

## Re: Epistemology 201: The Science of Science

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.physics/2005-02/7230.html>

---

**From:** Allan C Cybulskie (*allan.c.cybulskie\_at\_yahoo.ca*)

**Date:** 02/15/05

Date: Mon, 14 Feb 2005 20:16:57 -0500

"robert j. kolker" <nowhere@nowhere.net> wrote in message  
news:37cqi2F59paiaU1@individual.net...

>

>

>>

>> *Of course not, Bob. I never suggested otherwise. Empiricism is a  
>> philosophy of science,*

>

> *No. It is a practice based on the principle that facts take precedence  
> over hypotheses and theories. In science, Facts Rule, Theory Serves.*

Absolutely not. It is a philosophy that states that what is to be given  
epistemic precedence is what can be observed through the senses -- to the  
best reliability of the senses that is possible -- as opposed to that which  
is logically reasoned.

>

>

>> *however. Unfortunately it is an incorrect*

>> *philosophy of science.*

>

> *Incorrect in what way? Has it been falsified by experiment?*

>

> *The emprical approach has served science will for over 400 years. It has  
> help to produce the computers and the internect networks on which you  
spew.*

And Newtonian physics would have taken us to the Moon. Does that make it  
correct?

Empiricism's strength has always been that it is directly about our  
experiences and the appearances presented therein. Its weakness has been  
that it can never justify that the appearances -- and the conclusions we  
draw from there -- are in any way really the way things are without diving  
into circular reasoning or assuming that what we see is the way things  
really are.