



Anarchism in Paul Feyerabend's Philosophy of Science

Nawzad Abdullah Mohammed Saeed *

Ministry of Education/ Nineveh Education

Directorate

sdgtgjh@gmail.com

Received: 21/01 /2026

Accepted: 16/03 /2026

Published: 31/03 /2026

Abstract

This research examines Paul Feyerabend's philosophy of science, focusing on the concept of anarchism as a radical critique of traditional scientific methods that presuppose fixed rules and absolute rational standards governing scientific research seeks to expand upon the intellectual foundations from knowledge. The which Feyerabend rejected the idea of a single scientific method and advocated for methodological pluralism as a necessary condition for achieving scientific progress ty. It also discusses Feyerabend's critique of empiricist and and intellectual creativi critical rationalism, particularly regarding the distinction between the contexts of discovery and justification, demonstrating that this separation does not reflect the fic practice. Furthermore, the research highlights actual nature of scienti Feyerabend's conception of science as a human, historical, and cultural activity, inseparable from other forms of human knowledge. The research concludes that science, but rather represents a call anarchism does not mean chaos or the denial of for intellectual liberation and openness to the diversity of methodologies and .intellectual alternatives

Keyword Words: Pluralism ,Anarchy ,Feyerabend pee ,Science Philosophy Rationality cash ,methodology

introduction the

The philosophy of science is one of the philosophical fields that witnessed a radical development in the twentieth century, as it transformed from a field associated with fixed principles and absolute theories to a field characterized by

* Corresponding author



lectual and methodological diversity. Paul Feyerabend is one of the most intel prominent philosophers who contributed to this qualitative shift, through his sharp criticism of traditional methods and his call for methodological pluralism and chism. Feyerabend did not merely criticize the prevailing epistemological anar scientific method, but called for reformulating the role of science in society through liberation from traditional constraints and openness to pluralism and .diversity

depth-search lies in providing an inof the re **The importance** understanding of Paul Feyerabend's philosophy, which is a turning point in the philosophy of modern science. Through analyzing his ideas, the limits of scientific s can be clarified. The rationality and its role in achieving scientific progres research also sheds light on the relationship between methodological pluralism and epistemological anarchism, and how they affect the formation of scientific research .methodologies in various fields

the concept of anarchism in Paul to analyze **aims** The research Feyerabend's philosophy of science, and to demonstrate his critique of traditional rational scientific approaches, while highlighting the role of methodological ing human and understanding the nature of science as a chang-pluralism in re .historical activity

lies in the apparent contradiction between scientific **problem** The research rationality as a means of reaching the truth, and scientific anarchism proposed by ns can be formulated Feyerabend as an alternative approach . The research questio as follows: How can a philosophy based on the rejection of traditional foundations contribute to the development of science? And to what extent does this philosophy ?rainfluence scientific practice and research methodology in the modern e

to study Paul **the critical analytical method** The research relies on Feyerabend's ideas, through an analysis of his basic texts in his works. In addition, to trace the development of the **the historical method** the research is based on . ience and Feyerabend's influence on itphilosophy of sc

First : The foundations of Paul Feyerabend's philosophy of science

Feyerabend's concept of science -1

That some very common and fundamental assumptions ^{*1} Feyerabend sees in science are not as intuitively true as commonly believed , and that important

Paul Feyerabend Feyerabend Paul Philosopher Prominent Austrian in philosophy : (1924–1994) born. in Vienna, And received His education in university Vienna, then become philosopher For Science . He was your information Affected With ideas Carl Popper . During His career academy lesson in number from sity Berkeley . Known Feyerabend By doubting Universities, before that becomes Honorary Professor in univer severe in rationality Science, so He was He sees that success Scientists no He returns to progress Knowledge He died ·objectivity In the world, As much as what Returns to Factors like Politics and rhetoric And propaganda Among his most . AD after that to leave Impact deep Controversial in date and philosophy the sciences 1994



parts of scientific ideology have been shaped Based on superficial generalizations, ding and alien concepts about the nature of this has led to the production of mislea human life. In addition, theoretical science, far from actually engaging in addressing the pressing problems of our time , War and poverty , It tends to oncrete details that give magnify temporary generalities instead of confronting the c life its meaning and value ; this is because the objectivity of science and its claim to generality are based primarily on abstraction, which entails a high ion of ideas epistemological and human cost ; as this abstraction leads to the separat —Based on firsthand experience , This ultimately weakens both . Hence, theorists They often tend to impose a kind of cognitive hegemony by —unlike practitioners employing abstract concepts that exclude subjective experience, which is the ience that gives life its authentic human meaning. (Fieraband, 1438 AH, p. exper . (23

