

## Re: Integrity

**Source:** <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-01/0523.html>

---

**From:** John Edser (*edser\_at\_tpg.com.au*)

**Date:** 01/23/05

Date: Sun, 23 Jan 2005 15:18:46 -0500 (EST)

> > *JE:*—  
> > *Just look at what you wrote above:*  
> > *1) "I offered a theory as to what BOH meant*  
> > *by this answer". No theory of "what BOH*  
> > *meant" is required. BOH either retracts*  
> > *his entirely unambiguous answer*  
> > *or he doesn't. He never retracted it*  
> > *despite many offers by me to do so.*  
> > *Therefore, his answer stands, exactly*  
> > *as written. He even requested me to*  
> > *provide other quotes of himself which*  
> > *confirmed this answer, e.g. BOH confirmed*  
> > *that c remains arbitrary. Are you now going*  
> > *to argue that some arbitrary things are*  
> > *less arbitrary than others?*

> *JM:*—  
> *Of course! You seem to think that something*  
> *is either arbitrary or it is not.*

> *snip*<

*JE:*—

Nothing can be BOTH arbitrary AND  
non arbitrary except at some  
very entertaining mathematicians  
Mad Hatter's Tea Party.

DEFINITIONS:—

Arbitrary: "Based on or subject to individual  
discretion or preference or sometimes impulse  
or caprice".

SO, what do YOU think non arbitrary means?

> > *2) .."received confirmation from BOH that*  
> > *he did, in fact, mean what I thought he*  
> > *meant"*

> > *JE:–*  
> > *The above sounds like (or was) some*  
> > *Mickey Mouse collusion in some back room*  
> > *to attempt to retract the non retractable*  
> > *in order to placate some mafia boss...*

> *JM:–*  
> *Hmmm. Let me see if I understand your suggested scenario.*  
> *I, in Cleveland, and BOH, in Helsinki, got together in*  
> *a (presumably electronic) backroom and decided to mislead*  
> *Edser (in Melbourne?). We concocted this plot to placate*  
> *Boss Joe (The Enforcer) Felsenstein, in Seattle.*

*JE:–*  
What you wrote was *\_arbitrary\_*. Anybody can validly claim it to imply anything they wish. ANY allocated (subjective) meanings are NOT the issue. The issue is that you proffered such nonsensical accusations re: myself to suggest I was telling lies.

> > *JE:–*  
> > *3) "...and then stated clearly that I*  
> > *agreed with what he intended to say"*  
> > *This can only mean BOH has admitted he*  
> > *had no idea what he was talking*  
> > *about in the first place*

> *JM:–*  
> *Or, perhaps, no idea what YOU were talking about.*

*JE:–*  
I am going to do a Jim McGinn Here because it is entirely warranted:–

Look you idiot, if BOH had no idea about what I was talking about then all he had to do was say so and ask me to clarify. He did no such thing because he DID understand what I was talking about. A child of 12 could.

Your claim that you do not, belies belief. Therefore, the only rational conclusion possible is that you are involved in a deliberate attempt to confound the issue for sbe readers.

The paranoid idea that only Menegay knows what people *\_actually\_* understand is so outrageously arrogant as to make him fully qualified to run

the next torture/witch burning exercise.

> > *JE*:–  
> > *until you provided*  
> > *him with his own intentions. I didn't know*  
> > *(but had suspected) BOH was just a computer ;–)*  
> > *Anyway, only a computer is required to provide a*  
> > *correct answer anyway because it is entirely*  
> > *deductive.*

*JE*:–  
I ask sbe reader's to ask themselves  
why JM never denied that he had  
"provided him [BOH] with his own  
intentions"

> > *JE*:–  
> > 4) *"..but felt that he was probably not*  
> > *giving a correct answer to the question that you*  
> > *were intending to ask."*

> > *JRE*:–  
> > *This is a real corker: It seems JM not only*  
> > *knows BOH's intentions better than BOH himself*  
> > *does but he also knows my intentions better than*  
> > *I do myself!*

> *JM*:–  
> *Exactly the opposite. I don't claim to understand your*  
> *intentions.*

*JE*:–  
Like EK you are a mathematician who  
you cannot reason your way out of  
a paper bag.

