

Edser: semantic insanity.

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-02/0791.html>

From: Jim McGinn (jimmcginn_at_yahoo.com)

Date: 02/25/05

Date: Fri, 25 Feb 2005 13:43:48 -0500 (EST)

John Edser wrote:

- > *McGinn refuses to admit that genes IBD*
- > *are absolutely required just to find (as*
- > *a probability) the parental gene selectee*
- > *in order to be able to allocate any inclusive*
- > *fitness*

I can't make any sense of this and past experience tells me it would be futile to ask for clarification.

- > *(yet he argues FOR fitness multilevels) while O'Hara,*
- > *Felsenstein, Morse etc refuse to admit that genes nonIBD*
- > *are also absolutely required to identify (again as just*
- > *another probability) that the replicate gene (note:*
- > *replicated over organism and not gene generations)*
- > *is the same gene as the parent gene, i.e. is not a*
- > *mutation where this applies no matter how you define*
- > *"sameness".*
- >
- > *So what exactly is the logic that is being evaded? Relatedness*
- > *IBD is NOT the same as genes IBD. This is because relatedness*
- > *IBD requires that the gene replicate be the same gene*
- > *AND be replicated from the same gene parent at an*
- > *independent gene level of selection. This absolutely*
- > *requires both probabilities to be multiplied.*
- >
- > *This debate is absurd. No duty of care is being*
- > *demonstrated by the so called professionals that*
- > *post here. The fact that they continue to refuse to*
- > *acknowledge that both probabilities have to be assumed*
- > *and then multiplied within Hamilton's logic proves they*
- > *are either incompetent or just playing politics with*
- > *evolutionary science (or both).*

I'm not sure what it is you think we should acknowledge or what is the scientific rationale that underlies your strong belief that we should acknowledge it, whatever

it is.

- > *An independent gene level of selection is the*
- > *_necessary_ rationale*

You need to first establish why it is necessary instead of just shouting it from the mountain top.

- > *that is being evaded by McGinn,*
- > *Felsenstein, O'Hara Morse, Menegay etc. The reason they*
- > *will do anything to evade it is because of the empirical*
- > *FACT that not one single independent gene fitness has ever*
- > *been documented in nature.*

Oh, so this is an empirical fact. Is there such thing as a non-empirical fact? What's the problem/issue that this, "empirical fact," supposedly solves/resolves. (Not that I'm under the slightest illusion that I'll actually get an intelligent response to this question.)

- > *The words, "dependent" and*
- > *"independent" re: fitness never left the lips of*
- > *any of these protagonists.*

Yes, apparently I didn't get that memo. Instead of whining why don't you explain your little 'dependent independent' distinction and let us come to our own conclusions about it's usefulness.

- > *Yet this is where an exact*
- > *fault line invisibly exists within the mathematics of*
- > *Hamilton's Rule. Hamilton's gene has to pass TWO and*
- > *not just ONE level of selection. Nobody wishes to*
- > *detail how Hamilton's gene could ever do so*

I'm not going to pretend to know what you mean by this but if it is as useful as you suggest then why don't you show us.

- > *(except by*
- > *some form of Neo Darwinian magic).*
- >
- > *Hamilton et al do not have any scientific rationale*
- > *for their mathematics.*

Yes, it's perpetual-motion-machine logic.

- > *McGinn's assumption of many*
- > *undefined fitness multi-levels tested as just*
- > *the one extra level by Hamilton et al (an*

Edser: semantic insanity.

- > *independent gene level of selection contesting*
- > *a Darwinian fertile organism level) does not*
- > *even exist within nature.*

I don't see the relevance of this comment.

- > *To verify that it could exist at least one*
- > *documented instance of the fitness of a trait*
- > *being the simple addition of the fitnesses of*
- > *a minimum of two genes at two loci has to exist.*
- > *It doesn't. Only just the one Darwinian level has*
- > *ever been empirically observed within nature*
- > *(can be verified or refuted within nature).*

Instead of constant whining why don't you set up a thought experiment. This may help you clarify what is you are trying to say. If you do, I think you will eventually find that your issues have more to do with semantics than science.

- > *At some stage the protagonists are going to have*
- > *to leave their Ivory Tower and take a walk in*
- > *the park of reality otherwise the people who pay*
- > *for the tower are going to have it demolished*
- > *because it has become embarrassingly irrelevant.*

Unfortunately this discipline passed this point a long long time ago.

John, many people on this NG suffer from the illusion that they understand evolutionary theory despite the obvious fact that they do not. For most of them this is a fatal flaw which they will never recover. Your issues are worse still. Your problems with evolutionary theory are further complicated by semantic insanity.

You'll have, no doubt, noticed that when the other dimwits on this NG lose an argument against me they clam up. They go into defensive mode. You do the opposite. You start spinning out of control coming up with more and more creative solutions that involve you latest all encompassing truths hot off the presses from John Edser.

And its too bad too, because you obviously have a lot of energy and commitment to the discipline.

Jim