

Re: Fossil Records Show Biodiversity Comes and Goes

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.geo.geology/2005-03/2057.html>

From: George (george_at_wfifswrongwithyou.com)

Date: 03/18/05

Date: Fri, 18 Mar 2005 20:55:30 GMT

"John Harshman" <jharshman.diespamdie@pacbell.net> wrote in message
news:IBE_d.20027\$Pz7.8401@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...

> *George wrote:*

>

>> "John Harshman" <jharshman.diespamdie@pacbell.net> wrote in message

>> news:vYB_d.11638\$C47.5213@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...

>>

>>> *George wrote:*

>>>

>>>

>>>> "John Harshman" <jharshman.diespamdie@pacbell.net> wrote in message

>>>> news:oPo_d.24046\$OU1.17168@newssvr21.news.prodigy.com...

>>>>

>>>>

>>>>> *George wrote:*

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>

>>>>>> "John Harshman" <jharshman.diespamdie@pacbell.net> wrote in message

>>>>>> news:f_l_d.11486\$C47.9372@newssvr14.news.prodigy.com...

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>

>>>>>>> *George wrote:*

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>> "John Harshman" <jharshman.diespamdie@pacbell.net> wrote in message

>>>>>>>> news:mvh_d.19664\$Pz7.10093@newssvr13.news.prodigy.com...

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>

>>>>>>>>> *George wrote:*

>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>"darthpup" <amchitka@mailexcite.com> wrote in message
>>>>>>>>>news:1111068702.868751.160260@z14g2000cwz.googlegroups.com...
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>SJ Gould published a paper in Science in the early seventies after an
>>>>>>>>>>exhaustive inventory of all collected fossils and showed that
>>>>>>>>>>diversity
>>>>>>>>>>is in fact random and not controlled by any correlative factor.
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I seem to recall something about this. Do you have a link to this
>>>>>>>>>>>paper?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I swear he's referring to Gould's entirely data-free simulations of
>>>>>>>>>>>clade shape evolution. But we'll see.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Oh God. Not that one.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>Actually, that paper is relevant to your claim to find some particular
>>>>>>>>>>>pattern, which implies some kind of mechanism. Gould showed in that
>>>>>>>>>>>paper that such patterns would appear with reasonable frequency even if
>>>>>>>>>>>speciation and extinction were entirely stochastic.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>The idea I espoused about specialists being more vulnerable to extinction
>>>>>>>>>>>is
>>>>>>>>>>>not
>>>>>>>>>>>a new one. Moore talked about it in his 1952 treatise on invertebrate
>>>>>>>>>>>paleontology.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>And that's an argument in favor of what? Are ideas good because they
>>>>>>>>>>>aren't new, or are they bad because they aren't new, or is their age
>>>>>>>>>>>irrelevant?
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>I was simply pointing out that this is an idea that has been thought about
>>>>>>>>>>>so
>>>>>>>>>>>quite some time. That's all.
>>>>>>>>>>>
>>>>>>>>>>>

>>>Ah, but what was your purpose in pointing that out? Just making
>>>conversation?

>>>

>>

>> My purpose in pointing it out was that it has been accepted for quite some
>> time,

>> so I don't understand your objection to it.

>>

> Well, "thought about" and "accepted" are two quite different things.

> Accepted on what basis? We just know it's true? It sounds nice? Or was

> this established on the basis of rigorous tests? If so, do you have

> citations? The Paleobiology paper you cited was one such test, which

> seems to show an effect in crinoids -- though again, greater speciation

> rates among the specialists compensated for the greater extinction

> rates. What else you got?

If it wasn't accepted, it wouldn't still be discussed at length in Moore's
"Treatise On Invertebrate Paleontology" (which now comprises 46 volumes,
involving the work of more than 300 authors worldwide).