us to generalization of philosophy of science in a much more satisfactory way than many efforts to date (Kuhn 1970; Rodych 2018; Laplace 1902; Hoang 2020).

## Introduction

It has been argued that the development of computational capability was a significant force in human history. One can start with ancient Egypt, where mathematics and engineering were reserved to priests, through geographic discoveries, when accessible astronomy and precise computation allowed for daily course corrections, til now, when the availability of personal computing allows nearly all scientists tackle much greater challenges through bioinformatics, galaxy simulations, or mass analysis of social networks (Himmelboim 2017).

In the current philosophy of science, it is argued that the mass of empirical data

allow us quicker to falsify less useful scientific theories, and thus that overall quality of our base theories has risen exponentially. However, at the same time, it is argued that despite more advanced methodologies, basic facts published by scientific journals have a higher and higher probability of being false (Ioannidis 2005; Economist 2013; Colquhoun 2017).

Indeed it seems that philosophers of science have up to now failed to reconcile our feeling of growth of scientific knowledge, with the statistical measures proposed to quantify it.

## Definitions

*Empiricism* is a philosophical view that all concepts originate from experience, and *empirical science* is thus science is thus knowledge based on experimental confirmation and falsification. Thus scientific theories are those that may be subject to continued revision based on experiments.

*Falsificationism* claims that most statements cannot be logically deduced but only disproved by contrary evidence. Thus scientific knowledge develops by *falsification* of theories by experience. Knowledge may be scientific only if it is falsifiable. Failed attempts at falsification increase our confidence in theories, whereas successful falsifications drive us to develop new theories (Popper 1934).

*Bayesianism* claims that all knowledge is subject to varying degrees of probability, and thus updating our beliefs should be subject to Bayes' rule (Laplace 1902; Hoang 2020).

*Predictivism* introduced in this work claims that we need to go further than just the requirement of empirical validation and a probabilistic view of knowledge. All scientific knowledge is just a way to provide probabilistic predictions and is subject to constraints of our computational abilities. Thus theories that have been falsified, but are computationally inexpensive, should be still considered valid scientific knowledge since they still provide predictions at lower costs than more complex theories.

## Research questions

We would like to discuss the following research questions:

- RQ1** What are traits of science as opposed to other human endeavours?
- RQ2** Can we define science in such a way that it encompasses all current activities?
- RQ3** How do the philosophies of science differ in their applicability to different domains and scientific activities?

## Proposal

We propose to generalize the naive principle of simplification and computation, that says that theories allowing us for simpler explanations are indeed better scientific theories.

And given the logical development of the theory of falsification, we want to eliminate absurdity of negative criterion for theoretical validity.

After all, scientists willingly use falsified theories as tools when no better theories have been created. It is rare to argue that these falsified theories are a step back when they have some prediction.

Indeed we claim that a series of empirical theories may be all somewhat false due to overgeneralization, and they still could represent the growth of scientific knowledge, if each consecutive theory provides more accurate predictions.

Thus we claim that the *predictive power* should be the most important quality of science. That makes science a practical tool that allows us to simplify and predict a universe of facts and explains the popularity of already falsified theories. Simpler theory may have simpler computational requirements and thus make predictions *more accessible* for the scientists. Thus falsified theories become usual stepping stones in the hierarchy of theories, and an essential part of the holistic view of science as a predictive tool.

One could be even tempted to draw theories in such a hierarchy and conclude that for a plot where the X-axis would be computational complexity of prediction, and Y-axis would be the accuracy of the prediction, useful scientific theories would go all the way along the waterfront of preference function.

## Scientific theories and methodologies considered

Here we give a few examples of how the framework of predictivism may explain the evolution of science.

### Newtonian dynamics vs relativity theory

Newtonian dynamics(Newton 1687) is a body of theories derived from Newton's three laws of motion. Its mathematical formulations are the basis for a significant body of state-of-art physical descriptions in physics, engineering, and architecture. However, it has since been falsified by experiments confirming the speed light limit and replaced by general relativity theory(Einstein 1905) and postnewtonian approximations(Chandrasekhar 1969).

The discovery of quantum mechanics also forced a revision of the Newton equation(Meter 2011).

Why is the theory still used long after its falsification? Would it not be prudent to stop teaching an obviously false theory and convert all mathematical

descriptions to general relativity?

While it seems possible for macroscopic interactions, it would also significantly increase the complexity of these descriptions.

Indeed, practitioners in this field have long argued that sound research is characterized by the interaction of falsifiable theories, experimental measurements, and effective approximations(Hartmann 2001).

