

Twenty Points Proving That Empiricism Is A Faulty Epistemology

Modern Atheistic Science is based on the philosophical view of Empiricism. Empiricism claims that the only true knowledge is based upon observation and ultimately our senses without any presuppositions or bias.

Here is a list of problems that cripple this means as a source of knowledge:

Empiricism fails because...

1. Its opening assumption is not rational but circular. It states that the only way to have true knowledge is by observation. But if it tries to prove this statement itself by citing examples then it engages in circular reasoning and irrationality. Moreover, if it seeks to prove the statement some other way, then it will disprove the statement itself that it is the 'only' way to acquire true knowledge.
2. If an empiricist only knows a fact to be true by experimentation then they cannot know a thing before or apart from experiments.
3. Even with experiments, it is only a hypothesis awaiting possible disapproval by future observations since every outcome could possibly have been different.
4. Empiricism assumes unlimited possibilities. So, there can be no probability since there will always be a possibility that cancels it out.
5. It commits the pragmatist fallacy - If A, then B; B, therefore A. In logic, this is the fallacy of Affirming the Consequent. Example: If Einstein's theory of relativity is true then this atom bomb will explode. This atom bomb did explode therefore his theory is true. Using the same logic- If I am in Lee county, I am in Florida; I am in Florida; therefore, I am in Lee county. Or a more famous example: If stones are bread and bread is nourishing then this bread will nourish me. This bread does nourish me therefore this bread is a stone and stones are nourishing.

6. It commits a circular reasoning fallacy. It makes the metaphysical assertion that the future will resemble the past (*if we have observed A happen X number of times in the past then A will occur in the future; aka - uniformity in nature*). But this is strictly an assumption they base purely on habit alone. It assumes A will occur in the future because the future will be like the past. If you ask them how they know this, they will say because it always has in the past. If you challenge this they may claim 'statistically it will occur' or 'very probably it will happen,' but probability assumes uniformity in nature (*again, assuming what it is supposed to prove*).
7. It assumes a proposition is validly inferred from something non-propositional (*random irrational brute facts in nature*).
8. They make unlimited conclusions based upon a limited number of examples. All crows are black, because all the ones we have seen are black.
9. Empiricism cannot know anything (*such as 'the ball is red'*) without testing experiments universally.
10. It must prove the reliability of sense perception by citing examples of sense perception using their senses (*completely circular*).
11. It is a house divided. As atheist Bertrand Russell pointed out, we assume things to be as they seem to appear. The grass is green, the stones are hard and the ice is cold. But physics explains to us that greenness, hardness and coldness is really quite different than we first think. Actually, we are experiencing the effects of the grass, stones and ice upon ourselves. Thus science seems to be at war with itself: when science intends most of all to be objective, it finds itself plunged into subjectivity against its will.
12. To continue with the subjective problem, empiricism claims observation is knowledge (*the present tense report of an observation such as I am seeing a red ball*). But then it seeks to objectify this observation by others claims of the same experience (*we also see a red ball*). So, at what point is it true knowledge? One persons present tense report of an observation or X number of others reporting the same observation? So, if others do not have the same sensations then we doubt our own.
13. According to empiricism our observations are misleading. Our observation of a stone is that it is hard and solid. But a scientist will tell us that the atoms do not touch each other and they are in constant motion.
14. Actually, empiricism is not based upon direct observation but what is inferred from observation. If a scientist asks you if you see a red ball you would reply '*No - only patches of color created by the reflection of light waves from colorless groups of atoms in constant motion. And because I have this sensation I attribute it to what you call a red ball.*' So, the object is never observed (*only*

inferred) from my sensations of it. So, empiricism is actually a philosophy of my senses and not the objective material world.

15. If empiricism is a philosophy of my sensations, then I am never acquainted with the red ball (*only my senses of a red ball*). And if I am to believe in an actual red ball existing apart from my senses of it, I will need to presuppose other things that I cannot prove with my senses (*e.g. that my senses do not change or that they are not affected by some unknown influence and that the red ball continues to exist when I am not sensing it - assuming some kind of uniformity in nature - which is a metaphysical view*). Thus, complete empiricism is impossible unless you are God.
16. It assumes your abstract thoughts are accurately related to material things or your abstract thoughts actually are material things. And if they are material things, then they are subject to the laws of biology and chemistry and not free thoughts. So what is the point in having an argument about anything?
17. It would have to conclude that your thoughts are the effects of a cause. But the cause could possibly create another effect (*a different thought*) in your mind the next time or maybe did the last time and thus calling memory into question (*memory itself already being questionable and very unreliable*). Furthermore, memories cannot prove that the past occurred by themselves since everything could have started 5 minutes ago with the memories already in place (*an atheistic scientist rejecting a 6000 year earth cannot actually disprove a 5 minute old earth*).
18. Empiricists claim that universal abstract thoughts such as color or circularity are generalized abstractions from particular examples in our memory (*as in circularity being the abstract law and certain circles being particular examples falling within the laws of circularity*). But why combine certain sensations along with the color red and a certain roundness calling it an apple? Why not additionally combine the sound of a fan, the feeling of a shirt, the temperature (*or any other number of sensations*) along with the apple and call it something? Is there something in the sensations that order them into that combination? You may say that the spatial location in time along with the color and shape makes it an apple. However, the lighting makes the color vary (*and distorting conditions such as color blindness*) and your closeness to the object and from different angles makes the shape appear differently at different times as you move to and from the object. Yet it is still called by the universal term apple. Empiricism assumes and ever seeks to find the balance between and account for particulars and universals.
19. Empiricism requires the use of and dependence upon abstract entities such as the laws of logic, causation, or validity and invalidity in an argument. However, these are things that cannot be experienced empirically.

20. Empiricism excludes the possibility of morality. There is no 'ought to' or 'should behave in a certain manner.' Such would only be a non-sequitur in an empiricist pure material world.

—Todd Greer