

Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-09/msg00365.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 16 Sep 2005 01:03:44 -0400 (EDT)
-

"g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote

Hi Gil,

Firstly, my apologies for any delay. I depend of receiving sbe as an email sent by Josh . However, nothing was sent to my email address this week.

- >> Popper's refutation tool is the only thing that can
- >> remove evasion because it prohibits it _entirely_.
- >> I employ Hamilton's Rule as a litmus test of gene centric Neo Darwinism.
- >> The rule cannot possibly do what Neo Darwinists insist that it can:
- >> provide an empirically based rationale for the evolution of organism
- >> fitness altruism within nature. The Neo Darwinists that post here refuse
- >> to take any responsibility for the consistent misuse of this model.

>snip<

- > Let me see if I can break down the above and ask you to explain it as you
- > would to a bright fourth grader:
- >>I employ Hamilton's Rule as a litmus test of gene centric Neo Darwinism.
- > If I had never heard of Hamilton's Rule nor Darwinism nor New Darwinism,
- and
- > if I had never used litmus paper to test the ph of something, and you
- really
- > wanted to explain this, how might you word it?

JE:-

Ok. Some very powerful guys think they can explain why some living things appear to help each other even when this provides a risk of almost certain death to the helper. To be able to do so they made up some maths called ?Hamilton?s Rule? which they say provides an correct explanation as to how this type of behavior evolves in nature. While mathematical models are ok they cannot replace reality. For example, your favorite scaled down model of the titanic, while true in many details, cannot even support your pet cat in our pond let alone 1000?s of people in the open sea like the real titanic did before it sank. Even worse then that your model actually has one side removed just so we can see the engine room etc more easily so it would not even float! A reduced size model that can float is called ?simplified? while a model boat that cannot even float is called ?oversimplified?. The only

Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

reason these models even exist is because they help us to understand the things that we know and love. It would be really silly if anybody said that their favorite model can replace the thing they were modeled from. However, this type of silly business appears to be happening a lot these days by people who should know better. In a study called "Neo Darwinism" a model called "Hamilton's Rule" (which is a model just like a model boat) was used to replace the idea it was modeled from which in this case was a really good idea put forward by Darwin and Wallace over 150 years ago. Models can be very useful because they are much easier and cheaper to study than the real thing. However they become more than useless if they attempt to replace the reality they were modeled from. This type of silly business appears to be happening a lot these days so the model called Hamilton's Rule may be useful to study to try to find out why. This is like using those bits of paper called "litmus paper" that are in your chemistry set. These turn pink/red for acids like lemon juice or a shade of blue for alkalis like baking soda except that this time we are testing the difference between truth and untruth in Neo Darwinism using Hamilton's Rule as a litmus paper.

>> JE

>> The rule cannot possibly do what Neo Darwinists insist that it can:

> Again, if I had never heard of Darwin nor of Neo Darwinism, how would you
> explain to me that there are some people who believe (whatever) and what
it
> is they believe that you do not.

JE:–

Darwin and Wallace explained how one species can evolve from another in such a way that anybody in the world could test the truth or untruth of it for themselves but only if they could think. Sadly, most people cannot think so their idea made a really big stink. It challenged the accepted idea which could not be tested, that each species remains fixed because it was only believed they were separately created. Neither Darwin or Wallace knew what exactly was passed on from parent to parent but a monk called Mendel who lived before Darwin and Wallace had already worked that out doing some experiments on plants. Sadly, neither Darwin or Wallace ever found that out. After Darwin and Wallace died Mendel's experiments were rediscovered. Mendel had found out that only things called genes are passed on from parent to children. These coded for some of the things we can observe about ourselves like eye color, how tall we are or what color skin that we have. The people who attempted to join what Mendel had found out to what Darwin and Wallace had found out were called "Neo Darwinists". They had a really hard job ahead of them because each one of us has many genes but we pass on just a jumble of half of them to each of our children. Darwin and Wallace's idea stated that parents can be selected for or against in nature without anything that knows what it is doing. This may seem silly but can be proven to happen in nature. They called this very important process "natural selection". It was this they said caused the evolution of one species into another but only over very long periods of time. Darwin and Wallace allowed nature to select individual parents but the Neo Darwinists decided to allow nature to select individual genes in just a mathematical model of what was actually happening

Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

in nature because this was much easier. In nature individual genes are not selected, only individual parents, each of which have about 30,000 genes which are all selected at once every time just one parent is selected.

>> JE:–

>> provide an empirically based rationale for the evolution of organism

>> fitness altruism within nature.

> If I did not know the meaning of 'empirically based,' nor what a rationale

> is, what everyday words could be used to state your meaning here.

JE:–

For nature to be able to select things (even though nobody anywhere is making a selection) a measure called 'fitness' is used. This just means how well you fit in with your surroundings. Taller people often play basketball better than shorter people whereas shorter people are often make better weight lifters. This is why over time, the players in each game tend to become a certain body type. This is something like natural selection because the game of sport and not just a person is doing the selecting. This sort of thing is called a 'rationale' simply because it makes sense. In nature, parents with more fitness marks are selected for and those with less selected against, no matter if they like it or not. As a result many genes are selected for and against each and every time just one individual parent is selected for or against. Because all of this can be observed within nature it is called an 'empirically based' rationale which means it makes sense of nature. If it could only ever be observed as just numbers on a bit of paper it would be called a model. The model that each gene is selected and not each parent is only ever observed as just numbers on a bit of paper so it is just a non empirically based logic, i.e. does not make sense of nature just a model of nature. What we call science is only interested in what actually happens in nature so what happens as just numbers on bits of paper must also be what actually happens in nature to make any sense.

> Now, as for the term 'altruism,' it is another fuzzy term.

> I know my saying that will drive at least one sbe contributor you and I know

> and like up the wall. But what that one never seems to answer is the basic

> question of how he would explain its meaning without using that buzz word.

JE:–

The correct term is: 'cost'.

> If a word is a fuzzy buzz word, and a person has no ability to find any less

> ambiguous way of explaining something he claims to understand... that leaves

> me no choice but to wonder whether "quotations" and formal

> definitions comprise true understanding.

Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

> Have you ever taught classes. I have.

JE:–

Yes I have. I have the utmost respect for the naïve honesty of most questions asked by students, particularly what is often incorrectly referred to 'obvious' or 'silly' questions. One of the best questions I have ever been asked was: 'do two dead halves of a sheep equal one live sheep?'

> And if you have, then you will know

> by experience what I am talking about when I say that there are students who

> can memorize things all day long and spit them out on exam papers; but it is

> a rare and rewarding experience to find a student who can explain something

> equally as clearly as the text book he learns from, or even MORE clearly

> than the book version.

>snip for brevity<

JE:–

Yes, the more gifted students (IMHO) asked more 'stupid' questions and did either worse OR better on standard tests.

My Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx

• ***Follow-Ups:***

◆ ***Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE***

◇ *From:* g

• Prev by Date: ***Re: Unequal branch lengths***

• Next by Date: ***Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE***

• Previous by thread: ***Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE***

• Next by thread: ***Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE***

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

Re: A FUNDAMENTAL ISSUE

◆ *Thread*