Feyerabend attempted to take a corrective and critical stance on the concept of science. In his view, science, which had previously emerged to combat other the authority of religion, philosophical doctrines, and politics, ideologies such as has now itself become an ideology. He says in This is: “Science is but one . (ideology among many ideologies” (Feyerabend , 2000, p. 120

has entered the arena of Since the dawn of the European Renaissance, science competition with other ideologies, seeking power and dominance over society, much like the Church in the Middle Ages. While science may not have achieved ause it prominence and influence then, today it has attained a leading role, not bec has discovered truth or because of the effectiveness of its methodology, but because it has triumphed over all ideologies, including religion. Having won this competition, science has become the ideology forever associated with distinction . (riority. (Mashat , 2021, p. 291and supe

Feyerabend argues that science has become a kind of ideology because its principles are based on flawed ideas. These ideas include the belief that scientific s of scientists are the discourse is the only logical discourse, and that the opinion only true and reliable ones. It also assumes that science and technology can solve all of humanity's problems. He laments that this belief has become prevalent in protected contemporary culture, where science has become an ideology. Laws have science and rejected all other forms of knowledge, making science appear as a privileged and superior activity to all other human endeavors. This has led to an increase in the power and authority of science, allowing it to dominate many of human life. Therefore, we must set limits on it before it negatively aspects influences and controls human behavior, because the rationality that science boasts



of is often used to subjugate people. (Feyerabend, n.d. , p. 228) . And if the led in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was an science that prevail instrument of liberation and enlightenment, then today's science has become an instrument of destruction and ruin when it was turned into an ideology. Science is of weapons of mass destruction, and what is what led to the invention of all kinds happening in our world now in terms of wars, massacres, and the harvesting of the lives of thousands of people is conclusive evidence of that. Feyerabend points to a represented in this contradiction it strange paradox in Western discourse, which is carries. On the one hand, it calls for democracy, which is characterized by the spirit of criticism, freedom of opinion, and openness, and on the other hand, we find that s you can criticize whatever you want what is practiced in reality is the opposite, a and however you want, except for science , because it is considered something sacred that cannot be criticized. Feyerabend gives us examples of Western thinkers cal systems, with the who criticized all systems, including religion and politi - **Claude Lévi** 'exception of science. For instance **Strauss (2009–1908)** demonstrated that Western thought is not the most important achievement in human history, as was previously claimed. He also criticized all traditional titutions. However, science was excluded from that (Hussein , 2001, p. Western ins . (138

called -Paul Feyerabend argues that science, scientific logic, and the so scientific worldview are nothing more than a "public relations myth , " and that t of the problem he seeks to critique and address . In his view , they constitute par science does not speak with one voice, nor does it offer a unified worldview . Contrary to prevailing discourses, and precisely what Feyerabend seeks to expose, the myth that scientific truth is capable of providing his work is coherent . It is evident reality. The inhumane consequences of a -sufficient evidence for a self society succumbing to the allure of abstract theorizing are the primary focus of his not science as a —hat the various sciencescritical project. Feyerabend argues t are capable of employing theory to address pressing —single, transcendent entity problems, and indeed they do. Thus, science itself is not the adversary, as it ons. However, engaging in the contributes to producing realistic and effective soluti practice of science within contemporary society still comes at a price. Within this context, scientists learn to adopt a rigid model of objectivity and approach the n world can offer and world as an abstract object. Instead of testing what the huma harnessing science to actually help people, the prevailing system encourages world situations as abstract-addressing problems theoretically, viewing real possibilities, and even treating human beings themselves as objects. This is cisely the crux of the problem that Feyerabend highlights in his book *The pre Tyranny of Science*, one of his most powerful works in stimulating critical



thinking and opening up avenues for challenging a number of contemporary myths . (and dominance of science (Feyerabend , p. 25 associated with the image

Feyerabend calls for a new philosophy and a critical approach aimed at correcting the concept of science. It should not be seen as a sacred system of from it, but rather as a system knowledge requiring the rejection of all that differs of knowledge that can grow and develop alongside other systems. It is essential to allow all traditions to flourish freely alongside one another. Science has gained its ther human activities, but supremacy and privilege not because it is superior to o due to the decisions of politicians and those in power. Therefore, it should be completely separated from the state, just as religion is now considered separate . (121-from the state. (Feyerabend, 120

f traditional scientific methodsFeyerabend's critique o -2

And his men, in Feyerabend is launching a campaign Violent against science defense of society, believe that in a society that allows freedom, there is room for superiority many Western ideas, beliefs, and systems. However, the idea of associated with science has transcended science itself and become a matter of faith for most people. Furthermore, science has become not just a separate system, but a fundamental element in the structure of society. (G. Yerband, 2000 AD , . (slator's Introduction, p. 8Tran