You wrote: *"..to the question that you*  
*[JE] were intending to ask"*.

Here your paranoid arrogance is asserting  
that ONLY you understood an alleged  
intended question by myself. NO such  
intended question ever existed except within  
your paranoia. At this point you should  
apologise to sbe reader's in general and  
myself in particular for asserting such  
hopeless nonsense.

> *JM*:–  
> *snip*<  
> *And, in any case, the correct inference would have been*

> *that I know your intentions better than BOH does, not*  
> *better than you do.*

JE:–

Nonsense. JE is not BOH (thankfully for both of us, I imagine).

> *JM:–*

> *[snip demands that I provide quotes from the original*  
> *postings where I (idiotically – I should never have*  
> *gotten involved!) offered my hypothesis as to what*  
> *BOH intended. Anyone who is interested in the originals*  
> *can go to the source.]*

JE:–

JM simply snips the outrageous logic (I went to immense trouble to exactly identify) that he the gall to offer sbe reader's as a REASONED argument re: how I was supposed to have lied and just walks away from it as if it never happened.

> > > *JM:–*

> > > *I cannot give an answer to the question you intended*  
> > > *to ask here, because the question makes no sense to*  
> > > *me.*

> > *JE:–*

> > *I didn't know Jim could read my mind so that he*  
> > *KNOWS the question I INTENDED to ask even before I*  
> > *ask it, so that Jim does NOT NOW have to answer*  
> > *the question I actually asked. Dear oh dear...*

> *JM:–*

> *And again, John objects to what he sees as my claim*  
> *of the ability to read minds, when actually I am saying*  
> *that I can't answer the question because I CAN'T*  
> *read minds.*

JE:–

Yet again JM proves he cannot reason or refuses to do so when it suits him.

If JM "cannot read minds" then he cannot know "the question you [JE] intended" because the only possible way he could know this is to read my mind. JM WILL NEVER ACCEPT THAT NO OTHER QUESTION WAS INTENDED BY ME BECAUSE IT DOES NOT SUIT HIS ARGUMENT.

JM uses his admitted non ability to read minds to read mine(!) so as to "know" "the question you [JE] intended" just to provide a spurious reason to sbe reader's as to why he will NEVER answer THE QUESTION I ACTUALLY ASKED or comment on the answer BOH ACTUALLY PROVIDED. JM should be utterly ashamed of himself for this public display irrationality for what can only be described as deceitful purposes.

> > > *JM:–*

> > > *You seem to have some misconception as to what*  
> > > *"c" represents. In an effort to find out what you*  
> > > *think that "c" represents, I went to a great deal of*  
> > > *effort to construct a "thought experiment" in which*  
> > > *you, I, and BOH could present our apparently different*  
> > > *ideas about what "c" represents, as a step toward*  
> > > *understanding each other. You refused to participate*  
> > > *unless I would agree in advance to fill out an*  
> > > *irrelevant and (to me) unacceptable "form".*

> > *JE:–*

> > *It was and remains perfectly clear what I mean*  
> > *by c and what Hamilton must have meant by it.*

> *JM:–*

> *Not clear to me.*

*JE:–*

*I entirely agree.*

> > *JE:–*

> > *It has always been perfectly clear. You don't*  
> > *like it because it attacks your misconceptions/bias*  
> > *or both so you pretend not to understand it.*

> *JM:–*

> *Hmmm. Who is reading whose mind?*

*JE:–*

*Since your claims as to why you refused to answer the question I ACTUALLY ASKED are proven irrational then this become the most simple hypothesis as to why an intelligent man should act is such an utterly disgraceful way.*

> > *JE:–*

> > *This is why I filled out a declaration of meaning*  
> > *but you refused to do so. I will define c*

> > *YET AGAIN. I challenge you to define it here.*  
> > *I predict that you will refuse to do so.*

> *JM:–*  
> *Your prediction fails.*

*JM:–*  
I can see no DEFINITION by yourself  
of what *c* is! @\$%^&\*

> > *JE:–*  
> > *The value c is the cost of b in fertile*  
> > *organism units of fitness.*

> *JM:–*  
> *Ok. Now we are getting down to it.*

*JE:–*  
Do you have myopia? Perhaps you cannot read?  
Perhaps you have a disease that destroys  
the memory of time? I have defined it this  
way for over FOUR YEARS. I have produced  
a declaration of meaning. I have provided  
a refutable experiment. None of this matters  
does it! You do not like it and that is all  
that matters to you.