Also, such replacement is not known in generality for quantum mechanics.

## **Quantum mechanics vs general relativity**

World description by quantum mechanics(Feynman 1950; Schweber 1986) is considered inconsistent with that of general relativity. Whereas general relativity correctly describes phenomena at the macroscale, quantum mechanics correctly describes sub-nanometer scale processes.

Thus we see that both theories were falsified when tried in full generality!

## **Biomolecular structure prediction**

Having developed theories of protein structure(Pauling, Corey, and Branson 1951), scientists attempted to describe the mechanics of small and large molecules by means of molecular mechanics(Allinger 1959). This theory uses Newtonian laws of motion, together with a simplified view of chemical potentials, to describe forces acting on different atoms and thus model their interaction.

This approach was so successful that nowadays, experimentalists turn to molecular mechanics to solve complex experimental data(Joosten et al. 2011). This is an example of a theory that is used despite its inaccuracy as compared with quantum chemistry (Warshel and Levitt 1976). Indeed its success has led to further simplifications: approximating covalent bonds by the stiff connections of fixed length, and recomputing all forces in angle space has given birth to torsion angle mechanics(Bae and Haug 1987; Kumar, Hosur, and Govil 1991). This method has sped up protein structure determination from days and hours to minutes for computing the simple model(Winn et al. 2002). Even further is the Rosetta method(Rohl et al. 2004), which uses molecular mechanics for the last stage of structure polishing but starts by simply trying to copy and paste fragments of existing protein structures from Protein Databank(H. M. Berman 2003, 2007; Consortium 2019) database and checking for geometrical compatibility<sup>1</sup>.

This is an excellent example of a modern scientific domain that has developed by going towards computationally more straightforward and faster methods, in

---

<sup>1</sup>Called “steric clashes”.

order to achieve overall improvements in the number and accuracy of predictions.

This also shows how great progress in science is achieved by going from complex to simpler explanations, even though the simpler explanations are less accurate and indeed more easily falsified (Rauscher et al. 2015)

## DNA barcoding vs computational phylogeny

Add DNA barcoding as a recently proposed approximation method that tries to reduce the computational load of getting the right answer.

DNA barcoding (Woese, Kandler, and Wheelis 1990; Hebert et al. 2003) is a recent method of species identification that attempts to decrease the computational complexity of the process. It is based on a comparison of gene regions with a less interspecific variation. Alternative “golden standard of truth” for species differentiation nowadays is computational phylogeny analysis, but this method requires extensive sequencing of the genome and computational analysis that requires computational resources as well as expertise. That is why DNA barcoding was proposed as a method that can be used by the wider society of scientists. DNA barcoding is also faster than traditional morphological comparison methods and can be used when fruits and pollens are unavailable.

## History

Science of history can also be described as following from the known *historical records* to infer likely *historical facts*<sup>2</sup> in order to describe processes that shaped human history.

This seems hard to describe in either a classical framework of seeking the truth (since we know that a significant percentage of the facts will be untrue), within the framework of empiricism (since we can hardly *repeat the experiment*) and within the framework of falsificationism (since strict falsification of most historical facts would require time travel).

However, it is easy to describe within a framework of predictivism: we say that inferred historical events are most likely, and the simplest explanation of the existing historical records. In the same manner, we discuss historical forces and processes: they are more general, shorter, and thus more predictive explanations of the historical facts than enumerating the facts themselves.

This shows how the framework of predictivism can describe science outside of the empirical domain.

---

<sup>2</sup>The historical events may not have exactly correspond to the events in records, and this is an important part of the process

## Philosophy

In our proposal, some fields of philosophical endeavour can be rephrased into fields of predictive science:

- ontology as a way of predicting mutual relations of abstract terms and classifications
- axiology as a way of predicting consistency of value judgements

In this sense, we can straightforwardly state that philosophy is indeed *empirical* science since we have clear metrics of success for each theory.

## Engineering as the science of achieving goals

Similarly, many engineering and applied mechanics domains are obviously scientific: for example, software engineering is the art of predicting what software systems will satisfy design (or business) goals while optimizing the work effort.

We can also argue that such a definition of science makes it easy to explain improved fitness achieved by individuals and organizations using scientific methods to compete. Even if these methods are based on falsifiable theories, predictive power allows these entities to improve their fitness by either reducing computational effort needed for situational awareness or providing increased situational awareness.

## What is the value of the theory?

What differentiates science from epistemic decisions of the individual are that scientific theories are transmitted within the community, and verifiable by community members.

