


UDC: 7203.01

LBC: 63.3(2)6-7; 65.497; 71; 71.1

MJ № 314

 10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i5.97-116

## KARL POPPER AND OPEN MONETARY RATIONALITY PROJECT: IDEOLOGICAL VERIFICATION MECHANISMS'S CRITIQUE AND ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY

Yamina Bensahla\*

Cherif Benzineb\*\*

**Abstract.** Karl Popper (1902-1994) is one of the most eminent philosophers of the 20th century which reconfigured the scientific method through the creation of the project (critical spirit) as an alternative to the model of certainty and traditional verification, as contributions from the philosophy of science tendencies Doughanism in Both Natural and Human Sciences, We Aim, Through this philosophical approval Attempt to establish a new Critical Epistemology, The Principle of Open, Critical, Monetary, To Achieve the Maximum Degree of Accuracy and Scientific Certainty to Understand the Human Experience in the Field of Multiple Cultural Perceptions, and Social Systems Through the Draft Critical Objectivity in Front of the Bets and Challenges The humanities, and social sciences to enhance Critical Dynamics and overcome the risks of current ideological stagnation, that forces us to present the following problem: How did Karl Popper establish an open rationality as an alternative to false neutrality? What is the truth of human? The answer to this problem confirms that man has always occupied the centrality of the epistemic field of humanities, and social and socially based on the controversy of the transcendent and realistic idealism within the dualism of being and nature, but with the end of the nineteenth century the human being occupied the field of experimental studies towards objective knowledge

---

\* University of Oran2 Mohamed Ben Ahmed; Algeria

E-mail: [bensahla.amina@univ-oran2.dz](mailto:bensahla.amina@univ-oran2.dz)  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-2850-5435>

\*\* University of Medea; Algeria

E-mail: [benzineb.cherif@univ-medea.dz](mailto:benzineb.cherif@univ-medea.dz)  
<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8691-7015>

**To cite this article:** Bensahla, Y., & Benzineb, Ch. [2025]. KARL POPPER AND OPEN MONETARY RATIONALITY PROJECT: IDEOLOGICAL VERIFICATION MECHANISMS'S CRITIQUE AND ABSOLUTE CERTAINTY. "Metafizika" journal, 8(5), pp.97-116.  
<https://doi.org/10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i5.97-116>

**Article history:**

Received: 15.06.2025

Accepted: 04.08.2025



**Copyright:** © 2025 by AcademyGate Publishing. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the CC BY-NC 4.0. For details on this license, please visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.


through the establishment of the ego's ego through self-experience, which forced humanities and social sciences from the birth of modern science to this day to this day to this day to this day The imperative to overcome all classical curricula and studies based on ancient Greek perceptions, and the intellectual and systematic transition towards the scientific situation, to achieve its presence in the cognitive field through an attempt to establish an accurate objective independence by adopting the experimental approach like other modern science as "the" path leading to revealing the truth in science by a group of general rules that dominate the progress of the mind, and determines its operations until it reaches a known result".

**Keywords:** human experience, philosophy of science, ability to denial, critical spirit, social and human sciences, social criticism, critical objectivity

УДК: 7203.01

ББК: 63.3(2)6-7; 65.497; 71; 71.1

МЖ № 314

 10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i5.97-116

**КАРЛ ПОППЕР И ПРОЕКТ ОТКРЫТОЙ МОНЕТАРНОЙ  
РАЦИОНАЛЬНОСТИ: КРИТИКА ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ  
МЕХАНИЗМОВ ВЕРИФИКАЦИИ И АБСОЛЮТНОЙ УВЕРЕННОСТИ**  
**Ямина Бенсахла\***

**Шериф Бензинеб\*\***

**Абстракт.** Карл Поппер (1902-1994) - один из самых выдающихся философов XX века, который переосмыслил научный метод, разработав проект «критического духа» как альтернативу модели уверенности и традиционной верификации. Его вклад в философию науки стал вызовом догматическим тенденциям как в естественных, так и в гуманитарных науках. В рамках данной философской работы мы стремимся заложить основы новой критической эпистемологии, основанной на принципах открытости, критичности и рационального подхода, чтобы достичь максимальной точности и научной достоверности в понимании человеческого опыта в контексте множественности культурных восприятий и социальных систем. Через концепцию критической объективности исследуются вызовы, стоящие перед гуманитарными и социальными науками, с целью укрепления критической динамики и преодоления идеологического застоя. Это поднимает ключевой вопрос: Как Карл Поппер обосновал открытую рациональность как альтернативу ложной нейтральности? В чем заключается истина человеческого существа? Ответ на этот вопрос подтверждает, что человек всегда находился в центре эпистемологического поля гуманитарных и социальных наук. Его понимание опиралось на спор между

\* Университет Оран 2 имени Мухаммеда Бен Ахмеда; Алжир

E-mail: [bensahla.amina@univ-oran2.dz](mailto:bensahla.amina@univ-oran2.dz)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-2850-5435>

\*\* Университет Медеа; Алжир

E-mail: [benzineb.cherif@univ-medea.dz](mailto:benzineb.cherif@univ-medea.dz)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8691-7015>

**Цитировать статью:** Бенсахла, Я., & Бензинеб, Ш. [2025]. КАРЛ ПОППЕР И ПРОЕКТ ОТКРЫТОЙ МОНЕТАРНОЙ РАЦИОНАЛЬНОСТИ: КРИТИКА ИДЕОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ МЕХАНИЗМОВ ВЕРИФИКАЦИИ И АБСОЛЮТНОЙ УВЕРЕННОСТИ. Журнал «Metafizika», 8(5), с.97-116.