Science is not an absolutely sacred entity ; the mere fact that it exists , or that it is admired and appreciated , does not provide sufficient justification for al superiority. This is taking it as the sole criterion for excellence or intellectu because modern science historically arose from fundamental objections. Based on previous cognitive positions, and even on a comprehensive critique For rationality standards by itself, and it arose from skepticism With the existence of rules and which human affairs can be managed , including matters of knowledge, it was also Based on common sense or shared understanding, as established Strong objections exemplified by Xenophanes's view of Homer , the question arises: should we cease engaging with those critical activities that originally gave rise to science and rationality? Or should we simply accept their outcomes ? And is it valid to assume It —or after von Neumann —that everything accomplished after Newton t for the sake of intellectual perfection ? Or is it more represents a model Is i appropriate? It is the acknowledgment that modern science may contain structural errors, or Does it need a comprehensive review ? And if we accept that , So how is d how do we identify the errors and implement that possible? Moving forward ? An the change process ? In this context, don't we need a critical standard independent of science , and perhaps even contradicting it, to create the necessary conditions for rsistent insistence on rejecting rules and the desired change ? And doesn't the pe standards that contradict science hinder the possibility of finding such a standard ?



Furthermore, some case studies have shown that strict application , Or pure d to a better science . Nor did it rationality , for systematic procedures, has not le lead to a better world , and sometimes it did not lead to anything of any significant value. The question remains as to how this can be achieved. The judgment is based Clearly , that h There is no on the results themselves . And then it becomes clear made rules , or to formulate -simple way to guide scientific practice through ready critical criteria for rationality based on practice itself (Feyerabend, 2000 , p. 25) . ecome a central element of Science is no longer a private institution, but has b democracy, just as the Church was once an essential part of the social structure. Although the Church has been completely separated from the government, the state mproving and science still work together. Vast sums of money are spent on i scientific subjects like the philosophy of science, which -scientific ideas, on pseudo shares only the name with science and hardly anything else , taking advantage of the popularity of science. Human relations have been subjected to scientific lysis, as evidenced by educational programs, proposals for prison reform and ana military training, and so on. The power of the medical profession is immense; it has permeated every stage of our lives and has even surpassed the power once held irtually all scientific subjects have become compulsory in our by the Church. V old can decide to educate him in the basics -year-schools. While the parents of a six of Protestantism, the basics of Judaism, or even abolish religious education e same freedom to do so in the field of science, in altogether, they do not have th substituting disparate modes of knowledge. Magic, astrology, or the study of myth cannot replace what must be learned in physics , astronomy , or history . Nor is it cal account of astronomical , biological , sufficient to merely present a histori sociological , or other facts and principles in a neutral manner that equates opposing viewpoints. For example, it is not enough The statement : Some people un, while others believe believe and Some believe the Earth revolves around the s the Earth is a hollow sphere containing the sun, planets, and stars . It should be asserted that the Earth revolves around the Sun, and anything else is mere baseless radically from the rhetoric . The way we accept or reject scientific ideas differs making mechanisms in systems. Democracy is flawed because laws and -decision scientific facts are accepted and taught in educational institutions , and used as the c critical basis for crucial political decisions , without being subjected to publi examination or voting mechanisms . While it is true that some scientific applications may be discussed , and even put to a vote, such as the construction of a nuclear reactor , this procedure does not apply to all scientific applications. On The general public or the scientific facts themselves . Therefore , theories the modern society is described as "Copernican " not because Copernicus 's theory ... I submitted Not because of democratic debate or a majority vote , but because the emselves embrace the view. The Copernican dynasty , and because scientists th



individuals are required By accepting this (cosmology) almost absolutely , this situation reveals a striking paradox; for contemporary science is accepted in the imposed in previous eras by bishops and cardinals, same way that cosmology was even Bold and revolutionary thinkers often end up bowing down to the basket of . (89-scientific opinion (Feyerabend, 2000 , pp. 88

(Critique of Rationalism empiricism (Logical positioning -A

positivism focused on the study of human knowledge, considering Logical it confined solely to scientific knowledge. It sought to unify the sciences and liberate them from any metaphysical influences within a single scientific tegrated entity based on coherent and framework. It viewed science as an in consistent logical foundations and fixed rules. However, Feyerabend led a critique of this view, arguing that science is a complex and inconsistent .dictionproject influenced by extraneous factors, resulting in inherent contra Feyerabend, 2005) (392) . Feyerabend discovered this through a historical) investigation of science, asserting that science is not bound by a specific scientific method, and that adhering to and following certain rules in scientific practice inders scientific progress, especially The idea of methodology, which contains h strict rules for managing the scientific process, faces a great difficulty when . (dealing with the results of historical research. (Feyerabend, 2005, p. 33

