

Re: Claims Of Abuse

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-11/0103.html>

From: John Edser (*edser_at_tpg.com.au*)

Date: 11/05/04

Date: Fri, 5 Nov 2004 16:28:27 +0000 (UTC)

ekurtz99@WhoKnowsWhere.com wrote:

> >> *"How can anybody who has a BSc in statistics and
> >> a PhD in quantitative biology not know that random
> >> processes ... _cannot_ be eliminated from
> >> a natural population? Has Dr O'Hara been misusing models
> >> for so long that he cannot discriminate between testable
> >> reality and just his oversimplified "quantitative
> >> biology" models?"
> >> (from the 5th of October)*

JE:--

Dr O'Hara has never explained how all variation
can be deleted from any natural population.

All variation can be deleted from a simplified
model of such a population but not from the
natural population itself. My posting over
the last 4 years or so focuses on simplified
model misuse. Dr O'Hara's accusation that within
my proposed experiment (not a model) to delete
all Darwinian selection I had deleted all random
variation within an experimental but natural population
constituted a typical example of this misuse. Evasion
of critical questions asked here remains an ongoing
pattern by O'Hara et al.

I am happy to document and post to sbe
a list of questions Dr O'Hara has evaded. If anybody
here would like to accuse me of similar evasive
tactics and can quote any critical question that I
have not attempted to answer I will attempt to answer
it forth with. I have gone to great lengths to
attempt to answer all questions asked of myself
here. If I have missed any then I can assure sbe

reader's that this was not my intention.

> > *John is something of a conundrum. He is neither stupid nor
> > ignorant. But
> > he is singularly single-minded, and has an unfortunate tendency (shared
> > by many humans, including myself) to lapse into calumny when his
> > arguments are challenged.
> > I gave up responding to John some time ago,
> > even though he raises some good arguments, because of his single-
> > mindedness. I suggest you do the same. What we need to do is get into
> > some good arguments between ourselves so we can both satisfy our desire
> > for intellectual discussion.*

> *EK:-
> Well said.
> There appears to be a general rule in USENET groups that the most
> obnoxious and fanatical posters attract the most attention. As a result
> they never learn to moderate their behavior, as they would have to do in
> a normal social environment. Perhaps those that never learned correct
> social behavior or are congenitally incapable of it gravitate to USENET
> since it is the only social outlet available to them.*

JE:-
The scientific process demands that questions are actually answered and not just evaded because dialog is required to contest theories of nature to refutation. A major part of this process is the asking and answering of basic questions. All O'Hara et al have to do is to attempt to answer the questions asked of them even if they have no clear answer. Evasion is never an option. Discussion must become over heated when critical questions are continually evaded for what appears to be, protecting a favoured view from scientific refutation.

> *EK:-
> If everyone generally observed the rule you recommend for Edser, USENET
> would be a far better place. Though Bob O'Hara means well, he is
> actually an unconscious enabler of the behavior he complains about.*

JE:-
All O'Hara et al has to do is answer the questions asked! Until they do so I and others here can ethically continue to exert pressure to convince them to do so.

Respectfully,

sci.bio.evolution: Re: Claims Of Abuse

John Edser
Independent Researcher

PO Box 266
Church Pt
NSW 2105
Australia

edser@tpg.com.au