> *JM:–*  
> *I am willing to*  
> *accept fertile organism units as the measuring scheme*  
> *for fitness. But you still need to clarify. For*  
> *example, I would have written "the cost of the behavior"*  
> *but you wrote "the cost of b". This worries me.*

*JE:–*  
In Hamilton's RULE *b* is donated resources.  
This can be food donated, risks taken etc,  
measured in fertile organism fitness units as  
the cost *c* where *rb* is NOT A TOTAL.

Hamilton's RULE does not need to refer  
to ANY phenotype (behavioural or non behavioural).  
IF any one gene has an INDEPENDENT fitness as  
Hamilton et al suppose their heuristic gene does,  
THEN it MUST compete against every other gene at every  
other locus at Hamilton's gene level of selection,  
NO EXCEPTIONS. If that gene provides say, rotten teeth  
then it STILL MUST compete to increase its OWN relative  
frequency (a comparison of the freq. of the wildtype  
allele that codes for non rotten teeth with the freq.  
of the rotten teeth allele on just a 100% relative basis)

over an entirely \_undefined\_ number of organism generations (not gene generations!) no matter that selection at the Darwinian fertile organism level of selection does with it! This Darwinian organism level MUST compete against the lower gene level where the rule indicates that, no matter what that selfish gene actually provides at the Darwinian level, from self immolation to just a hapless organism with rotten teeth, this gene CAN still be selected FOR when  $rb > c$ ! This is because Mad Hatter Mathematics within the rule has reversed cause and effect. Now do you understand why Felsenstein refuses to discuss cause and effect?

> JM:–

- > *Furthermore, we need to come to agreement as to*
- > *whether the cost is to be a cost per behavior (i.e. per act),*
- > *or a cumulative cost of all altruistic behaviors (acts)*
- > *that the organism performs over its lifetime. I*
- > *can live with either assumption, but I want to have*
- > *it clear which we are talking about.*

JE:–

ALL GENE CENTRIC FITNESSSES  
COUNTS REMAIN INCOMPLETE.  
No total fitness count is ever  
specified. No finite time period  
to complete a fitness count within  
Hamilton's Rule is ever defined.  
Hamilton's  $rb$  count remains forever  
ongoing. This is why the sign of  $c$   
always remains arbitrary. The only  
possible way Hamilton's ongoing  $rb$   
incomplete total can become complete  
is when  $c = c(\max)$ . NO OTHER WAY EXISTS

The only limit that exists that does not  
allow the rule to remain 100% relative  
is  $c(\max)$ . Very clearly, you cannot invest  
resources that you do not have (unless  
of course you are Stalin so you just  
steal them using group selective logic).  
Thus Hamilton's 100% relative rule  
ceases to be so with just ONE case  
of  $c$ ,  $c(\max)$ . This just happens to be  
(surprise surprise) the REFUTABLE  
Darwinian maximand fitness.  
Hamilton et al deleted it because:

- 1) They made a very basic mistake.

OR:

2) They remain engaged is a deliberate act of deceit.

The only conclusion any RATIONAL person can make given over four frustrating years of myself pointing out this basic error, where people of Felsenstein's stature have refused to just discuss the matter, is 2.

> JM:–  
> *I would prefer,*  
> *though, that it be a cost per behaviour, since we*  
> *need to multiply by r, which should properly be*  
> *understood as referring to a single behaviour with*  
> *a single donor and a single recipient.*

JE:–  
As I have pointed out the phenotype of any independent gene fitness becomes immaterial to Hamilton's selfish gene argument.

> JM:–  
> *Most importantly, we must come to agreement regarding*  
> *the "basis" for calculating c. Every cost must be*  
> *given as the difference between one situation and another.*

JE:–  
The value c is the cost of b in fertile organism units. That is it! A 10 year old can understand it.

