

Re: Hamilton's Rule is Xeno's Paradox (was Re: Underestimating

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-10/msg00803.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 26 Oct 2005 01:11:45 -0400 (EDT)
-

William Morse wdmorse@xxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:–

- > You may want to note that E Kurtz was responding to John Edser's post,
- > and accusing John of being an idiot. I do agree that while John is
- > exasperating, and has on occasion made personal attacks himself, ad
- > hominem arguments have no place on the newsgroup.

JE:

I would like to point out that stating that something is "absurd" is not a "personal attack" yet it is incorrectly taken to be so by many here. Also, I do not consider just a humorous description of population genetics as a "Mad Hatter's Tea Party" to be an unwarranted attack on population genetics. I do not consider calling Prof. Felsenstein "The Pope of Neo Darwinism to be a personal attack on him, just a lampooning of what I continue to argue to be Felsenstein's consistent and utter misuse of oversimplified models within evolutionary theory produced by Felsenstein et al throwing out Karl Poppers most basic requirement: theories of nature must remain refutable. Hamilton's Rule remains not refutable yet it is allowed to contest, win against and finally replace refutable Darwinism by only HEURISTICALLY forcing organism fitness altruism at the Darwinian level of selection.

- > I had long thought, as EKurtz has argued, that Zeno's paradox was
- > adequately resolved by the theory of limits. However, I do remember an
- > article a number of years ago in Scientific American that challenged this
- > resolution, as you have done. Unfortunately I am not a good enough
- > theoretical mathematician to comment more, and in any case I don't think
- > the discussion belongs on sbe. However, I have enjoyed your further
- > thought experiments on Achilles–tortoise races.

JE:–

The paradox was never empirically based (none of them ever are). The original mathematical description of the empirical events described by just a mathematical paradox was flawed because the constant time had been deleted. Simple. Mathematics cannot make empirical sense unless at least one constant algebraic term is included so as to provide a critical frame of reference for the mathematical description. Any mathematical description of an empirical event remains a meaningless tautological description unless at least one algebraic constant term is included.

Re: Hamilton's Rule is Xeno's Paradox (was Re: Underestimating

If you consider yourself to be a non biased person of integrity then please take another look at Felsenstein's starting assumptions for his derivation of HR.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx

• ***Follow-Ups:***

◆ ***Re: Hamilton's Rule is Xeno's Paradox (was Re: Underestimating***

◇ *From:* g

• Prev by Date: ***Re: Hamilton's Rule: light at the end of a LONG tunnel?***

• Next by Date: ***Re: Hamilton's Rule: light at the end of a LONG tunnel?***

• Previous by thread: ***Re: Hamilton's Rule is Xeno's Paradox (was Re: Underestimating***

• Next by thread: ***Re: Hamilton's Rule is Xeno's Paradox (was Re: Underestimating***

• Index(es):

◆ ***Date***

◆ ***Thread***