

# Re: Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005–08/msg00531.html>

---

- *From:* "Malcolm" <[regniztar@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:regniztar@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 28 Aug 2005 18:17:18 –0400 (EDT)
- 

"Wirt Atmar" <[atmar@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:atmar@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)> wrote

>

> Robert MacArthur wrote in the preface to his 1972

> "Geographical Ecology" that the only rules to the scientific method are

> honest observation and accurate logic.

>

OK, my research project is this: I'm interested in horses, so I'm going to measure the depth of their hooves (as a ratio of total size) and see if there is any correlation with coat colour.

We'll have proper randomisation techniques for selecting our sample of horses, which will increase costs considerably, because we'll have to get permission from large numbers of owners to measure their animals. We will of course apply all the proper statistical tests.

Would you fund this study? If not, why not?

---

• *References:*

- ◆ ***Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?***  
◇ *From:* Robert Karl Stonjek
- ◆ ***Re: Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?***  
◇ *From:* John S. Wilkins
- ◆ ***Re: Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?***  
◇ *From:* Wirt Atmar

- Prev by Date: ***Re: new description of the AAT group***
- Next by Date: ***Re: A question of timing***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?***
- Index(es):
  - ◆ ***Date***
  - ◆ ***Thread***