

RE: Some answers by Hamilton

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-07/0096.html>

From: John Edser (edser_at_tpg.com.au)

Date: 07/02/04

Date: Fri, 2 Jul 2004 17:52:45 +0000 (UTC)

Michael Ragland wrote:—

> *Interviewer:*

> *A general question. Do living organisms behave as if they want to pass on their own genes, or do they behave as if each of their genes is trying to replicate itself, possibly at the expense of other genes of the same genome?*

> *Hamilton:*

> *This is a very deep and difficult question I think. One's impression is that there is a conflict between selfish genes, but largely it is being overridden by a kind of democracy that has arisen in the genome. It combines to suppress this intergene conflict and the outcome is that the organism acts largely as a whole.*

JE:—

My interpretation:

IF "the outcome is that the organism acts largely as a whole"

THEN: genomic genes can only be selected *_simultaneously_* at the *_same_* level of selection: an organism level. IF an organism is infertile THEN all the genomic genes remain trapped, so the simultaneous level of selection that Hamilton must be referring to is the fertile organism level. This level is the Darwinian single level of selection. However, Hamilton has to reduce this level for the actor using Hamiltonian selection at his supposed gene level, in order to prove OFA was operating on the actor within his rule. This he failed to prove.

> *Interviewer:*

> *You write that evolutionary ideas "turn out to have, or are perceived to have, the unfortunate property of being solvents of a vital societal glue". What kind of glue is this?*

> *Hamilton:*

> *The glue that I am thinking of is various myths that tend to hold societies together. When these myths are wrong, I think that they exist because they have helped people to be more cooperative than they would be if proceeding with a full understanding of evolutionary theory. This is the most unfortunate fact about teaching evolution. I also think that*

- > *it is the threat that is dimly perceived by all religious people. They*
- > *think that if people 'believe' evolution instead of believing, say, the*
- > *gospels, they will no longer be able to celebrate simple honesty, or*
- > *kindly and warm feelings toward others, as unequivocally 'good'.*
- > *I think they exaggerate the danger, but they don't exaggerate a nothing.*
- > *There is a danger of that kind.*

JE:–

My interpretation:

The social conscience that a belief may engineer can enable organism fitness mutualisation (OFM) to become maximised. This provides a geometric increase in resources available to Darwinian individuals. OFM was mistaken for organism fitness altruism (OFA) by Hamilton et al. OFM specifically involves a unique form of mutual exchange commonly termed "trade" which provided the resources for a human population explosion. Unfortunately human trade which is just a process, has become politicised within evolutionary theory, i.e. trade was deleted by both the political left and right as a major human adaptation.

Human Darwinian fitness has become dependent on many diverse belief systems that provide the critical social glue for OFM (which includes trade). This emotional glue effect remains independent of any beliefs truth content. As long as theory and belief can be kept separate no threat to any societies social glue must eventuate. Unfortunately, this separation is only attempted within democratic societies which constitute a tiny minority of human social systems.

>snip<

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

PO Box 266
Church Pt
NSW 2105
Australia

edser@tpg.com.au