The first factor allows us to build scientific theories across the chasm of time and to make steady progress in our understanding of the world. But the second factor is also important: it allows us to “discard spam”: theories contributing less than the others, by the merit of providing less truthy or more computationally expensive predictions. This allows us to avoid an explosion of untruths that would otherwise accumulate in unfiltered culture. We still have a “valuation” of scientific theories. One such valuation is truth-untruth; however, Laplace posited that we could only assess the probability of the truth, so bayesian interpretation by the probability of truth is in order. Additional gradation may be that of Kolmogorov complexity of the explanation since simpler explanations are preferred.

The philosophy described here points out that besides the probability of truthiness, we also have a computational complexity of using the theory in practice. Epistemological preference would thus only choose theories that either enjoy a higher probability of truthiness OR lower computational complexity. This is important both for humans (who can use multiple methods but see only a few

moves ahead in games like chess) and for computers. One can, of course, argue that epistemological computational cost is different for humans and for computers. They have different computational models: humans have massively parallel neural networks of only limited depth and a limited number of layers that can be used during the time for computation; computers have highly sequential CPUs that allow for billions of operations per second but only limited parallelism. One can also consider the cost of human training or implementation of prediction software on the computing platform, but the resolution will be similar: the overall computational complexity of both implementing and running the predictive theory will dictate its value much more than its truthiness. Because most of the time, we only predict as much as our computational power predicts, not only saving energy this way but providing a timely world-view to our decision making.

## Family of optimal theories

It also allows us to talk about ultrafinitist logic, calculus of constructions, intuitionist logic, and classical logic on equal footing by considering them some possible *optimal* points on the scale between the accessibility of logic and the desire for the elimination of all paradoxes. Thus one could argue that the recent development of multimodal and other variant logics is not experimentation, but a natural exploration of *all possible optimal theories* within this space.

## Discussion

We see how predictivism provides an accessible basis for defining various domains of science, and explains the continued development of readily falsified theories. We also propose a metric that allows us to compare theories on a non-bibliometric basis, and thus judge whether they are optimal in the sense of providing the best prediction for a given computational complexity or not.

We thus proposed a re-evaluation of the philosophy of science through the lens of computational complexity. This suggests that computational complexity may be indeed a fundamental concept for the understanding of science in general, just like the theory of probability is.

## Bibliography

Allinger, Norman. 1959. "Conformational Analysis. III. Applications to Some Medium Ring Compounds<sup>1,2</sup>." *Journal of the American Chemical Society* 81 (November). <https://doi.org/10.1021/ja01530a049>.

Angius, Nicola, Giuseppe Primiero, and Raymond Turner. 2021. "The Philosophy of Computer Science." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2021. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2021/entries/computer-science-philosophy/> Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University.

- Bae, Dae-Sung, and Edward J. Haug. 1987. “A Recursive Formulation for Constrained Mechanical System Dynamics: Part i. Open Loop Systems.” *Mechanics of Structures and Machines* 15 (3): 359–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08905458708905124>.
- Chandrasekhar, S. 1969. “Conservation Laws in General Relativity and in the Post-Newtonian Approximations” 158 (October): 45. <https://doi.org/10.1086/150170>.
- Colquhoun, David. 2017. “The Reproducibility of Research and the Misinterpretation of p-Values.” *Royal Society Open Science* 4 (12): 171085–85. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.171085>.
- Consortium, wwPDB. 2019. “Protein Data Bank: The Single Global Archive for 3d Macromolecular Structure Data.” *Nucleic Acids Research* 47 (12): 520–28. <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gky949>.
- Economist. 2013. 2013. <https://www.economist.com/briefing/2013/10/18/trouble-at-the-lab>.
- Einstein, A. 1905. “Zur Elektrodynamik Bewegter Körper.” *Annalen Der Physik* 322 (10): 891–921. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/andp.19053221004>.
- Feynman, R. P. 1950. “Mathematical Formulation of the Quantum Theory of Electromagnetic Interaction.” *Phys. Rev.* 80 (November): 440–57. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRev.80.440>.
- H. M. Berman, H. Nakamura, K. Henrick. 2003. “Announcing the Worldwide Protein Data Bank.” *Nature Structural Biology* 10 (12): 980.
- . 2007. “(2007) the Worldwide Protein Data Bank (wwPDB): Ensuring a Single, Uniform Archive of PDB Data Nucleic Acids Res. 35 (Database Issue): D301-3.” *Nucleic Acids Research* 35 (Database issue) (3): 301.
- Hartmann, Stephan. 2001. “Effective Field Theories, Reductionism and Scientific Explanation.” *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science Part B: Studies in History and Philosophy of Modern Physics* 32 (2): 267–304. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1355-2198\(01\)00005-3](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1355-2198(01)00005-3).
- Hebert, Paul D. N., Alina Cywinska, Shelley L. Ball, and Jeremy R. deWaard. 2003. “Biological Identifications Through DNA Barcodes.” *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 270 (1512): 313–21. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2002.2218>.
- Himmelboim, Itai. 2017. “Social Network Analysis (Social Media).” In. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118901731.iecrm0236>.
- Hoang, Lê Nguyễn. 2020. *The Equation of Knowledge: From Bayes’ Rule to a Unified Philosophy of Science*. 1st ed. Chapman; Hall/CRC. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780367855307>.
- Ioannidis, John P. A. 2005. “Why Most Published Research Findings Are False.” *PLOS Medicine* 2 (8). <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.0020124>.
- Joosten, Robbie P., Krista Joosten, Serge X. Cohen, Gert Vriend, and Anastassis Perrakis. 2011. “Automatic rebuilding and optimization of crystallographic structures in the Protein Data Bank.” *Bioinformatics* 27 (24): 3392–98. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btr590>.
- Kuhn, Thomas S. 1970. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kumar, R. Ajay, R. V. Hosur, and G. Govil. 1991. “Torsion Angle Approach to



