

Re: Theories, models, and simplifications

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-02/0098.html>

From: John Edser (*edser_at_tpg.com.au*)

Date: 02/03/05

Date: Thu, 3 Feb 2005 14:54:48 -0500 (EST)

>>>>> *JE:-*

>>>>> *Until this entirely missing point of*

>>>>> *refutation is supplied forthwith, ...*

>>>>> *JM:-*

>>>>> *... I wish you had omitted that "forthwith".*

>>>>> *The people you converse with here on sbe are not robots*

>>>>> *or lackeys that you can order around. Stop making demands*

>>>>> *of people. I demand that you stop doing this. ;-)*

>>>> *JE:-*

>>>> *Yet again, you seem not to wish to understand*

>>>> *that the scientific method is making this demand.*

>>>> *I am simply articulating it. Please stop*

>>>> *shooting the messenger.*

>>> *JM:-*

>>> *Oh, wonderful! McGinn casts himself as the hero of a*

>>> *fairy tale. Edser annoints himself as the messenger*

>>> *for "the scientific method". You two are certainly*

>>> *not "complimentary", as you put it, but you seem to*

>>> *be cut from the same (transparent) cloth.*

>>> *And people sometimes tell me that *I* am arrogant...*

>> *JE:-*

>> *The baseline of any discussion within the sciences*

>> *is some sort of agreement on the scientific method.*

> *JM:-*

> *John, the "scientific method", as I understand it, does not*

> *even address the question of the proper protocols for*

> *our disputation. You and I, John, are not conducting*

> *experiments, and experimentation is at the heart of*

> *what the "scientific method" is about.*

JE:-

Jim, the fact is you are not conducting

experiments but I am and all of science is, all of the time. A year or two ago I received a censure from Josh about my comment that to do science "just read Darwin". Science is not only done by men in white coats working in labs it is done by inductive and then deductive thinking. Most of this work has to be done before a test tube is even washed. This thinking work is only possible using the scientific method. If you read Darwin you will see his mind was a working laboratory almost all of the time where he studiously adhered to the scientific method in his thoughts.

> > *JE:–*
> > *You have agreed with Popper's requirement for refutation*
> > *but you flatly refuse to live up to it. When I point this*
> > *out you have the gall to suggest that I am being*
> > *arrogant. Either junk Popper or provide an apology.*

> *JM:–*
> *Perhaps I will choose to Junk Edser's "improvements" on*
> *Popper, instead. Or, perhaps I also will adhere to*
> *a self-invented improved version of Popper. I have*
> *other choices here besides the two you list!*

JE:–
Please do either. Popper and not Edser's "improvements" requires you to produce a refutation for either, Hamilton's Rule itself or the theory it was oversimplified from. You cannot pass off this responsibility and agree with Popper's basic requirement for the sciences. Either provide the missing refutation or junk Popper and stop blaming me for this quite obvious Popperian demand!

> *snip*<

> > *JM:–*
> > *The scientific method requires you to answer*
> > *any question that is not illogical. It also*
> > *requires you to say when you do not understand*
> > *a question and admit it. Also it requires you*
> > *to freely admit when you cannot provide*
> > *an answer. Endless evasion*
> > *is evidence of a lack of integrity. It undermines*
> > *the scientific method. If you do not agree then*
> > *please list your reasons why.*

> JM:–

> *Disagree. I think you have the "scientific method"*
> *confused with something that might be called the*
> *"philosophical method". But I don't think that your*
> *methodology is a good example of the best practices*
> *in philosophy.*

JE:–

I am not talking "philosophy". Testing refutable ideas against nature is what Popper demarks as science. You have agreed with Popper. In order to do science you must ask and answer questions. I can't imagine why you think experimental methodology does not require a rational dialogue. Science is not a machine you can purchase from K–mart any more than epistemology is.

>snip<

> > JE:–

> > 3) *Do you agree that the rule remains*
> > *100% relative?*

> JM:–

> *I honestly don't know what this question means. At one*
> *point, I thought it meant "Does the rule contain only*
> *variables; no constants?". My answer to that would be*
> *"yes", since you insist that "r" does not qualify as*
> *a constant.*

JE:–

Ok.

