

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech–archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005–08/msg00552.html>

---

- *From:* "Pompous Git" <[jpsturm@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:jpsturm@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Sun, 28 Aug 2005 18:17:14 –0400 (EDT)
- 

Since my words have been posted here without my consent, I thought it best to post a message in my own behalf since my words were not within their original context and replies to Robert's message have been forwarded to me. I also made an error of fact.

First, the error of fact. I accept that I misheard/misremembered/misinterpreted [delete whichever is inapplicable] John Maynard Smith's and Lewis Wolpert's words in a BBC radio broadcast some years ago where I thought they discussed the conflict between being a Christian and being a Darwinist. JMS appears to have been an atheist according to a link provided elsewhere in this thread. I stand corrected.

I have heard Michael Ruse speak, have read some of his papers and knew he had written a book: "Can a Darwinian be a Christian?" that I have been assured was in the affirmative. Ruse has frequently spoken in defence of a position I hold, that a religious belief is not \*necessarily\* incompatible with science. I note that Robert failed to mention that Michael Ruse is Professor of Zoology as well as a Professor of Philosophy at the University of Miami. He was also prominent in McLean vs. Arkansas where the right to teach Creation "Science" as science was struck down due to his testimony.

While Robert introduced me as a philosopher of science, I also write about history, mainly the history of science, gardening, owner–building and many other things. The unfolding of my thoughts over the last few weeks that triggered Robert's post commences here:

<http://www.sturmsoft.com/Writing/diatribe01/20050004.htm>

Robert has made a number of claims that he has refused to substantiate in our recent correspondence [my opinion in square braces]:

1. "Ruse is a philosopher of science, not a biologist" [I thought zoology was a sub–discipline of biology.]
2. "Ruse DOES NOT speak for evolutionary Biology" [It's a bit difficult to believe he's an anti–evolutionist]
3. "ALL mutation is random according to evolution theory" {"Oh, randomness is just an excuse for ignorance," quips Lynn Margulis. [Hey, Lynn, that was supposed to be my opinion!]}

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

4. "No one says 'Science is based upon an assumption of uniform physical laws' except for philosophers, which are largely ignored by scientists."  
[Actually physicists do say that. Dick Feynman did. Four of my philosophy teachers (physicists all) did. Perhaps biologists disagree.]

Jonathan Sturm

The world's most Pompous Git according to Google

"As my conclusions have lately been much misrepresented, and it has been stated that I attribute the modification of species exclusively to natural selection, I may be permitted to remark that in the first edition of this work, and subsequently, I place in a most conspicuous position — namely at the close of the Introduction — the following words: 'I am convinced that natural selection has been the main, but not the exclusive means of modification.' This has been of no avail. Great is the power of steady misrepresentation." — Charles Darwin

"Robert Karl Stonjek" <rstonjek@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:dekok9\\$2k52\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:dekok9$2k52$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

- > Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?
- >
- > A friend of mine claims that: "Michael Ruse has written a book as well as
- > published many articles on the issue. Ruse demonstrates that there is no
- > necessary conflict between Christianity and evolutionism as you assert.
- > John
- > Maynard Smith, described in his obituary as 'the greatest evolutionary
- > biologist since Darwin', was a devout Christian."
- >
- > Who is Michael Ruse? He is, as far as I can tell, a Philosopher of
- > Science.
- > He has written many books on evolution. But have evolutionists read any
- > of
- > them?
- > Have serious
- > Evolutionary –Biologists, –psychologists, –researchers, –philosophers,
- > or –other interested parties even heard of him.
- >
- > So here is my question – reply directly to me if you feel like it:
- >
- > A) Have you:
- > 1) Heard of Michael Ruse;
- > 2) Read Michael Ruse;
- > 3) Has Michael Ruse influenced your thinking in the area of evolution?
- >
- > B) Philosopher of Science:
- > 1) Are you aware of the discipline?
- > 2) Have you read any books on the subject vis evolution?
- > 3) Has Philosopher of Science influenced your thinking?
- >
- > C) I am a
- > 1) Researcher/lecturer/qualified in an area related to Evolution;

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

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

- > 2) PhD but not in Evolution related discipline;
- > 3) Independent researcher;
- > 4) Other
- >
- > Please let me know – my friend, a Philosopher of Science, thinks that
- > Philosophy of Science has an impact on scientific thinking, perhaps it
- > does.
- >
- > Kind Regards
- > Robert Karl Stonjek
- >
- >

---

• **References:**

- ◆ **Question: Philosophy of Science – is it Relevant?**  
◇ From: Robert Karl Stonjek

- Prev by Date: **Re: Human design and natural "design"**
- Next by Date: **Re: evolution explains what?**
- 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**