Feyerabend directs his criticism at the methodological principles underlying logical positivism, the most important of which is the distinction between the context of discovery and the context of justification. Previous epistemological rted this principle, acknowledging the absence of a definitive approaches had suppo method for discovering theories. There is no organized and effective research in the realm of discovery; such research falls within the domain of intuition, epts difficult to apply laws to or even study all conc—inspiration, and conjecture systematically. The logic of discovery may be irrational because it contains elements of a subjective nature, while the logic of justification relies on) ate and importantobservation and experimentation, making its study legitim Here, he criticizes logical positivism for its ahistorical . (Mashat, 2021, p. 286 approach; it has neglected the historical frameworks surrounding scientific ce knowledge and focused solely on justifying scientific theory. However, scien cannot be reduced to justification alone. In this context, Feyerabend criticizes the idea of distinctions between the context of discovery and the context of justification. He pointed out that “the separation between discovery and etely unrealistic, as discovery cannot be just a kind of justification is compl randomness or a distant dream, but includes many elements of reasoning. Similarly, justification cannot always be considered a completely objective .(ts.” (Verend, 1997, p. 217process, because it contains many subjective elemen



Feyerabend excelled in criticizing the foundations of empiricist rationalism, particularly its belief that empirical science is the essence of all knowledge. He not only denied the distinction between the context of discovery and the context of justification, but also demonstrated the lack of a difference between the natural and justificatory human sciences. All sciences, regardless of their diversity, are considered human activities, and the humanities contain knowledge that cannot be ignored. This understanding expands the fields of inquiry, and helps us knowledge enhances our choices, (Mashat, 2021) , 29 0) .understand the world better

Critique of critical rationality - - b

Karl Feyerabend offered his critique of **Popper** influenced (1994–1902) ility, which initially shaped his work, quickly became by the principle of falsifiability (Khouli, 2000, p. 425) . Popper believed there was no -an opponent of Popper (Al quick fix for success; rather, we learn through trial and error. This influence is al positivism and the inductive method. evident in Popper's critique of logic Popperian critical rationalism, or what became known as the "logic of scientific discovery," placed great emphasis on criticism as a new approach, open to all per expressed this by possible suggestions for solving scientific problems. Pop saying, "We need others to evaluate our ideas and determine which ones are correct" (Madbouh, 2011, p. 17). This vision is similar to the ideas presented by e Feyerabend, who also encouraged openness to all traditions and giving everyone the opportunity to participate in the development and growth of science. Popper's first methodological step is to remove the protection afforded to scientific theories, regardless of the principles or rules upon which they are based, because they be a source of trust. "The conditions of objective scientific knowledge make cannot this imperative." The persistence of every scientific hypothesis is a necessity and an absolute. It is given as an attempt" (Madbouh, 2002, p. 71). But this erabend showed for Boyer's philosophy did not last long and fascination that Fey turned into refutation, considering his method naive and his philosophy dogmatic, since many theories do not accept falsification in the way that Boyer describes (. (Feyerabend, n.d. , p. 19

Feyerabend uses the history of science to emphasize the futility of **violation of Copernican (1642-Galileo's (1564 Popperian refutation, citing theories. He argues that** scientific theories do not develop through falsification; rather, they flourish. It destroys science and does not allow it to flourish (...rious falsification goes on. (Feyerabend, 2005 , p. 246

Based on the foregoing, Feyerabend adopted a critical stance towards critical rationalism, describing it as mere conjecture and arguing that the criteria presented Boyer were of no value or benefit to science. He considered Boyer's by falsification misleading and contradictory, even to the history of science. "The



method of conjecture and implementation cannot overcome the difficulties faced Sayyid, -single method that is suitable in all cases" (Al by inductivism; there is no p. 123) . Through this argument, Feyerabend seeks to demonstrate that '1996 knowledge cannot be confined to a single method, but is rather multifaceted and e points out that scientific knowledge is not diverse, and is relative, not absolute. H simply predictions or reactions. History shows us that scientists often overlook unusual or unexpected cases, which could be considered refutations. Even if such nd do not lead to the rejection of a cases exist, they remain exceptions in science a scientific theory. Therefore, it is illogical to reject an entire theory simply because of a single negative piece of evidence. Feyerabend continues his criticism of l rules do not contribute to Popper's views, asserting that Popper's methodologica the development of science, but rather hinder it, because the emphasis on the principle of strict falsification may destroy science and prevent it from progressing .(Feyerabend, 2000). , 264)

sm in Feyerabend's philosophySecond: The concept of anarchi

Anarchism as a scientific method -1

Anarchy is a word derived from the Greek word *anarchia* Ali, 1990, p. 276),) which means the absence of a ruler, king, or president. This word is a Latin "translation of "anarchiawhich) consists of two parts: the firstan denotes () negation or the opposite, and the secondarchia refers to authority. Thus, the (literal translation means the absence of authority, disorder, or the lack of .(government (Frank, 2004, p. 25

efined in the Comprehensive Dictionary of Philosophical Anarchism is d government,' -Terms as "a social ideology derived from a Greek word meaning 'non which opposes the existence of governments and calls for the establishment of -the choice and will of individuals" (Al social and economic institutions based on Hafni, 2000, p. 624). Anarchism is also considered a political theory based on the voluntary cooperation of individuals and groups, where relationships are built on .(p. 435 'the foundations of individual freedom (Tawfiq, 2001