<https://doi.org/10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i5.97-116>

**История статьи:**

Статья поступила в редакцию: 15.06.2025

Отправлена на доработку: 14.07.2025

Принята для печати: 04.08.2025



**Copyright: © 2025 by AcademyGate Publishing.** This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the CC BY-NC 4.0. For details on this license, please visit

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.


трансцендентным и реалистическим идеализмом в дуализме бытия и природы. Однако с конца XIX века человек вошел в сферу экспериментальных исследований с целью достижения объективного знания посредством самопознания, что заставило гуманитарные и социальные науки- начиная с зарождения современной науки и по сей день- преодолеть классические подходы и античные греческие представления. Взамен этого произошло интеллектуальное и методологическое переосмысление в сторону научного подхода, стремящегося к объективной независимости через принятие экспериментального метода- подобно другим современным наукам- как пути к раскрытию истины в науке посредством набора общих правил, направляющих разум и определяющих его действия до получения достоверного результата.

**Ключевые слова:** человеческий опыт, философия науки, способность к опровержению, критический дух, социальные и гуманитарные науки, социальная критика, критическая объективность

UOT: 7203.01

KBT: 63.3(2)6-7; 65.497; 71; 71.1

MJ № 314

 10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i5.97-116

## KARL POPPER VƏ AÇIQ MONETAR RASİONALLIQ LAYİHƏSİ: İDEOLOJİ DOĞRULAMA MEXANİZMLƏRİNƏ TƏNQİD VƏ MÜTLƏQ ƏMİNLİK

Yamina Bensahla\*

Şərif Benzineb\*\*

**Abstrakt.** Karl Popper (1902-1994) XX əsrin ən görkəmli filosoflarından biridir. O, elm metodunu yenidən formalaşdıraraq əminlik və ənənəvi doğrulama modelinə alternativ olaraq "tənqidi ruh" layihəsini yaratmışdır. Bu, elm fəlsəfəsindəki Doğançılıq (dogmatizm) meyillərinə qarşı həm təbiət, həm də humanitar elmlər sahəsində mühüm bir töhfədir. Biz bu fəlsəfi yanaşma vasitəsilə yeni bir tənqidi epistemologiyanın- açıq, tənqidi, monetar prinsiplərə əsaslanan- qurulmasını təklif edirik. Məqsədimiz insan təcrübəsini müxtəlif mədəni dərk formaları və sosial sistemlər sahəsində daha dəqiq və elmi əminliklə başa düşməkdir. Bu, humanitar və sosial elmlərin qarşısında duran mərc və çağırışlara qarşı tənqidi obyektivlik layihəsini irəli sürməklə tənqidi dinamizmi gücləndirməyə və hazırkı ideoloji durğunluq risklərini aşmağa yönəlib. Bu isə bizi aşağıdakı əsas problemə gətirir: Karl Popper saxta neytrallığa alternativ olaraq açıq rasionallığı necə əsaslandırdı? İnsan həqiqəti nədir? Bu problemə cavab olaraq qeyd edilir ki, insan həmişə humanitar və sosial elmlərin epistemik sahəsində mərkəzi mövqe tutmuşdur. Bu da varlıq və təbiət dualizmi daxilindəki transsendent və realist idealizm arasındakı mübahisəyə əsaslanır. Lakin XIX əsrin sonlarına doğru insan eksperimental tədqiqat sahəsinə daxil olmuş və obyektiv bilik axtarışı naminə öz "mən"-inin təcrübəsi vasitəsilə elmi ego-nun əsasını qoymuşdur. Bu, müasir elmin

\* Oran 2 Məhəmməd Ben Ahmed Universiteti; Əlcəzair

E-mail: [bensahla.amina@univ-oran2.dz](mailto:bensahla.amina@univ-oran2.dz)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-2850-5435>

\*\* Medea Universiteti; Əlcəzair

E-mail: [benzineb.cherif@univ-medea.dz](mailto:benzineb.cherif@univ-medea.dz)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0009-8691-7015>

**Məqaləyə istinad:** Bensahla., Y., & Benzineb, Ş. [2025] KARL POPPER VƏ AÇIQ MONETAR RASİONALLIQ LAYİHƏSİ: İDEOLOJİ DOĞRULAMA MEXANİZMLƏRİNƏ TƏNQİD VƏ MÜTLƏQ ƏMİNLİK. "Metafizika" jurnalı, 8(5), səh.97-116.