> > JE:–

> > *IF yes: please state what the entire*
> > *rule is 100% relative to?*

> JM:–

> *But then this follow–up question makes absolutely no sense.*
> *How can the lack of a constant force a rule to be*
> *"relative to" something.*

JE:–

Logic dictates that if something is stated to be 100% relative then EITHER:–

- 1) It is just 100% relative to just itself.
- 2) It is 100% relative to something else.

If the rule is not relative to anything at all then it is based on an absolute inductive assumption, i.e. it is a guess.

Since you agreed that the rule was 100% relative you must answer 1) or 2) above OR state that is it not relative to anything. These are all the alternatives unless you can provide another!

> JM:–
> *I'm going to guess that you
> want the "theory" that contained the constant that is now
> "missing". So, I'm guessing that you want me to say that
> Hamilton's rule is 100% relative to Darwin's refutable
> theory. OK, so I've said it. But I have no idea what
> that really means.*

JE:–
You guessed correctly.

It means that the missing constant remains within the parent theory so it only *_seems_* to be missing within the model because the model zoomed in at high power under the epistemological microscope. In this case the microscope was set to maximal high power where not one single constant can be seen. This means nothing of scientific interest exists to be viewed. All you are left with is the logical structure, i.e. the mathematics. You have agreed that mathematics is not a science. This is why.

When you return to the lowest power possible the entire theory can now be viewed from which Hamilton's model only constitutes a *_maximal_* over simplification (a simplification that removes all constants from view). Without at least one constant term no frame of reference exists to measure anything so what is visible cannot be tested to refutation. Of course, in reality, all models remain a sub set of their parent theory. This is why it is absurd to argue, as Hamilton et al argue, that a model can contest its parent theory and then replace it.

Total Darwinian Fitness as the ONE Darwinian maximand fitness can be represented as a constant. When it becomes removed from view the entire ball game changes. Dr Jeckle suddenly changes into Mr Hyde.

- > *JM:-*
- > *I've told you repeatedly that I*
- > *don't think that Darwin has a refutable theory, in the*
- > *sense of "refutable" that was intended by Karl Popper.*
- > *And, while I now understand what YOU mean when you*
- > *say that fitness is a constant, I still don't understand*
- > *what this has to do with refutation.*

JE:-

You never commented on my answer.
Popper was fed Spencer's tautology
in the name of Darwinism by incompetent
Evolutionary Theorists. Given the
level of disinformation POpper was fed
he had no other choice but to conclude
that "Darwinism" was not refutable.
It was, always.

> *snip*>

- > > *JE:-*
- > > *Creationism remains irrefutable. You can't have an*
- > > *argument with an irrefutable proposition and you*
- > > *cannot test it against nature. Therefore it is*
- > > *NOT arrogant to state your position on what the*
- > > *scientific method is because such a declaration*
- > > *is just an obvious **ESSENTIAL**.*

- > *JM:-*
- > *It is not arrogant to state ANY position. It IS arrogant*
- > *to claim to be the spokesperson for "the method" and to*
- > *assert that that self-assumed role makes you exempt from*
- > *the usual standards of polite discourse.*

JE:-

EVERY PERSON HERE must state what
they argue is the scientific method
and not just leave it to K-Mart. I have
stated what I argue to be the scientific
method. Getting anything out of
most others here on this subject is
more difficult than doing dentistry
on a hippo without aesthetic. One
tends not to be "polite" when discussion
hits the brick wall of consistent evasion
re: such basics.

- > > *JE:-*
- > > *Many people here remain two faced. They disallow*
- > > *discussion of creationism but they do not*
- > > *appear to know why they must do so. Thus they*

- > > *allow irrefutable propositions that EVERYBODY*
- > > *LIKES, e.g. random processes can cause evolution,*
- > > *providing evidence for a hopeless level of bias.*
- > > *Science cannot survive in such a world.*

JE:–

Self consistency is the basis
of integrity. If you cannot
act consistently to yourself
then you cannot act consistently
to others.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

PO Box 266
Church Pt
NSW 2105
Australia

edser@tpg.com.au