According to Jamil Saliba's Philosophical Dictionary, anarchysis the state that occurs when governance loses its influence, fails to perform its role correctly, or is It .caused by conflicting desires and orientations, or by a lack of organization expresses the absence of order and structure (Saliba, 1979, Vol. 2, p. 168). Anarchy is defined in the Dictionary of Philosophy as the state of a people governed by no authority, referencing Plato's definition. Anarchy represents a mocracy, where each individual seeks to submit their will to narrow segment of de the authority, while that authority strives to achieve the common good, leading to



chaos. Anarchy has two meanings: the first is the narrow concept referring to a mental authority, and the second is the broad theory of a society without government concept meaning that society is not subject to any coercion from any authority in various spheres: government, work, industry, commerce, religion, education, and family.

complete rejection of any system or state, Since political anarchism entails a complete and advocates for freedom, viewing laws and governmental frameworks as obstacles to individuals, Feyerabend applies the same idea to science, arguing that evident in his book "science should not be confined by specific methods. This is Against Method: A Preliminary Draft of an Anarchist Theory of Knowledge," where he expresses his interest in an anarchist model that discusses the absence of methodless a defined method for scientific inquiry. He believes in the existence of countless diverse methods, each with its own significance, thus denying the possibility of an objective scientific method that distinguishes the sciences. He believes that any progress in science will result from the shattering of all conceivable rules of rationality.

Feyerabend explains why he chose the term anarchism as the basis for his scientific philosophy, explaining that it means striving for greater freedom from all constraints, whether scientific, social, or political, to achieve a full and valuable life. This can only be achieved by rejecting comprehensive standards and strict systems, including the laws of the scientific method and reason. He says about anarchism: "Professional anarchists oppose any form of constraint and demand that be given the opportunity to develop freely, without being hindered by the individual by laws or obligations." They adhere to a vision far removed from the standards imposed by scientists.

Feyerabend argues that anarchism provides space for everyone to express their ideas and suggestions in the formation of science without marginalization or exclusion of their opinion or exclusion, thus promoting the development of science. He says: "My theory is that anarchism contributes to the achievement of any kind of progress that science that operates according to certain laws will individuals choose, and even science". only succeed if chaotic phases are allowed to occur from time to time.

Feyerabend refers to "anarchic steps" as all the endeavors undertaken by individuals across different periods as a result of their diverse life experiences. This accumulation encompasses social traditions such as religion, art, myth, and all aspects of human life, including perceptions, ideas, and visions. Therefore, he chose the motto "Anything goes" to express his acceptance of all endeavors. Anarchism contributes to scientific progress through its capacity to



accommodate the diverse and varied factors that constitute knowledge, regardless of their differing meanings and methods. The science of order and law only exists to the extent that it allows for the integration of undisciplined practices, such as those known as anarchic movements, into its evolutionary path. Thus, the claim of a specific scientific rationality governed by a single, fixed method lacks sound foundations and appears simplistic when viewed within the epistemological context of the history of science, rich with events and experiments that often contradict the methodological conceptions defended by proponents of scientific rationalism. Feyerabend says: "It is clear that scientific worldviews will require more anarchy than science itself does. -and non-Therefore, anarchy is not only possible, but necessary for the internal progress of science and the development of our culture in general" (Feyerabend, 2005, p. 270).

Feyerabend asserts that the anarchism he advocates has a distinctly humanistic character, as it is based on the principle of individual freedom of experience. According to what a person deems reasonable based on their experience, thought, and context, no standards are imposed on him from ready-made established rules, and in this sense, Feyerabend adopts a humanistic position that affirms that human beings are active and free in their cognitive

Stuart enjoy freedom, in the sense that we find in John Stuart Mill's (1806) *On Liberty*, where freedom of thought is a basic condition for creativity and progress, and is not an obstacle that should be restricted in the name of method or strict rationality (Shalme, 1991, p. 1).

