

Re: True Gems of Scientific Epistemology

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.cognitive/2004-07/0482.html>

From: dan michaels (*feedbackdroids_at_yahoo.com*)

Date: 07/27/04

Date: 27 Jul 2004 10:10:51 -0700

JXStern <JXSternChangeX2R@gte.net> wrote in message
news:<7ea8g0d8qflcog9uplkt236j1dnmq9cmuf@4ax.com>...
> On 22 Jul 2004 07:06:05 -0700, erayo@bilkent.edu.tr (Eray Ozkural
> exa) wrote:
> >> *So, I'll stay with the biologist Mayr when it comes to evolution.*
> >>
> >> *(for a great overview of the history and foundations of evolutionary
> >> theory, Peter Bowler, "Evolution: The History of an Idea", 1983/1989,
> >> isbn 0-520-06386-4)*
> >
> >*It's safer to stick with biology when talking about evolution, but
> >some biologists see evolutionary programming as identical to
> >evolution, so perhaps it really isn't limited to the domain of biology
> >(and evidently so, since there is evolution, for instance, of
> >astrophysics, or of ideas)*
>
> *If there is an abstract evolutionary theory as a pure mathematical
> and/or philosophical construct, it may indeed have applications in
> many parts of science. However, like applying Gaussian distributions
> or the periodic table across various special sciences, one needs to
> specialize knowledge to deal with a domain. To clarify my own
> comments then, what I meant above is that I would stay with Mayr, who
> presumably owns rather more knowledge of biology than does Dennett,
> when discussing evolution in a biological framework. If someone else
> (Millikan or Dennett) want to make claims about evolutionary phenomena
> in a cognitive framework, I think such claims have value, though they
> are, like most evolutionary arguments, extremely slippery, and Mayr
> indeed has little or nothing to say about evolutionary explanations of
> cognition, IIRC, much less the "evolution" of galaxies or the
> evolution of popular music, etc.*