

Re: Units of IBD

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-10/msg00117.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 5 Oct 2005 11:50:27 -0400 (EDT)
-

r norman NotMyRealEmail@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote: _

>> JE:–
>> It appears Mr Norman cannot/refuses to differentiate between non
> empirical
>> based mathematics and entirely empirically based theories of science. He
> is
>> not alone. Arguably the most senior sbe poster Prof. Felsenstein who
>> actually precipitated this particular debate set the example. He has
> always
>> refused to discriminate between a non empirically based proposition of
>> mathematics, e.g. Hamilton's Rule and an empirically based proposition of
>> science e.g. Darwinian theory from which the rule was oversimplified.
> Prof
>> Felsenstein and others here profess to be competent mathematicians yet
> they
>> appear never to have applied Godel to critical mathematical propositions
>> employed within evolutionary theory, e.g. Hamilton's Rule.

> snip rhetoric<

> I will only point out my naive impression that mathematics has been
> useful to one or two branches of sciences in the past 400 or more
> years. To evolution, too (although not quite for so long).

JE:–

I entirely agree. I have never ever argued that simplified/oversimplified models CANNOT be correctly and usefully employed within evolutionary theory.

It appears here that Mr Norman has just a dyslexic response to the word "MISUSED" which I have employed here about 600 times. I have been arguing for over 5 years now within sbe that mathematically based simplified/oversimplified models have been MISUSED within evolutionary theory. I have never ever argued that they CANNOT BE USED. I can only conclude that Mr Norman wishes to misrepresent the argument I have been presenting here for so long. To repeat it YET AGAIN: a non refutable simplified/oversimplified model cannot be used to compete against the

Re: Units of IBD

refutable parent theory it was simplified/oversimplified from let alone replace it, e.g. Hamilton's Rule.

- > Then, again, I actually do have a degree in mathematics, so perhaps I
- > am biased. Somehow I fail to appreciate that the existence of an
- > undecidable proposition should prove that mathematics fails when
- > applied to the real world. I guess I should have listened more
- > closely in my "Foundations of Mathematics" class.

JE:–

Mathematics is *NOT*, never was and has never ever claimed to be, an empirically based science. THEREFORE mathematics can be used or misused within the empirically based the sciences. I am happy to open any NON BIASED discussion as to what constitutes both the USE and the MISUSE of mathematics within the sciences.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxxx

-
- Prev by Date: [**Re: NS and AaD curves**](#)
 - Next by Date: [**Re: Underestimating 'r'**](#)
 - Previous by thread: [**Re: Units of IBD**](#)
 - Next by thread: [**Re: Units of IBD**](#)
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ [**Date**](#)
 - ◆ [**Thread**](#)