Anarchism stems from a radical rejection of all forms of oppression. This is achieved by overcoming the restrictions and obstacles that prevent individuals from attaining freedom and happiness. It also takes a firm, critical stance against a monopoly on truth based on a particular form of rationality or any claim described as scientific. Accordingly, all viewpoints are legitimate and acceptable, as each of them expresses reality in his own way. Without the possibility of an independent standard that can be referred to for judgment on the scientific nature of knowledge or its lack thereof. Therefore, allowing diverse ideas to emerge and circulate is not a threat to science, but rather a fundamental condition for its progress and development. The broader the horizon of pluralism, the greater the potential for intellectual growth and development. Feyerabend's rejection of these forms of thought known in art as rationalisms stems from his affinity for the school of Dadaism (a cultural movement that emerged in Switzerland, rejecting all that is traditional and embracing anarchism). He is more influenced by political anarchism, where the political anarchist seeks to destroy or eliminate a specific aspect of life related to authority. In contrast, the epistemological anarchist defends this authority; he does not possess permanent loyalty or aversion toward any



particular institutions or ideologies, whatever they may be, much like the primitive) who lacks a specific intellectual program and is against all programs Feyerabend, 1996, p. .(4

Feyerabend explains the anarchism he prefers, which aligns with Dadaism, not political anarchism, which he considers inherently negative. He says: "In using the term anarchism, I simply avoided the general direction. However, anarchism as it has been implemented in the past and as it is practiced today has characteristics that I cannot support or endorse. Anarchism is not concerned with the life and of humanity, only with the life and happiness of those belonging to a happiness particular group. For this reason, I prefer to use the term Dadaism, where the Dadaist allows the individual to continue his journey without being drawn into any .(nd, 2005). , 28fixed project" (Feyerabe

Feyerabend refers to methodological anarchy, arguing that no single method can be definitively proven to be the best for scientific creativity. Therefore, he advocates methodological pluralism based on his favorite motto: "Anything works." Methodological anarchy, and its associated anarchic science, together .constitute an optimal theory of knowledge

Feyerabend's anarchism is based on the complete rejection of all forms of rejects assigning epistemic authority exercised by rationalists. It "strongly epistemic authority to a particular method or rationality, and even to science itself, arguing that science progresses by opening up fields of research and knowledge to adhering to a unleash creative energies within a diversity of methodologies, not by single method. Therefore, science is not a sacred epistemic system, but a rational system that must grow, flourish, and develop within the environment of other .(Sayyid, 1996). , 26-epistemic systems" (Al

uralismThe call for methodological pl -2

The philosophy of science was profoundly influenced in the second half of the twentieth century by scientific advancements, particularly the scientific examine many -revolutions. This prompted contemporary philosophers to re logical foundations that had prevailed for centuries and theoretical and methodo were considered unquestionable axioms. The concept of method was the one most subject to this revision. We can say that Feyerabend was one of the most of modern philosophy of science. He influential philosophers in this transformation offered a sharp critique of the scientific method and challenged it, a method that had always been defended by philosophical schools of thought. He presented a ionship to other fields of new vision of science and worked to rethink it and its relat knowledge, leading him to rebel against all established theories in the field of



scientific philosophy. He shook his confidence in everything absolute and fixed in scientific science, opposing all methodologies and rejecting the notion that research should follow a specific method due to its inherent methodological diversity (Mashat, 2021, p. 285). The methodological pluralism in modern philosophy of science is characterized by several aspects, most notably that science is freed without the need for specific scientific expertise or adherence to any fixed methodological rules. Thanks to this pluralism, science has acquired a humanistic and social character, which contributes to scientific progress and development (Qutb, 2008, pp. 14-13).

Feyerabend highlights a kind of pluralism that celebrates the diversity of opinions and multiple theoretical alternatives. These different ideas and theories can enrich and enhance our knowledge (Hamdan, 2014, p. 163). In other words, various forms of knowledge that may provide us with new they support perspectives that benefit scientific research. Science advances by utilizing this knowledge and the new ideas it offers, without being bound by a single method. As practice science without being bound by a Feyerabend says, "Today, we should not use a specific scientific method, although there are criteria. But these criteria emanate from the research process itself, not from abstract rational opinions" (Feyerabend, 2000, p. 113).

In this context, Feyerabend seeks to deconstruct traditional concepts in modern philosophy of science by criticizing the methodologies and standards adopted by scientists in their research. He argues that these standards contribute to the progress of science (Qutb, 2008, restricting individual freedom and hindering the progress of science (p. 45).

Feyerabend rejects the idea of a single method and questions the very possibility of defining the concept of method precisely. He elaborates on this in his well-known book, **Against Method**, where he asserts that science, at any stage of its history, has never been subject to a fixed method or set of immutable rules. His project is truly an anarchist one, meaning he does not recognize any absolute methodological authority. From his perspective, all methods are legitimate and can be used, which aligns with his famous motto, "All method is fair." The validity of any method is measured by its correspondence to the nature of the problem at hand, its ability to contribute to its solution, and its contribution to expanding scientific knowledge with new insights (Alto enric Khouli, 2020, p. 119).

