

## Re: Challenges for Evolutionary Ethics

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2004-10/0129.html>

---

**From:** John Edser ([edser\\_at\\_tpg.com.au](mailto:edser_at_tpg.com.au))

**Date:** 10/07/04

Date: Thu, 7 Oct 2004 21:16:32 +0000 (UTC)

> **FB:**

- > *This is the theme of my article *Alive and Human. Evolution and Reason**
- > *are two decoupled survival systems. Reason provides analogies to*
- > *Evolution in a different level, like superseding biological adaptation*
- > *with technological adaptation. Other examples can be found in the*
- > *mentioned article (google groups). For all practical considerations*
- > *evolution is stopped and that is the main difference between Rational*
- > *Living Beings (Man) and Irrational Living Beings.*

JE:–

It is totally incorrect to argue that because humans employ reason they are not subject to Darwinian natural selection or that Darwinian evolution and reason are somehow, "decoupled". Humans remain unique in that they live in \_enormous\_ sized trading groups which provide \_geometric\_ (but not necessarily equal) fitness gains to all these grouped \_individuals\_ (note: no group selection is required). To make mutualised trading groups work our species evolved mental as well as physical, \_specialisations\_. The range of mental/physical abilities within a trading super tribe has to be \_very\_ extensive. What matters is that a selected RANGE of ability compliments in a mutualistic way at the individual Darwinistic level of selection so that goods and services can be produced and distributed providing larger gains to all the trading individuals. To be able to make such a trading system work more individuals with "working skills" are required than those with "intellectual" skills. Thus nature would evolve such a range of mental/physical abilities to suit trading conditions via natural selection acting on individuals (not groups). If this range of ability was incorrect then absolute Darwinian fitness would drop for \_all\_ concerned because the mean gains from trading would drop per individual. Such a high level of social selection (the individual remains the selectee but the group becomes a selector so again, no group

selection is involved) is unique to humans. The only unique adaptation that humans have is trade. No other living species has been observed to trade. However, read almost any tract on human evolution and you will find that trade is hardly even mentioned. The tragedy remains that trade as a highly mutualised process has become almost totally politicised. For over 50 years gene centric Neo Darwinism has politicised evolutionary theory with totally inappropriate and politically sensitive terms as "altruism" and "selfishness". The rational concept of mutualism has been swept aside in a swath of politically motivated nonsense, e.g. Hamilton's rule which was incorrectly supposed to be able to measure when organism fitness altruism (OFA) could evolve within nature after group selection failed to be able to do so (I refer reader's to my extensive posting on this concept). This has allowed "Sociobiology" etc to thrive. Billions of taxpayer's dollars are being consumed by political bigots in the name of "science". The cost is that REAL Darwinian fitness mutualisation has been ignored.

Regards,

John Edser  
Independent Researcher

PO Box 266  
Church Pt  
NSW 2105  
Australia

edser@tpg.com.au