<https://doi.org/10.33864/2617-751X.2025.v8.i5.97-116>

**Məqalənin tarixçəsi:**

Məqalə redaksiyaya daxil olmuşdur: 15.06.2025

Təkrar işlənməyə göndərilmişdir: 14.07.2025

Çapa qəbul edilmişdir: 04.08.2025



**Copyright:** © 2025 by AcademyGate Publishing. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the CC BY-NC 4.0. For details on this license, please visit

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>.

doğuluşundan bu günə qədər humanitar və sosial elmləri qədim yunan təsəvvürlərinə əsaslanan klassik proqramları və yanaşmaları aşmağa məcbur etmişdir. Eyni zamanda bu sahələr digər müasir elmlərdə olduğu kimi, obyektiv müstəqilliyi və elmi mövqeni təsis etmək üçün eksperimental yanaşmanı qəbul etməyə başlamışdır. Beləliklə, elm sahəsində həqiqəti üzə çıxarmağa aparan "ümumi qaydalar" toplusu formalaşmışdır ki, bu qaydalar ağıla rəhbərlik edir və əməliyyatlarını müəyyən edərək onu məlum nəticəyə yönəldir.

**Açar sözlər:** insan təcrübəsi, elm fəlsəfəsi, inkar qabiliyyəti, tənqidi ruh, sosial və humanitar elmlər, sosial tənqid, tənqidi obyektivlik

## **1.Introduction**

The attempt to establish a project of humanities and social sciences has been and still exists since the birth of modern sciences, where the human phenomena are subject to the scientific status by applying it within the experimental field with the aim of reaching the utmost accuracy, and scientific certainty to understand the reality of human experience from a deep, historical, cultural, political, and spiritual perspective ... It also addresses all the ways that allow self -reflection. In fact, living in front of the inevitability of the process of social change based on the dialectic of the constant and the variable.

But despite the fact that the science of soul is new science, but it expanded today to include new branches associated with the positive project that works to overcome contemplative philosophical discourse through the establishment of a new philosophical thought that comes out of thought and liberates it from the traditional, abstract perceived side to the field of applied reality, because the study of human experience requires the combination of the historical dimension and the current reality in order to reach the correct evaluation, To analyze human activity, as the human and social sciences are concerned with objective and aware scientific criticism of human existence, and the extent of its association with the truth by applying experimental models, its product was the study of mental and emotional processes by psychology, while sociology dealt with relations and social institutions framed for human behavior, to address history science the repercussions of the issues and events of the past in human life.

The subjugation of human phenomena and experiments to accurate objective study imposes the inevitability of using multiple systems of research, because the only field of real knowledge is scientific knowledge based on the positive affirmation of theories through the strict scientific method, which determines the nature of the existing difference between natural sciences, humanities, and social sciences within two basic points: "the objective of the human phenomenon on the one hand, and its model on the other hand", but talking about the issue of science. Humanity and social means studying the problematic problem of metoder, because the problem of the curriculum, and the reality of research in human and social phenomena made it mortgaged in its development in front of stakes and inevitable challenges for a very rapid process of a world controlled by the trilogy "digital language, technical, scientific thought" as it is a city at the same time to the multiple cultural choices, as well as various ideological perceptions in a time that does not recognize the limits, nor for privacy.

Karl R. Popper alerted to the methods of research in social sciences, and tried to determine the most important reasons that led to its delay, but it ended up "the impossibility of predicting the future because human history is greatly

affected by the growth of knowledge", which means the impossibility of predicting the growth of knowledge, and it forced him to the need to pay attention to the problem of providing knowledge, and its growth to objective knowledge through his criticism of the classic rationality on which it is based on it Social sciences, and the attempt to establish a new critical epistemology of the principle of open scientific criticism that goes beyond the traditional traditional epistemology field since "Aristotle until Descartes, passing through the Hobbes, Locke, Barclay and Hume, until Kant all the way to messengers and his freezing" because it is based on the link between our subjective minds, and with the topics of knowledge called the messengers of belief or judgment Judgment, which made science just a special quality Safe for beliefs, "what made Bober interested in two basic principles (scientific criticism, the criterion of distinction between self -knowledge and objectivity to overcome the traditional methods of epistemology, and to open the way for objective knowledge and the possibility of the scientific phenomenon.

This puts us in front of a difficult equation whose variables are the effectiveness of the current circumstances, and the effectiveness of the human and social sciences that have become the basic condition of civilization and nationalism, it is the major development equation to ensure a scientific mentality, and an intellectual continuity of critical, not effective, because the emergence of the humanities was associated with the emergence of epistemological problems, and other Awaisi metology that refused to recognize its science and determine its status. Pestimia within the system of contemporary knowledge with a barbaric concern, and other, the most important of which are:

□ How did Karl Popper established open -minded rationality in the field of imperial science?

□ What are the foundations of the criterion of denial? Is it considered applicable to the privacy of spiritual science?