The knowledge that Feyerabend seeks is not a set of consistent theories aimed at arriving at the truth (Hamdan, 2014, p. 164). He also says: "The rationality I



r does not mean achieving a perfect theory, but rather expanding the am looking for circle of alternatives, and using all theories, even those that have declined and become forgotten, because they may contain valuable elements that limit our In other words, Feyerabend was not seeking to (44 ‘ knowledge” (Qutb, 2008 establish his own ideal theory, as some scientists do when discovering new ideas. Rather, he wanted to integrate science with other forms of human knowledge, on. Science should draw upon this recognizing it as a social and human phenomenon knowledge to foster continuous progress, benefiting from new and diverse theories .and ideas that would further advance it

Therefore, Paul Feyerabend rejects the authority of knowledge conferred by method. He believes that science "cannot depend on a single the singular scientific method, because it is a rational system that must evolve and flourish among other systems of knowledge. Science represents a type of human knowledge, so richly t it, and all are effective as long as they branched that all methods can benefit contribute to solving the problems at hand. This diversity is essential for .(Khouli, 2020). , 119-innovation and progress in science" (Al

his We can see that Feyerabend's call for methodological diversity, and rejection of a single method, partially resemble the views of some contemporary philosophers of science such as Thomas Kuhn, Michael Polanyi, and Gaston Bachelard, but Feyerabend's position differs significantly because it is more lutionary towards the scientific method (Hamdan, 2014). , distinctive and revo :We can highlight the views of these philosophers as follows .(164

Thomas Kuhn (opposed the existence of rules or standards (1996–1922 at such rules evolve and are external to science that dictate its practice, arguing th subject to critique and examination through the research itself. Michael Polanyi (on the other hand, believed that adhering to a single method limits the ‘(1976–1891 emological scope of human knowledge. He emphasized that no single epist framework can be considered rational and objective. Every scientist has their own perspective and personal knowledge. Consequently, creativity does not arise from following a fixed method, but rather from conjecture and imagination. Standards olve and change through research, not through abstract, rational perspectives ev .(Feyerabend, 2000). , 114)

also opposed the existence (1962–We also note that Gaston Bachelard (1884 knowledge, of a unified scientific method applicable to all sciences and fields of because every advance in scientific thought or new experiment is capable of changing scientific thought entirely, not just its methodologies. Each science has its own methodology and concepts that suit the stage it is in. Therefore, any



on of the scientific method will always be within a specific context and discussi
.(will not be characterized by a definitive model (Hamdan, 2014, p. 165

These philosophers agree with Feyerabend on some points, such as the
table for all sciences, as methodologies absence of a single scientific method sui
vary according to the field of science. This diversity is one of the fundamental
characteristics of science, ensuring its continuity. However, Feyerabend's approach
and in its treatment of the problem remains unique and distinctive, both in its ideas
.of the logic of science

Conclusion

Paul Feyerabend's philosophy constituted one of the most daring theses in the
history of the philosophy of science, as it called for shaking the traditional
ominated scientific practice, such as strict adherence to foundations that had long d
a single method or belief in the existence of absolute scientific standards .
Feyerabend believed that science could only be a flourishing human activity if it
strict rationality and embraced got rid of the constraints imposed by
.methodological pluralism that allows for diversity and creativity

: Among the most important findings of this research are

Feyerabend presented a fundamental critique of the concept of the -1
framework governing scientific research, and stressed scientific method as a rigid
that this traditional concept limits creativity and innovation, calling for
methodological pluralism that gives researchers greater freedom in choosing the
.fic problemsappropriate tools and methods to solve scienti

Feyerabend proposed epistemological anarchism as an alternative approach .2
characterized by flexibility and comprehensiveness, arguing that all
epistemological methods are valid as long as they contribute to the advancement of
advocated against favoring one method over another absolutely, knowledge. He
.leaving the door open to experimenting with multiple approaches

Feyerabend offered a scathing critique of traditional rationalism, .3
of discovery and the particularly regarding the distinction between the context
context of justification . He considered this separation unrealistic and reflective of
a reductive view of the scientific process , and he emphasized that science cannot
.nd historical contextsbe It is completely neutral, but rather influenced by cultural a

Feyerabend's philosophy calls for viewing science as part of a broader -4
knowledge system that includes religion, art, and myth, and rejects the idea that
science is the only valid form of knowledge, emphasizing the importance of
.recognizing the legitimacy of other patterns of human thought

