

Re: What constitutes a valid THEORY of life?]]

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2009-02/msg00009.html>

- *From:* Lorentz <drosen0000@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 4 Feb 2009 12:27:33 -0500 (EST)
-

On Feb 1, 5:41=A0pm, John Edser <ed...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Thus unless the approach to defining life changes then a definition is impossible, even in principle, as new examples or new properties can be discovered at any time and under the current approach, this would requi=

re a

revision of the definition which would change both the properties of li=

fe

and the list of things which are considered to be living.

JE:–

IOW, without a frame of reference which can only be created by at least one proposed constant, the variables remain _irrational_.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

ed...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx

- 1) Meteorology is supposedly the study of the weather. Have you applied your reasoning to the study of the weather? What is the single variable that can be compared in the theory of the weather?
 - 2) Geology is the study of the earth. Have you applied your reasoning to the study of the earth? What is the single variable that can be compared in the theory of the earth?
 - 3) Astronomy is the study of the stars. ...
 - 4) Psychology is the study of the mind...
- My point is that complex systems aren't easily analyzed from one unique "reference frame". I am not even sure exactly how you are generalizing the concept of "reference frame."

Re: What constitutes a valid THEORY of life?]]