## **2.Karl Popper's criticism of science: from verification to denial**

### **1.2.Human and social sciences in the field of Boubari's criticism:**

Karl R. Popper is considered one of the greatest philosophers of contemporary sciences who have presented criticisms of the Natural Sciences research program in the light of contemporary trends through its criticisms of the problem of traditional induction, and to the reference of the enlargement of the field of scientific knowledge and the establishment in a broader field of what was defined by the discourse, which was underlined in the classical discourse, Dogmatic, where its author has opened "to what rationalism is classic, which has been underlined in dogmatic rationalism, which was underlined in dogmatic rationalism, that rationalism is classic, which was underlined in classical rationalism, which has a classic clue in dogmatic



rationalism, where its author opened" "I believe that I have been able to solve a major philosophical problem: Induction, and I reached the solution in 1927 or on this subject ... However, a few philosophers support my opinion that I analyzed the problem of induction. " He said in the same context Lakatos in an article he wrote on Popper, "Popper's ideas represent the most important development of an event in the philosophy of the 20th century", as some scholars of natural history recognize him in the same context. Popper is due to his idea of falsifiability "as a direct perception of science, while sociologists show that" the concept of testing hypotheses in exchange for facts "is a scientific victory that Karl Popper in the history of philosophical and scientific thought.

Karl Popper presented a strong criticism of the approach of research in natural sciences in the light of contemporary tendencies, while it dominated the field of research and thought, and the attempt to establish a new scientific rationality including the field of scientific thought of human sciences, where intellectual chaos in the new physics in the first quarter of the 20th century, confirmed that philosophy of the card. The philosophy of contemporary sciences is continuous direct contact with the fictitious radical changes brought by the theory of relativity of Einstein, the private and the public, and the mechanics of the quantum theory of the French physicist Max Planck, and Heisenberg also led a strong attack on the logical situation through its logic of disciplinization of the scientific regime, which made the situation of the scientific regime The scientific regime in 1934. Although it played an important role in its intellectual and philosophical references, that did not prevent it from criticizing the criterion of gunshots to prove that it is not applicable as it said: "They declared that the posts in their desire to cancel metaphysics, they cancel the flag with metaphysics, because scientific problems ... because it is based on the facts in fact that has logically returned to primary experience problems ... "because it is based on the scientific facts that are logical to them. It is significant, as criticized by inductive doctrines, and the gaps that result from the growth of knowledge, and scientific disclosure together, so that its alternative in the field of scientific knowledge is the standard of discipline, the basis of chulpitiology.

The physicist Viktor Kraft answered this problem (the relationship between Popper, and a ring in Vienna) through his article under the title "Popper and a ring in us" and said:

- Popper never belonged to an episode in us
- Popper's work himself cannot be understood without reference or referring to an episode in us, which played an important role in the development of his opinions

- Popper read the Rudolph KarenabR.Carnap book "Expression and Logical Language" and considered it the beginning of a real revolution
- Popper sees in his book "Conjectures and refutation"

This relationship between Popper and the episode of Vienna proves, but it stopped for almost twenty years, and despite this, it shared the logical situation its experimental trend, but it rejected the excessive imperial and defends the imperial in the face of the doctrines of Bananakiri, and Duhim, "as Kraft notes in the same psychoanalysis tale in Freud, and the psychology of the individual" These theories and found itself to raise the following questions:

How to decide if the theory is correct?

- How the scientific problems gets

## **2.2.Popperian objective and criticism of the standard of ability to achieve:**

Carl Popper Criticized The Standard of the Verification of the Logical Situation in His Book "The Logic of Scientific Disclosure" and proven that is not Applicable, through His Critical Study of the Criterion of Discrimination As It Brings Together the Self -Study with the Subject Studied in the Field WHERE BetWEEN the phrases of meaning, and the phrases free of meaning makes the outlets or phrases that do not have external achievement of false, while from the point that have a sense or realization of the domain, these are sincere problems, and this can be examined by the standard of the capacity to investigate, which is based on "a prior hypothesis that decides for each problem which should be possible and if it is unaccomplished where we must decide whether the problem is sincere or false. "

The standard of capacity to verify after the distinction between false problems and sincere problems to classify the last in preliminary and logical problems, and the combination of them produces a scientific and scientific problem which is subject to study and reflection provided that it is revenge opposite is false, because the truth of the partial sentence indicates the sincerity of the atomic sentence which is constituted, we can therefore Completely lying.

## **3.2.The standard of discrimination occupied between: science and metaphysics**

The criterion of discrimination by Karl Popper is a systematic character, but it is based on not in the field of imperial science. He said: "He puts the world, whether theoretically or experimentally, problems or the coordination of problems, then to gradually test them in the field of imperial sciences, and in particular hypotheses or coordination of theories, and it is a test in the face of experience through observation and experience", which means a logical analysis in the field of empirical sciences, and between the logic of knowledge of knowledge.

Popper also emphasizes the need to distinguish between metaphysics, and the pseudo science because metaphysical issues cannot be denying them with

descriptive personal issues, such as our saying, "There are sincere college issues that will not be denied by any number of descriptive personal issues" which prompted him to move away from this type of issues, but this does not mean excluding metaphysical issues from the field of knowledge, but rather, but rather He said about emphasizing its importance in building abstract mock knowledge at the forefront of the English edition of the logic of scientific disclosure, "It is a Muslim fact that pure metaphysical ideas, and then philosophical ideas of utmost importance to cosmology, from Talis to Antistine, and from ancient atoms to Descartes' reflections on the material, and from Newton's and Leibniz, and Baskovic about the powers to Faradi reflections and Einstein on areas Powers, metaphysical ideas illuminated the landmarks of the road. "As for the pseudo sciences, according to the piperian philosophy, it is just metaphysical images of the progress of sincere college issues, but this is rejected by Popper because they do not correspond to the observable situations in the external reality, and what it confirmed through his saying, "We must set our eyes to the standards of rejection, and we must agree that Observed positions really means that the theory is rejected, but what kind of clinical responses refuse to satisfy the analyst, it is not just a partial diagnosis, but rather the psychological analysis itself, "which means that the function of observation of false science is not achieved because the condition of conformity between the observation, and the external incident as is the case in psychology.