The methodological pluralism advocated by Feyerabend represents one of -5
his most important contributions, as it provides a space for creativity and diversity
lights the importance of this idea in facing in scientific solutions, and high



contemporary challenges that require the integration of multiple knowledge and .diverse disciplines

Feyerabend was not hostile to science itself, but rather he was a critic of -6 turned into bureaucratic entities that imposed scientific institutions that had restrictions on the freedom of research and thought, and he believed that these .institutions should be more open to new and unconventional ideas

Sources and references

First: Dictionaries and Encyclopedias

- 1 Ted, Hondrich, The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy, Vol. 2, trans. Najib .Hassadi, National Library for Research and Development, Libya, n.d-Al Irshad Publishing, -Tawfiq, Musa Khalil, Contemporary Dictionary, Dar Al - 2 .st Edition, 2001 AD1
- 3 Munim, The Comprehensive Dictionary of Philosophy -Abdul ‘Hanafi-Al - 3 .Terms, Madbouli Library, Cairo, 3rd edition, 2000 AD
- 4 Saliba, Jamil, The Philosophical Dictionary, Vol. 2, Lebanese Book - 4 .House, Beirut, Lebanon, no edition, 1979 AD
- 5 Dictionary, Library of Lebanon, Beirut, no Greek-Ali, Nour, Arabic - 5 .edition, 1990 AD
- 6 Frank, Bailey, Blackpool Dictionary of Political Science, translated and - 6 .published by: Gulf Research Center, 1st edition, 2004

Second: Sources and references in Arabic

- 1 Science and Ideology between Absoluteness and Relativity, ‘Hussein, Ali -1 .Enlightenment for Printing, Distribution and Publishing, Beirut, n.d., 2001
- 2 Khouli, Yumna Tarif, Philosophy of Science in the Twentieth Century: -Al -2 nowledge Series, Kuwait, n.d., Future Horizons, World of K -Harvest -Images .AD 2000
- 3 Khouli, Yumna Tarif, The Concept of the Scientific Method, Hindawi -Al -3 . Foundation, no edition , 2020 AD
- 4 -Sayyid, Muhammad Ahmad, Distinguishing between Science and Non-Al - 4 Maaref -Scientific Method, Al Science: A Study in the Problem of the .Establishment, Alexandria, no edition, 1996 AD
- 5 Hussein Sahban -Chalmers, Alan, Theories of Science, translated by: Al - 5 Safa, Dar Toubkal Publishing, Casablanca, Morocco, 1st edition, -and Fouad Al .AD 1991
- 6 ul, Science in a Free Society, trans. Mr. Nafadi, National Feyerabend, Pa - 6 .Translation Project , n.d., 2000
- 7 Feyerabend, Paul, Three Dialogues on Knowledge, trans. Muhammad .7 .Ma'arif, Alexandria, n.d. T-Sayyid, Mansha'at al-Ahmad al



hod, translated by Maher Abdelkader Feyerabend, Paul, Against the Met - 8
.Mohamed Ali, Student Edition, Alexandria, 2005

Feyerabend, Paul, The Tyranny of Science: What is Science? What are its - 9
Limits and Tools?, translated and published by: Dalail Center, Kingdom of Saudi
.ion, 1438 AH Arabia, 1st edit

Verend, Paul, Three Dialogues on Knowledge, translated by: Muhammad - 10
.Sayed, University Knowledge House, Alexandria, no edition, 1997-Ahmad Al

Qutb , Khalid, Methodological Pluralism, Academic Library, Cairo, 1st .1
.Edition, 2008

Alma'iya -adhbouh, Lakhdar, The Philosophy of Karl Popper, AIM - 2 1
.Publishing and Distribution House, no edition, 2011 AD

Third: Sources and references in English

- 1) Blackburn, Simon, Oxford Dictionary Of Philosophy, Soeton Public Library,
Second Edition, Oxford University Press, 1994.
- 2) Feyerabend, Paul, These sur lanarchism epistemologique, (review alliage
numero 28, 1996).
- 3) Didier, Julia, Dictionnaire de la philosophie, Larousse, Librairie Larousse Paris
1964.

and websites 'Fourth: Research papers, journals, dissertations

Hamdan, Bousaleh, Contemporary Scientific Rationalism and its -1
.Criticisms: Paul Feyerabend as a Model, PhD Thesis, University of Oran, 2014

Madhbouh, Lakhdar, The Idea of Openness in the Philosophy of Karl -2
.University Constantine, Algeria, 2002 Popper, PhD Thesis, Mentouri

Mashat, Hayat, The Scientific Phenomenon in Paul Feyerabend, Journal of -3
.Algeria , 2021 'the Academy for Social and Human Studies, Vol. 13, No. 1

'The Arab Electronic Encyclopedia -4<https://mail.arab-ency.com.sy/details/2262>