> JM:–  
> *Clearly, we are taking one of the two situations to be*  
> *the case where the organism behaves altruistically,*  
> *and may also be the recipient of some altruism. What*  
> *is the other situation – the basis for the cost calculation?*  
> *I would claim that it is a hypothetical situation in*  
> *which the organism does not behave altruistically, ..*  
> *but still receives all of the benefits from other organisms'*  
> *altruism that it would have received in the original case.*  
> *Do you agree with this?*

JE:–  
Your biology (above) is more Mad Hatter nonsense. You have it all in reverse. The cost of b in fertile organism units is just one part of a refutable Darwinian fitness maximand (cmax). Yet, here you go attempting to reverse the empirical

facts of nature by suggesting the exact opposite: mutualism and not altruism is just a "hypothetical situation".

The case "in which the organism does not behave altruistically, but still receives all of the benefits from other organisms' altruism that it would have received in the original case" is the ENTIRELY opposing Darwinian mutualistic argument. Here the cost of  $c$  now constitutes an investment. Until  $rb$  completes at  $c_{max}$  you can never know if  $c$  is an altruistic cost OR an investment cost. This is why the sign of  $c$  must remain arbitrary until  $c$  is included within the rule. This remains empirical.

It is not just obvious that mutualised associations can pay as much IF NOT MORE than altruistic associations because mutualistic associations can provide absolute (total) geometric fitness gains?

> > *JE:—*  
> > *The value  $c_{max}$*   
> > *is the limit of this cost and represents*  
> > *a Darwinian refutable maximand total fitness.*  
> > *This can be defined as the total number of*  
> > *fertile forms reproduced by each parent into*  
> > *one population.*

> *JM:—*  
> *Please clarify. Is  $c_{max}$  the fitness with or without*  
> *altruism?*

*JE:—*  
When  $c_{max}$  is PAID by the actor altruism is proven because  $c_{max}$  is the maximal COST in fertile form units. If you pay  $c_{max}$  that is it. You have nothing left over to reproduce with either normally or by proxy. You remain fertile but cannot reproduce just subsist, i.e. you have now been proven altruistic.

> *JM:—*  
> *With or without the benefits of altruism?*  
> *Is there a different  $c_{max}$  for each individual, or is*

- > *c*max an average over the population? (Your claim
- > that it is a "maximand" suggests to me that it is
- > a population average, but other things you have
- > written seem to contradict this.) Also, that
- > "into one population" still strikes me as a little
- > mysterious. You seem to be suggesting that an organism
- > has multiple fitnesses – one for each population that
- > it "reproduces into". I can imagine how this complication
- > might be useful in analyzing some kinds of "structured
- > populations", but until I understand how it works, it
- > can't understand *c*max or the meaning you give to *c*.

JE:–

Maximands are NOT population averages.

Ok. You don't understand what a maximand fitness is. Lets clear that up. The total number of fertile forms reproduced into one population by each parent is one maximand i.e. one total Darwinian fitness. Evolution is per population but selection is per individual. One individual may have as many independent fitnesses as populations it exports its reproductions into. This is like a person having many different bank accounts in many different currencies in many different countries. He may be bankrupt in one and a millionaire in another (depending on agreements between countries).

At the moment the Darwinian maximand fitness cannot be predicted except in retrospect. The aim is to be able to predict it. Thus *c*max is the Darwinian maximand fitness expressed as a cost, i.e. you cannot pay more. If you pay *c*max that is it, you are now Darwinian fitness bankrupt within that population.

> > JE:–

> > *No total fitness even exists*

> > *within Hamilton's Rule because ALL Neo*

> > *Darwinian fitnesses are defined as ongoing.*

> JM:–

> *I'm not sure what "ongoing" means in this context.*

JE:–

All Neo Darwinian fitness counts are ongoing. A gene can be selected for at the 1st organism generation and then selected against in the 2nd only to be selected for in the next ..for ever and ever, amen. This why *c* the sign of *c* remains arbitrary until *c*max is reached. Only here is

gene centric Neo Darwinian ongoing fitness  
nonsense halted within the rule so the  
sign of c becomes \_non\_ arbitrary.