If the standard of biographical discrimination is the result of its metaphysical perception of science as it is based on basic steps that can be presented in entirety and descriptive issues, while the flag is delivered by the total issues that it experiences in front of facing the state of observed things or topics, which means that any theoretical thinking can be interpreted as it proposes entirely and descriptive issues, but if the theoretical saying or thinking is offered in violation, then it must be described as non -scientific or false science like our saying:

- s 1: the case of a man pushing a small child to the water to drown
- S2: The case of another man sacrifices his life in an attempt to save the child

According to Freud's psychological analysis, the condition of each case is determined as follows:

- s 1: The first man suffers from a suppression or complex of Oedipus
- s 2: The second man tried to satisfy the tendency of vanity in himself

This makes the theoretical structure of psychoanalysis no- Non-Descriptive, because psychological analysis cannot be denied by relying on observation as it does not indicate the state of observed things, which makes him classify in the field of non-science, and therefore we find that the perception of the nature of the relationship between the theory, and observation in the imperial sciences

through the model of non-similar between the general and descriptive issues, and personal issues, and personal issues. Descriptive.

Karl Popper also distinguishes between the logic of knowledge and the psychology of knowledge to prove the importance of the relationship between the counterpart and the observation of spirit sciences, as it refers to the logical structure of the theory and the extent of its conformity to reality, which makes the logical relationships within the theory a subject of imperial rejection because the deductive test of the theory is returned to reality, which means that Popper does not care about the source of ideas, but rather cares about a suitable extent. These ideas are for reality, which is confirmed by its distinction between the three worlds from the ontological point of view in his book "*Objective Knowledge and said*". The first world is the physical world or the world of physical cases, and the second world is the mental world or the world of mental states, and the third world is a world that is reasonable in the objective sense and it is the world of possible things for thought, which means that the objective boulear knowledge is independent of the subjective situation of the individual mind. In the same context, he said, "Knowledge of the objective sense is knowledge without knowing KNOWER, it is a knowledge without the knowledge of Knowing Subject", which means that all the mental activities of the well-known self classifies by Popper in the world 3 where he said in his book "*The soul and its brain*" there is a third world the world of the contents of thought and the products of the human mind ... such as stories, frank myths, tools, and scientific theories either Sincerely or false, scientific problems, social institutions, and artistic works "which means that the third world is the manufacture of man, which makes them material embodiment that combines world 1 and world 3", which drives people to produce other topics for the world 3, and they exercise an impact on the first world."

Popper asserts through the controversy of the three worlds, and the position of everything that the individual makes in the third world is that "theories are the outcomes of human thought, but the theories have a certain degree of independence" where this proves to us through the example of the account ( $2 \times 2 = 4$ ), and he said, "From behaviorals who see it as a correct issue that should be interpreted as a human creation ... but the matter is not so it is a logical result of our numerical format. Problems can be discovered not to invent."

Karl Popper compared the mental trend to the critical trend through the necessity of dropping it all the decisions or self-solutions, which is what he emphasizes in the introduction to the first English edition in 1959 and said, "The important point is that when we suggest a solution to a problem, we should try in various ways to drop our solution instead of defending it, and unfortunately, a little of those who practice this direct perception", as it is

possible that Popper sees that it is possible. We approach the epistemology problem through one of the following three methods:

- The problem of regular knowledge
- Knowing Common Sense Knowledge
- The problem of scientific knowledge

Karl Popper studied the three epistemology entrances to a critical study where he sees that philosophers who prefer the first entrance (regular knowledge) believe that scientific knowledge is just an extension of the knowledge of common common understanding only "what makes them describe the new way of ideas instead of analyzing the ordinary language according to which the knowledge of common common understanding is formed, where they put instead of analyzing vision, perception, knowledge or belief: I am: I see, I realize, I know, I think, maybe, perhaps ... ", but this makes the owners of this entrance cannot reach a good understanding of most epistemological problems, which is what Popper said in the same context" Now I can respond to those who prefer this entrance to the theory of knowledge even though I go that scientific knowledge is merely an evolution of regular knowledge or knowledge of common common understanding except that most of the problems are completely convinced. The important and many epistemology will remain completely unresolved for those who define themselves by analyzing normal knowledge or knowing common understanding or formulating it in the normal language".

To conclude that the first entrance based on analyzing knowledge by analyzing the ordinary language is narrow in terms of the analysis of knowledge in front of the function of epistemology according to the boulear theory. He said, "I will classify philosophers who take the second entrance into two guns of goats and sheep". As for the second group, Popper acknowledges that they are not a special approach for them, but rather they "adopt any approach that they think may help them to see their knowledge problems clearly or shed light on the solution even if in a temporary way", but the multiplicity of curricula produces the multiplicity of artificial languages models in the field of knowledge, and it is unable to talk about the problems of knowledge growth according to the boulear theory.

