

Re: Paper: Contingent movement and cooperation evolve under

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-10/msg00071.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 4 Oct 2005 21:18:15 -0400 (EDT)
-

> No it doesn't. It's only a "key puzzle" among those biologists who believe
> that every single animal behavior must be due to adaptation.

JE:-

Darwinian theorists argue that only selection can provide a non random gene freq pattern of change. THAT IS ALL.

Not much is new under the sun. Moran's argument is just a repeat of the worthless straw man that the mutationists put up so many years ago. Today, "random drift" replaces "random mutation" within exactly the same false argument. It just remains basic to any science that random patterns must always be separated from non random patterns simply because only non random patterns can be definitive. This remains the case within Darwinism where the non random process of selection operates on ubiquitous heritable random variation to produce evolution within one population. However, because of chronic oversimplified model misuse Neo Darwinism today argues that evolution is "any gene freq. change in a deme", i.e. it elevates just a random event caused by sampling error to the status of an evolutionary event when it was just temporal variation and not evolution. Moran et al simply repeat the false mutationist logic wherein random mutation was incorrectly argued to produce evolution and not just variation. The net result in both cases is the reduction of Darwinian theory to become just an empty tautology. Here selection acts on ubiquitous evolution (not variation) to produce, yes you guessed it, evolution! i.e. evolution produces evolution without any selection required.

Until Neo Darwinists argue that evolution can only validly be defined as any NON RANDOM gene freq. change in a deme, evolutionary theory will remain languishing as just a mindless tautology along with racism and many other witchcrafts allowing science classes today to become infected with so called "intelligent design theory" (the most modern reincarnation of witchcraft).

> Cooperation, altruism, and cheating may not have specific genetic causes.
> They may be mostly social phenomena. Alternatively, they may have
> significant genetic causes but the behaviours are actually neutral or
> detrimental with respect to survival. They may be spandrels, or necessary

Re: Paper: Contingent movement and cooperation evolve under

- > consequences of something else that is beneficial. None of these
- > possibilities are the least bit "puzzling."

JE:–

Incredible. A gene that is being argued to force you to donate your limited resources so that your own fitness is supposed to become reduced in the short term may be just a "spandrel"? Is this the sort of nonsense you teach your hapless students?

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx

-
- Prev by Date: [*Re: NS and AaD curves*](#)
 - Next by Date: [*Biology and Mathematics*](#)
 - Previous by thread: [*Re: origin of thoughts*](#)
 - Next by thread: [*Biology and Mathematics*](#)
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ [*Date*](#)
 - ◆ [*Thread*](#)