***Paper Assignment 5***

In the section of the *Enquiry* devoted to necessary connection, Hume says

.

when one particular species of event has always, in all instances, been conjoined with another, we make no longer any scruple of foretelling one upon the appearance of the other, and of employing that reasoning, which can alone assure us of any matter of fact or existence. We then call the one object, Cause; the other, Effect. We suppose that there is some connexion between them; some power in the one, by which it infallibly produces the other, and operates with the greatest certainty and strongest necessity.

He then goes on to argue that “We have no idea of this connexion, nor even any distant notion what it is we desire to know, when we endeavour at a conception of it.”

In your paper, please do the following:

* Lay out Hume’s argument for the conclusion that we have no idea of necessary causal connection.
* It seems to follow that Hume thinks we are talking nonsense when we speak of connections of cause-and-effect. That implication, if Hume is right about it, would seem to be devastating for scientific explanations of the natural world. Explain why. (HINT: is the aim of science to discover causal laws?)
* Now lay out and explain the four conditions of scientific laws enumerated at *Philosophy of Biology*, pp. 45-46.
* Rosenberg and McShea say that if a generalization satisfies those four conditions, that generalization is a causal law. Would Hume agree? Why or why not? If you think they would disagree, say who do you think is right and why. If you think they would agree, say whether you think these authors or right or not and defend you answer.

Papers should be approximately 5 pages long and should be emailed in by class-time on Tuesday, December 10.