

Re: Hardy–Weinberg law

Source: <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004–06/0225.html>

From: Tim Tyler (*tim_at_tt1lock.org*)

Date: 06/24/04

Date: Thu, 24 Jun 2004 04:29:22 +0000 (UTC)

Anon. <bob.ohara@sod.off.spammers.helsinki.fi> wrote or quoted:

> *Tim Tyler wrote:*

>> *Bob O'Hara <bob.ohara@nospam.helsinki.fi> wrote or quoted:*

>>> *Tim Tyler wrote:*

>>>>> *Popularisers should make explicit the behaviour is what happens as
>>>>>the population size tends towards infinity – and not attempt to pass
>>>>>it off as an effect in an infinite population.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *But it is – in finite populations, you get an excess of homozygotes, as
>>>>>any student of population genetics should know.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *Any mention of gene frequencies in an infinite population is nonsense –
>>>>>as I stated originally.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *You can't talk about a fraction of an infinite population having
>>>>>a trait. You would get different results for that fraction depending
>>>>>on how you enumerated through the population.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *I don't understand what you mean, but by that argument, you can't even
>>>>>define a fraction or a probability.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *Fractions have nothing to do with infinite sets.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *But there are an infinite number of fractions, so they have at least
>>>>>that to do with infinite sets.*

You can talk about fractions just fine without ever mentioning infinite sets.

It is incorrect to say that you can't define fractions without reference to infinite sets.

A fraction is just one finite number divided by another one.

>>>>> *It's like claiming that half the integers are even.*

>>>>>

>>>>> *Err, they are. There are just rather a lot of them.*

sci.bio.evolution: Re: Hardy–Weinberg law

> >

> > *No, there aren't.*

> >

> > *There are an infinite number of even numbers.*