

Re: A DECLARATION OF MEANING

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-08/0049.html>

From: Perplexed in Peoria (jimmenegay_at_sbcglobal.net)

Date: 08/03/04

Date: Tue, 3 Aug 2004 04:25:07 +0000 (UTC)

"Name And Address Supplied" <name_and_address_supplied@hotmail.com> wrote in message news:celrvu\$170q\$1@darwin.ediacara.org...

> *Note that John Edser wrote:*

>

> > *Within Hamilton's rule the two fitnesses*

> > *being compared are inclusive fitness*

> > *(rb) and Darwinian fitness implied as*

> > *as just the cost (c).*

>

> *This is wrong. Conventionally, inclusive fitness is $r b - c$, not $r b$.*

This is also wrong. At least as Hamilton defined inclusive fitness in 1964. He defined it as something like $(K + r b - c)$, where K would be the fitness that an organism would have if all social interactions were excluded (and the costs of those interactions).

Inclusive fitness as you have defined it and inclusive fitness as Hamilton defined it maximize together only if there are no pleiotropic effects that modify both K and $(r b - c)$.