> *JM:*–  
> *But the reason why no total fitnesses appear in the*  
> *rule is simple. We subtracted two total fitnesses*  
> *(of the donor) to get c..*

*JE:*–  
It is impossible to have TWO total  
fitnesses for the same donor.  
Such a supposition is hopelessly  
irrational. You may as well argue,  
like Enron accounts argued, that an  
accounting entry can be either  
a debit or a credit depending  
on how you felt at the time  
allowing more than one  
contradictory bank account  
total for any one company.

However, prove me wrong and  
produce these two mythical  
\_fitness totals\_ for the same  
donor.

> *JM:*–  
> *and we subtracted two total*  
> *fitnesses (of the recipient)*  
> *to get b.*

*JE:*–  
Nonsense.  
(as above).

> *JM:*–  
> *Having*  
> *performed this subtraction, there are not total*  
> *fitnesses left lying around.*

Yes, m the deleted baseline fitness.

You may find that when it is  
included the rule now becomes:

$$rb-c > m$$

Most of the fitness within  
Hamilton's rule lies underwater  
like an iceberg: the deleted baseline

fitness m.

> > *JE*:–

> > *This is why the sign of c must remain*

> > *arbitrary within the rule.*

> *And I continue to fail to understand what you are*

> *saying here. Arbitrary in what sense?*

*JE*:–

As Forrest Gump said:

"stupid is as stupid does"

Likewise: arbitrary is as arbitray  
does.

> *JM*:–

> *The sign of c is completely determined*

> *by the subtraction that yielded c.*

*JE*:–

This is just a relative measure  
(a comparison of rb to c by  
simple subtraction over an arbitrary  
time period) and not an absolute  
measure (the same comparison over  
a defined time period). No time  
period to complete rb is defined  
within Hamilton's Rule so it can  
only be forced to completion  
when cmax is paid. This is why  
only this condition proves altruism  
within the rule bit remains DELETED  
by Hamilton et al.

> *JM*:–

> *If the subtraction*

> *yields a negative number, then the sign of c is*

> *negative. How is this "arbitrary"?*

*JE*:–

Because the rb fitness count remains  
incomplete until cmax is spent.  
Until cmax is spent all rb fitness  
counts remain INCOMPLETE.

> > *JE*:–

> > *I have provided;*

> > *1) A simple model of total Darwinian fitness.*

> > *2) A refutable experiment within nature*

> > *that can entirely refute Total Darwinian Fitness.*

> > 3) A rule that only Total Darwinian Fitness  
> > can provide that entirely contradicts  
> > Hamilton's Rule:

> > \_\_\_\_\_  
> > Edser's Rule: No total Darwinian fitness  
> > can be selected to be reduced, no exceptions.  
> > \_\_\_\_\_

> JM:–  
> But you haven't said (or perhaps, I just haven't read  
> where you said) what is meant by the phrase "selected  
> to be reduced". How would you recognize that your  
> experiment had shown that fitness was selected to be  
> reduced and thus provided an (unwelcome and unexpected)  
> refutation of Darwin?

JE:–  
Dear oh dear, why is it always ME  
who has to reiterate evolutionary  
theory basics time and time again?

"Selected to be reduced" means  
exactly what says! One Darwinian  
maximand total CAN be reduced by  
ANY event OTHER THAN A NATURALLY  
SELECTED EVENT.

> > JE:–  
> > I have shown by simple deductive reasoning  
> > that if all terms within any mathematical  
> > expression are just variables then that  
> > expression remains mathematically valid  
> > but not scientifically valid.

> JM:–  
> Disagree. And I provided my reasoning.

JE:–  
What reasoning? None exist in the above  
except your argument, like Enron  
accountants argument, you have provided  
two total fitness counts for one donar..

> > JE:–  
> > I have  
> > gone to the trouble of defining and  
> > providing examples of simplified and  
> > over simplified models arguing what  
> > can be a valid or just an invalid use  
> > of them. Nobody else here has done so.

