

## Re: "Relative fitness" and other evolution pertaining

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-07/0175.html>

---

**From:** Peter F. (*effectivespamblock\_at\_ozemail.com.au*)

**Date:** 07/07/04

Date: Wed, 7 Jul 2004 16:27:21 +0000 (UTC)

"John Edser" <edser@tpg.com.au> wrote in message  
news:ccei6k\$mmm\$1@darwin.ediacara.org...

<snip>

> *JE:* –

> *Before you \_can\_ measure any relative*

> *fitness (which is just a comparison)*

> *you must firstly measure the absolute*

> *fitnesses that are to be compared.*

<snip>

That "measurment" is being 'taken' all along. It is done by means of natural selection (of/amongst different genophenotypes) – or, still better beheld and grasped in bulk (IMO), as 'taken' by lineage-relevant "evolutionary (including lifetime) pressures".

So, it is measured \_for us\_ – with or without us – quite naturally, by Nature itself. :-)

I, personally, am not all that interested or concerned about moot and/or meagre mathematical models of biological evolution. Especially not since it is possible (apparently mainly for me) to approximately understand [understand in terms of generally and specifically describable/exemplifiable categories of lifetime (environmental and intrinsic) factors/situations that can be extrapolated back into our phylogeny] our overt and covert (unconscious even to ourselves – and further explainable with reference to Neuropsychobiology) motivations to do the things we do (such as e.g. being AEVASIVELY enchanted by one's own SEPTIC philosophical thoughts; and being self-rewarding by AEVASIVELY analysing and attacking a certain moot and meagre neo-Darwinian mathematical model. ;-)

Cheers,

P