The last group includes the Western epistemological group that did not contribute to Popper to establish a philosophical approach that helps the growth of knowledge, and the expansion of the philosophical epistemological field because they were concerned with analyzing scientific problems only where he said, "They did not exert themselves in the progress of any philosophical approach, and they use the analysis of scientific problems, theories, procedures, and scientific discussions in this epistemology within this The group is all the philosophers of the great West and their ancestors from Barclay,

Kant, Wifflé, Walt, Percy, Duhaim, Maerson ... but they discovered that scientific knowledge is the outcome of the growth of knowledge for common understanding, and scientific knowledge can be studied easily more than the knowledge of joint understanding "which means the possibility of studying scientific knowledge in a way that is easier than studying the knowledge of common understanding as it is the outcome that constitutes the initial and partial issues of total scientific knowledge.

After the circular critical study of the three groups, he tried to prove that most of the classical epistemological problems related to the problem of the growth of knowledge in the imperial sciences are practically unsuccessful, which forced him to propose a new entrance to epistemology through his book "The logic of scientific disclosure" is the entrance to the analysis of discussions and the positions of scientific problems with the aim of understanding the history of scientific thought "because it confirms that scientific knowledge is merely the outcome of knowledge based on common sense Common.

### **3.Karl Popper and the criterion of the guns of denial:**

#### **1.3.crisis of induction between repetition and justification:**

Karl Popper refused to use the principle of repetition or repeated experiences on which traditional induction is based and considered it just an illusion. It is made by his mental, biological, psychological activity, and on that he said, "They are interpretations in the light of theories that we only notice what our problems, our biological position, our interests, our expectations, and our programs are relevant" which proves that the principle of repetition is invalid according to the biographical philosophy, then we are in this case if we hope for reality in order to reach the scientific facts. By re -understanding or discovery, according to Popper, what a person made within the controversy of the three worlds, which made him reject the term invention, and confirming that he said, "Just as our note tools are based on theories as well as our themselves without which we cannot notice, there is no sensual member that is free from the theories of a genetically integrated expectation of it, such as that the frog is unable to see a fly near it if it does not move" Repeated because theories do not come through repeated observations, "We must abandon the theory of induction by repetition, and we replace them with a freshness of the awareness of his testing from theories or action programs, and their critical testing through their use in our actions".

Karl Popper also criticized the principle of justification for the induction methods that "is established by inferring personal issues that appear from noting or experiments reports to universal statements such as theories and assumptions" from here arose the induction problem based on inductive inferences in terms of being justified, But under what conditions is this justification?

Popper answers us by absolute rejection by saying, "Is it possible to justify the lawsuit that a theory is a good interpretation of an emotional reasons, that is, by assuming the sincerity of testing issues or specific observation issues? For sincerity theory or the total issue.

The issue of induction and the systematic problems raised by Karl Popper in the cognitive field of the history of science and philosophy of science is the starting point of his thinking, and the floor of establishing his new epistemological project by searching for the standard of sincere scientific rationality through his criticism of traditional induction and inductive tendencies, through his position on analyzing the problem of induction and "showing errors that surround the inductive doctrines, and the resulting of them A limit in front of the growth of knowledge and scientific disclosure, "and to prove this, Karl Popper made the logical situation his epistemological reference in building open critical scientific rationality through the criterion of the testing of the test, the physical tendency that characterizes the pioneers of the logical situation.

Karl Popper accepted the criterion of the testing of the test, but it differs from the episode of Vienna because it was "affected by the sensory imperial of both Ernest Mach and Aarsal, the experience on which the knowledge of reality is based is found with sensory perception and merged under the term observation", which means that the criterion of the test is based on the importance of congruence between the observed subject and the external reality that results in the series of interconnected imperial sensations, Vigel, "The final realism under which the phrase falls is a series of interconnected sensations." In the same context, Karenab wanted to establish experimental perceptions through the dependence on "the initial experiences of the individual self through matter and the assembly of similarities", which makes all imperial issues assumed, capable or capable of turning into issues related to the initial experiences to include all issues. Empire, which is proven by the imposition, and notes as issues on things, even if they are expressed in the language of physics.

Popper rejected the observation of the hypothetical test adopted by the logical situation because it is not sufficient to visualize the observation is psychological, while the basic issues should include objective facts, but the logical situation does not find a fundamental difference between (experience/issue), but Karl Popper differentiates between the imperial experience, and the overall issue where we find it concerns the objective issue as it is essential, and does not care about the imperial experience because it is because it is It is linked to self -sensation, which is the essence of the chapter of the criterion of the prohibition of the testing between the logical situation and the Carl Popper, because it confirms that the understanding of science and

scientific knowledge is achieved within a relative, unstable process. "We must study the growth of science by defining the starting point in our research, which is the problems by relying on our main conceptual unit through guessing, rejection or guess followed by criticism because there is no fixed basis for knowledge so that every temporary knowledge" Popper determines the starting point of the critical rationality of the Imperial sciences through the problems as a result of speculation resulting from the observation of the subject studying the subject in the field, provided that it is followed by criticism because there is no fixed knowledge and it is what results in the growth of scientific knowledge that is characterized by the critical of the "pulpitable theories" in exchange for non -scientific theories that include non -denial theories.