- > *JM*:–
- > *Because nobody else thinks that the distinction*
- > *between simplified and oversimplified models*
- > *is significant. To be honest, I didn't even*
- > *realize that you were making this distinction*
- > *until this thread.*

*JE*:–

The argument is circular. "Nobody else thinks that the distinction between simplified and oversimplified models is significant" because their view of reality is based on just a model within which nobody thinks that the distinction between simplified and oversimplified models is significant.

Can I suggest that someone pull their head out of their model backside (you can't stick your head up your backside and stay alive in reality) and reply to the argument that the deletion of all constants within any mathematical expression is logical but not rational.

Science is ENTIRELY based on reasoned argument where all reasoned arguments are logical but not all logical arguments are rational, e.g. the proposition of –time within any scientific notion is logical but irrational. Why is this the case? Simply because anything becomes possible if time can be reversed and no documented observation of –t has ever observed .

Any documented observation –t within nature refutes all sciences (physical and biological) as we know it, but it does NOT refute mathematics.

---

Please answer this question:  
Is mathematics a science?

---

- > > *JE*:–
- > > *JM's discussion did not even attempt*
- > > *to discriminate between model use and*
- > > *misuse.*

> *JM:*–  
> *Because I believe that there are countless ways of*  
> *misusing models.*

*JE:*–  
Please provide JUST ONE specific example  
and then define what constitutes a use  
and a misuse of it.

> > > *JM:*–  
> > > *I think that charges of evasion are more justified in*  
> > > *the other direction. I'll refrain from counter-charging*  
> > > *lack of integrity; that would be redundant, because*  
> > > *I am accusing you of deliberate and malicious lying.*  
> > > *Again, I ask, Josh, isn't there something that can be*  
> > > *done about this?*

> > *JE:*–  
> > *yes there is: Please just answer the questions*  
> > *asked or prove that question was not logically*  
> > *valid.*

> *JM:*–  
> *I can't answer the question if the question is not*  
> *understood (by ME).*

*JE:*–  
Then PLEASE say so or ask BOH  
who DOES understand it instead of the  
deceitful rubbish you wrote, including  
your statement that I lied.

> *JE:*–  
> *Whether YOU understand your questions*  
> *is totally irrelevant to whether I understand them.*

*JE:*–  
No. The question makes logical sense.  
You must provide an answer. It appears,  
after all this time that your  
difficulty is understanding the RATIONAL  
difference between just a relative and  
an absolute cost. I hope you don't  
run a business...

> *JM:*–  
> *And I can't prove that a question is not logically*  
> *valid unless it is the case that a question can be*  
> *unambiguously interpreted in only one way.*

JE:–

If a question is not logical then it has no answer because it makes no sense at all. Here you have to provide the contradiction that exists within the question.

> > *JE:–*

> > *Stop insulting the intelligence of sbe*

> > *reader's with (thankfully) comical but entirely*

> > *evasive and insulting nonsense.*

> *JM:–*

> *And I repeat: Your perception of evasion is paranoid.*

> *(Though your perception of insults seems to be normal!)*

> *Your questions fail to find answers because they are*

> *not understood as meaningful questions.*

JE:–

You remain ENTIRELY DELUSIONAL  
BOH ANSWERED THE QUESTION.

Dear oh dear...

For sbe reader's:

Here is my candid opinion.

JM understands both the question and BOH's answer. He also understands the dire implications of BOH's answer: the rule was and remains irrational so it cannot be used as a stand alone fitness accounting device to determine when altruism and non altruism can evolve in nature as it has been for over 50 years.

BOH admits that the sign of c remains arbitrary and has hinted that the rule was never meant to be used in certain ways (he will not list what they are). When pressed to identify them he just suggests he is going for long stiff drink. It is obvious to me that BOH cannot bring himself to admit that what follows from his answer was the rule was misused. This is because he would be letting down his own tribe. Some tribal elder would not like it so BOH might wake up one morning with a horses head in his bed...

My very best regards,

John Edser  
Independent Researcher

Re: Integrity

sci.bio.evolution: Re: Integrity

PO Box 266  
Church Pt  
NSW 2105  
Australia

[edser@tpg.com.au](mailto:edser@tpg.com.au)