Ústav geologie a paleontologie vás co nejsrdečněji zve na přednášku

Dr. Reného Zaragüety i Bagils

z Univerzity Pierra a Marie Curieových – Paris 6

http://www.infosyslab.fr/lis/?q=en/staff/rzb

na téma:

How many scientific disciplines called "*Biogeography*" do we have?

Přednáška se uskuteční v angličtině jako celosekční geologický seminář

ve středu 6. května 2015 v 10:00

ve Velké paleontologické posluchárně na Albertově 6

Na setkání s vámi se těší kolektiv pracovníků
Ústavu geologie a paleontologie PřF UK v Praze

za organizátory akce
Jakub Sakala
rade@natur.cuni.cz

↓ ***obsah přednášky na druhé straně*** ↓

Obsah přednášky :

Biogeography has two specificities: there are only very few biogeography laboratories and almost no pure biogeographers. Instead, biogeography is practiced in laboratories studying systematics and biogeographers are, in general, taxonomists.

Methodologically, biogeography also seems to appeal to diverse theories and methods. It has become customary to regard these methods, deriving from incompatible theoretical postulates, as relevant at different spatial and temporal scales: phylogeographic methods being adapted to reduced spatiotemporal scales, whereas cladistic methods would be relevant to the scales involving tectonic plates and large-scale processes. I focus here on historical biogeography and show that the reason there is not a unique biogeographical discipline is the existence of two historical biogeographies.

Indeed, two disciplines (that I call traditions) coexist since the beginning of the study of the geographic distribution of taxa. The first tradition, overwhelmingly dominant, dates back to Linnaeus and is rooted in Judeo-Christian myths. The second, which has been the work of de Candolle, is an original tradition based on the search for a botanical and zoological geography. From an epistemological point of view, the biogeographical research responds to the vision of the dynamics of science proposed by Kuhn, with nomologically incommensurable theories, much more than that proposed by Popper. However, only the second tradition is justifiable and meets the minimum requirements of Popperian testability unanimously accepted as a criterion for scientific theories. Two centuries after their description, the foundations of these two traditions still seem to require clarification.