Karl Popper is the growth of knowledge, the starting point for the development of the practical research of imperial sciences by identifying field problems, because nature includes the sincere total issues that are symmetrical with reality, which makes the growth of knowledge is through the beginning of the Elimination of Error error, which is what Popper explains to us through the formula that was mentioned in the logic of scientific disclosure



P1: We start with a problem

TT: Drafting a solution or a theory temporarily

EE: We show temporary solutions to all possible arduous tests in the context of the process of deleting the error that leads us to formulate new problems

P2: The new problems that were formulated after criticizing the solutions (EE)

P1 is the most important moment in the curriculum of the Bougrant Criticism, because it is the moment when the problem is determined, which is considered the starting point for the successful rational critical criticism where we must start from the field, and employ the observation based on the speculation followed by the criticism, which is the guesses that Popper calls the systematic decisions, the latter that are converted into sincere total issues, in the sense of objective and accurate objective theories (TT) and that after deleting all issues And the false partial speculation in which the observation does not reflect what is in the external reality, to transfer the critical mind to the most important stage and is the necessity of criticism directed at the overall issues (EE) because there is no fixed knowledge according to the critical philosophy, which means the reproduction of new problems (P2) and they are problems that arise from our creative creative activity, which results in the growth of spontaneity, and the continuation of a process of growth of knowledge in the field of epistemology of monetary epistemology By rebuilding critical rationality in the field of imperial science that aims to grow knowledge towards more accurate objective



knowledge. But how are the separation of sincere issues and false issues in the field?

Karl Popper answers us through his epistemological idea, "Natural Selection", which he has detailed in his book "The soul and its brain", and he said about that, "We learn from experience through the act, and the election" and here means everything that human activity in the third world is produced from the actions based on goals, desires, expectations, and theories ... The act of learning according to Popper means a process of amending our expectations, And our theories, or as Popper calls them with the programs of our actions, said, "It is a process of amendment and selection, especially through the refutation of our expectations". What means the knowledgeable self is the active self in the field, but what are the levels of natural election?

Karl Popper determines three levels of natural election that combined adaptive changes within the three structures, which are the following:

- 1.The structure at the genetic level: is the genome DNA
- 2.The structure at the animal and human behavioral level: The inherited stocks include genetically from the possible forms of behavior, in addition to the rules of behavior transmitted by custom that belong to science 3.
- 3.The structure at the level of formation of scientific theory: It consists of the prevailing scientific theories that are transmitted with custom, and the imperceptible problems.

Popper made the field of linking, and the interaction between these three structures through indoctrination, where "the genome copies as a template, and then by the two refinement, and the custom is transmitted with direct indoctrination, including simulation, but the new adaptive changes in the inherited structure", which means that the act of natural election Nature Séility is the liquidation of the correct action, and the rejection of test attempts is not The righteous within the conflict of the three structures, where he said, "The natural election process is in itself a permanent struggle that excludes those unpleasant assumptions." Therefore, the difference between scientific knowledge and pre-scientific knowledge is Pre-Scientific is:

Scientific knowledge: always exposed to conscious criticism in a systematic theoretical in theoretical.

- Pre -Scientific knowledge: It grows mainly by deleting an inappropriate hypothesis because scientific criticism often exposes our theories and deletes the wrong ones before we resort to deletion.

So the method of mental criticism is a dynamic system based on the purpose of the growth of knowledge towards honesty, the aim of the growth of knowledge through a good critical basis, which allows us to distinguish issues closest to honesty than others, which means that the steadfastness of the theory or the issue in the field of arduous imperial sciences in front of the campaign

of open scientific criticism, and the absence of scientific criticism means destroying the science plan, where he said, "It is correct to make mistakes in the observation It leads to false personal issues, but the world rarely has the opportunity to describe a personal issue as an imperial or metaphysical issue.

### **3.2. Popperian solution to the problem of induction:**

Karl Popper answered about the problem of stability in his author, "The logic of scientific disclosure", as it depends on the need to distinguish between two types of issues:

- Personal issues: indicate what can be observed in the field of sectors of time and space.
- Total issues: refer to the sectors of time and place, which makes the general image of the total issue for each point in place and time, or for all areas of time and place.

Imperial sciences are mainly based on the discovery of the theories or total issues through what Popper calls "the assignments of the universal hypothèses", while in contrast we find that scientific theories are based on entire issues called the laws of the nature of Natures "and if the theory is expressed by partial imperial issues it is possible We note it in specific sectors of the place and time", which is what Bouper has demonstrated with his famous example (the issue of white pelicans), which he formulated in his author "The logic of scientific disclosure".

