

Re: Hamilton's Rule In The Mirror

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-03/0420.html>

name_and_address_supplied_at_hotmail.com

Date: 03/12/05

Date: Sat, 12 Mar 2005 00:16:51 -0500 (EST)

John Edser wrote:

- > > > *JE:–*
- > > > *If you think the bank donating*
- > > > *\$1000 to me is the same as me donating \$1000 to the*
- > > > *bank only because both were altruistic acts then*
- > > > *your absurd lack of rationale speaks for itself.*
- >
- > > *NAS:–*
- > > *Your absurd non sequitur speaks volumes.*
- >
- > *JE:–*
- > *No wonder NAS keeps his identity secret.*
- > *The only absurdity here is NAS's failure*
- > *to even attempt to prove his point.*
- >
- > *NAS must prove that the rule in the mirror*
- > *did not allow recipients and actor to change*
- > *roles allowing a negative sign of c for*
- > *the actor to now represent an _altruistic gain_*
- > *for the actor and not just a mutualistic gain*
- > *proving the diagnostic sign of c to be ambiguous.*
- > *My "absurd non sequitur" simply illustrates such*
- > *a reversed role altruistic event.*

Your "reflection" of Hamilton's rule in a "mirror" does no such thing. r, b and c maintain their sign throughout. "–c" means "subtract the cost", which is different from "there is a negative cost".

- > *Typically, NAS just dictates what he wishes to get*
- > *away with and hopes nobody will notice. He employed*
- > *the same tactic when he deleted all algebraic*
- > *terms to disguise this role reversal. He may be able*
- > *to treat his students this way but he will not get*
- > *away with it here.*

I used a numerical counter-example to show that you were wrong. By moving from algebra to numbers I sacrificed some generality, but only

sci.bio.evolution: Re: Hamilton's Rule In The Mirror

one true counter-example was needed to demolish your position. This is called a gambit.