

Re: evolution explains what?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-08/msg00557.html>

- *From:* "JoeSixPack" <olegp@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 29 Aug 2005 12:32:13 -0400 (EDT)
-

"John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:deq9vi\\$1gf6\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:deq9vi$1gf6$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

>

> "JoeSixPack" olegp@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:-

>

- > 1) Darwinism entirely prohibits the evolution of organism fitness
- > altruism, i.e. if ever documented within nature Darwinism (the only
- > valid theory of evolution that we have) stands refuted.
- >
- > 2) Hamilton's rationale which is alone employed to sustain organism
- > fitness altruism within gene centric evolutionary theory is false and
- > can be proven to be so.
- >
- > 3) Organism fitness altruism has been routinely confused with organism
- > fitness mutualism but only because of the consistent misuse of
- > Hamilton's rationale. This misuse includes (amazingly) false fitness
- > accounting techniques which employ the same false rationale as the
- > fraudulent Enron accounting scheme: allow a negative credit to remain a
- > credit and not a debit. The net result is that Hamilton's actor has been
- > short changed within $-rb < -c$ (which is mathematically identical to $rb > c$
- > but not biologically equivalent) by exactly A units of fitness. Why has
- > this been done? Because this accounting error is required to sustain the
- > false Neo Darwinian notion that Hamilton's actor is acting
- > altruistically within $-rb < -c$ AND $rb > c$. I can only conclude that some
- > sort of political agenda is operating within Neo Darwinism. Why? Because
- > I cannot imagine how anybody could seriously argue that such an obvious
- > error remained "overlooked" for nearly fifty years.
- >
- >
- > 4) To avoid responsibility for their actions today's gene centric Neo
- > Darwinists have discarded Karl Popper's epistemology which simply
- > requires valid scientific theory to remain refutable. Today "anything
- > goes", e.g. Hamilton's Rule, because it has become impossible to
- > separate a belief from a scientific theory. This is why creationists
- > today have validly argued that "creation science" should be allowed to
- > be taught in science classes! This so called "science" has always been
- > excluded because it remains non refutable and for absolutely no other

Re: evolution explains what?

- > reason. Thus the error of polluting the minds of children within science
- > lessons is NOT the fault of the non evolutionists it is the fault of the
- > Neo Darwinists who opened this floodgate of horrors simply because they
- > decided to discard Popper.
- >
- >> Hereditary traits that benefit the community more than the
- >> individual are abundant in nature. Self-sacrifice is only one example.
- >
- > JE:–
- > These traits can be explained using organism fitness mutualism. I am
- > happy to debate anybody just using this premise to explain the evolution
- > of these type of traits. The reason why Neo Darwinists have failed to
- > just look at these traits in any other way, e.g. as caused by mutualism
- > and not altruism using basic scepticism is only because they have
- > falsely defined organism fitness mutualism within Hamilton's Rule to be
- > any negative value of c . In reality no mutualism is represented within
- > Hamilton's Rule, i.e. all of organism fitness mutualism has been
- > excluded from the rule so no valid argument for the evolution of
- > mutualistic traits even exists within Neo Darwinism.
- >

The dynamic is very different within a group than between groups. Selfishness is selected for within the group, but selfish groups are less fit than altruistic groups, so they are selected against, en masse.

This process creates an oscillating effect, producing selfish, then altruistic populations, that continues until some other genetic adaptation takes effect, such as instinctual intolerance for selfish individuals within the group.

- **References:**

- ◆ ***Re: evolution explains what?***

◇ From: John Edser

- Prev by Date: ***Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE***
- Next by Date: ***Speciation question***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: evolution explains what?***
- Next by thread: ***Re: evolution explains what?***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ ***Date***
 - ◆ ***Thread***