Karl Popper believes that scientific issues are descriptive issues that include all field observations within a field) time+place+fine conditions), and in return we find it rejects the limits of the theory that Carneab said, and based on this it becomes the idea of Popper correct "because no final or consecutive number of personal issues can be covered or click It includes all the points or sectors of time and place, "and therefore the criticism of the reasoning is only through the total issues because (the imperial observations of the white swale) cannot justify the result that (all the pelican is white) no matter how it is the number Personal issues that do not justify the total issues, but rather the most that you can do is to deny them Falsify "because we reach the total issues by deduction and refinement of Falsification" so the search for sincere total issues is done by deleting false issues, which is what Popper has proven when he said that "science is progressing through its attempt to deny the total issues, which is rejected through Dependence on the criterion of distinguishing between science, and no knowledge, as science provides the general, descriptive issues that are denying by the personal, descriptive issues, as for the science, the metaphysics, and the false science do not suggest such a identification ", because it does not result from the logical image of the overall sayings," all x is p ", which cannot be drawn from abnormal quotes, but it can be reversed by abnormal quotes".

The entrance to Popper differs in its treatment of the theory of science through the issue of (all the swanish) from all other entrances to the philosophers, the regions, and the philosophers of science, because it puts the problem as the main research starting point, and an objective income by "determining the problem that he wants to deal with and then provides a formula for it, and by determining the problem, and formulating it, it analyzes it from all aspects in a critical way that can pay the possible solutions to its problem It excludes it one by one to remain one solution and the problem through which it has become clear in all its dimensions. Decision, what is defined by systematic decisions?

Karl Popper determines the field of differentiation between the total and preliminary issues through the descriptive nature, which means that *"one of them at least must be false, and in the case of the resulting test before this contradiction to the decision to refuse to deny, the decision to reject a theory on the basis of any test requires a tribal Decision to accept specific initial issues"* means that accepting partial primary issues gives us the foundations The logic that allows the rejection of the theories contradicting the total issues, and therefore we find that what is tested in the field of imperial sciences is partial or descriptive issues alongside the elements of logic and mathematics, which gives us the field of prediction of the total issues but within the field of the dialectic of time and space, which was confirmed by Popper in his saying, "Acceptance of issues can only provide us with logical foundations To reject theories that contradict the initial issues, "such as our application of the calculation on reality, this loses its characteristic as a logical calculation and becomes a descriptive theory that accepts the imperial rejection, but" if the logical account is treated as not subject to rejection in the sense that it is a format of sincere logical formulas instead of being a descriptive scientific theory", it does not apply to reality in this case, to add Bober in the same context" and so we may be "and so we may be We started to determine the problem and limit it to the narrowest possible scope of questions, then we ended with systematic decisions about it determining its importance in the context, and sheds light on them adequately, "which means that the directed decisions are the result of the conflict interacting between the field observation, and determining the questions to draw the problem

#### **4.Conclusion**

Popper has opened the field of contemporary philosophical thought and science within the widest scale through its establishment of critical scientific rationality open to the problem of growth of knowledge in the field of imperial sciences that exceeded the classical, dogmatic rationalism through the importance of separation, and the distinction between experience/theory, as Karl Popper stresses that it is absurd that the researcher puts the assumption

and is isolated from looking at the reality and clues related to it, there is no imposition that can be isolated from The precedent is one of the observations of the clues that support the imposition, whether consciously or unclear, its systematic and dynamic proposal is based on the analog basis between the ability to verify and the ability to denounce.

Karl Popper tried to respond to his critics through his absolute rejection of the problem of justifying scientific issues, as he sees that if the scientific issues are total and objective, the issues that belong to the field of imperial science must be objective, i.e. the ability to test autonomy, which gives it the right to devise other issues that are continuously test, but if the basic issues in their role are subject to mutual self -testing, then then he will not There are final issues in science or issues that cannot be tested, and therefore one of them will not reject in principle, by denying some of the results that can be deduced from which it is not scientific unless it is subject to a test to be done to refute it, meaning that the theory is scientifically acceptable at a moment by achieving an important condition that is subject to rejection, and the theory remains valid as long as it does not refute.

Our adoption of the Al -Boubari scientific approach makes us approach more than honesty through the clear formulation of problems and testing, so that the bottom line is that the issues of stability cannot be sincere sincerely true, which requires us to exclude the psychological tendency, and to adopt the deductive test of theories, and issues that should not be empirical until they are scientific issues that are achieved through application The scientific theory of pulse critical theory is that it depends on a metaphysical perception because it assumes the truth of all natural issues, as they are total issues, although facts do not guarantee this. But can Falsifiability be applied to machine learning and artificial intelligence?.

## REFERENCES

1. Badawi, A. R. (n.d.). Scientific research match (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Publisher Publications Agency.
2. Awaida, K. M. M. (1995). Karl Popper, the philosopher of critical rationality (1<sup>st</sup> ed.). Dar Al-Kutub Al-Alami.
3. Popper, K. (1997). The logic of scientific discovery (M. A. Q. Mohamed Ali, Trans.). Arab Renaissance House for Printing and Publishing. (Original work published n.d.)
4. Popper, K. (2012). The self and its brain (A. Mustafa, Trans.). Vision for Publishing and Distribution. (Original work published n.d.)
5. Hili, B. (2008). Images of knowledge: An introduction to contemporary philosophy of science (N. Sheikh Obaid, Trans.). Arab Translation Organization.