- Nucleic Acid Distance Geometry: TANDY.” *Journal of Biomolecular NMR* 1 (4): 363–78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02192860>.
- Laplace, Pierre Simon. 1902. *A Philosophical Essay on Probabilities*. New York: J. Wiley & Sons.
- Meter, J R van. 2011. “Schrödinger–Newton ‘Collapse’ of the Wavefunction.” *Classical and Quantum Gravity* 28 (21): 215013. <https://doi.org/10.1088/0264-9381/28/21/215013>.
- Newton, Isaac. 1687. *Philosophiæ Naturalis Principia Mathematica*. William Dawson & Sons Ltd., London.
- Pauling, Linus, Robert Corey, and H. Branson. 1951. “The Structure of Proteins: Two Hydrogen-Bonded Helical Configurations of the Polypeptide Chain.” *Proceedings of The National Academy of Sciences - PNAS* 37 (April). <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.37.4.205>.
- Popper, K. R. 1934. *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. London: Hutchinson.
- Rauscher, Sarah, Vytautas Gapsys, Michal J. Gajda, Markus Zweckstetter, Bert L. de Groot, and Helmut Grubmüller. 2015. “Structural Ensembles of Intrinsically Disordered Proteins Depend Strongly on Force Field: A Comparison to Experiment.” *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* 11 (11): 5513–24. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acs.jctc.5b00736>.
- Rodych, Victor. 2018. “Wittgenstein’s Philosophy of Mathematics.” In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, edited by Edward N. Zalta, Spring 2018. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/wittgenstein-mathematics/>; Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2018/entries/wittgenstein-mathematics/>.
- Rohl, Carol A., Charlie E. M. Strauss, Kira M. S. Misura, and David Baker. 2004. “Protein Structure Prediction Using Rosetta.” In *Numerical Computer Methods, Part d*, 383:66–93. Methods in Enzymology. Academic Press. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879\(04\)83004-0](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S0076-6879(04)83004-0).
- Schweber, Silvan S. 1986. “Feynman and the Visualization of Space-Time Processes.” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 58 (April): 449–508. <https://doi.org/10.1103/RevModPhys.58.449>.
- Warshel, A., and M. Levitt. 1976. “Theoretical Studies of Enzymic Reactions: Dielectric, Electrostatic and Steric Stabilization of the Carbonium Ion in the Reaction of Lysozyme.” *Journal of Molecular Biology* 103 (2): 227–49. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836\(76\)90311-9](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/0022-2836(76)90311-9).
- Winn, M. D., A. W. Ashton, P. J. Briggs, C. C. Ballard, and P. Patel. 2002. “Ongoing developments in CCP4 for high-throughput structure determination.” *Acta Crystallographica Section D* 58 (11): 1929–36. <https://doi.org/10.1107/S0907444902016116>.
- Woese, C R, O Kandler, and M L Wheelis. 1990. “Towards a Natural System of Organisms: Proposal for the Domains Archaea, Bacteria, and Eucarya.” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 87 (12): 4576–79. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.87.12.4576>.
- Wolfram, Stephen. 2002. *A new kind of science*. 1st ed. Wolfram Media. <https://www.wolframscience.com/nks/>.