

Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-11/msg00256.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Wed, 16 Nov 2005 13:20:16 -0500 (EST)
-

"Perplexed in Peoria" jimmenegay@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:-

>>> name_and_address_supplied@xxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:-

>>>> If we want to show that Hamilton's

>>>> rule is a general principle, this is the way we have to go. But if

> we

>>>> want to say anything about causality we need an explicit model, and

>>>> with that disappears our generality.

>>> JE:-

>>> Yes, Popper would agree with you because the most general of

> statements are

>>> just epistemological perpetual motion machines, i.e. tautologies where

>>> causality remains 100% reversible. So far, Hamilton's Rule has not

> been

>>> supplied with any empirically based fitness limits which are

> absolutely

>>> required to break Hamilton's fitness tautology. Like Price's

> mathematics, HR

>>> does not represent a valid proposition of science.

> John, you seem to limit 'proposition of science' to things that I would

> call 'laws of nature'.

JE:-

Jim, I limit propositions of science to conjectures (theories) that can be verified or refuted within nature.

> Hamilton's law – at least the 1970 tautological

> version – is not a law of nature. It is a theorem of mathematics. But

> that doesn't mean that it is useless to scientists. Science makes use

> of a variety of propositions with no inherent physical content –

> Liouville's theorem, Bayes's theorem, Wigner's CPT theorem, etc.

JE:-

The issue here concerns the proper or improper use of heuristics within the

Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule

empirically based sciences. Hamilton's Rule was and remains an empty tautology of mathematics incorrectly proffered as valid theory of nature in its own right. Please take another look at the premises that Felsenstein used to derive HR and confirm or deny to readers that the premises he used were tautological. I have requested all sbe posters of integrity to make this basic test on a number of different occasions where I have stated will not do this for anybody here. I find it inconceivable that anybody of integrity would simply refuse to make this test.

HR is derived from a major oversimplification of Darwinism where TDF for the actor was and remains, deleted. This has allowed cause and effect to become reversed within a 100% relative proposition providing the empirically false gene centric argument that "genes use organisms to replicate genes" which is permeating consciousness like Herbert Spencer's tautology "survival of the fittest" did with disastrous results. The testable scientific truth is the contrary proposition: organisms use genes to reproduce organisms. It is just history repeating itself because we flatly refuse to correct the errors of the past. HR also allowed two critical simplifications: the deletion of all epistasis e within relatedness r^e by just artificially fixing e to 1 and the deletion of the number of recipients n which was and remains, absolutely required to CORRECTLY convert Hamilton's ONE group centric b selectee into a heuristic gene centric measure so that it could be compared to a gene centric version of the ONE organism centric c with which it competes for x reproductive resources. HR remains uncorrected for one oversimplification and two simplifications yet it has been allowed to contest and win against the empirically based theory it was oversimplified from which constitutes an utter misuse of Hamilton's model, i.e. just an absurdity.

>> NAS:–

>> See above.

>>

>> Also, natural selection does not care about causation, only

>> correlation. A trait that is correlated with high fitness is favoured,

>> whether it caused that high fitness or not.

> That depends on whether you wish to view 'natural selection' as a

> biological process (in which case formulas describing it ARE in some

> weak sense 'laws of nature') or whether you only wish to view 'natural

> selection' as a technique for organizing data about past populations.

JE:–

Darwin's description of the non random process of natural selection which he employed within a very specific theory of evolution which was then and remains today empirically based, did allow that theory to be verified or refuted within nature so it is NOT based on just "correlations" it is based on very specific predictions of nature.

> If you want to view it as a biological process, which continues in the

> present day, then you need to attach some kind of causality to those

> correlations, if only so that you can project the observed motions of

Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule

> the past into the future.

JE

The "causality to those correlations" is non random natural selection operating within refutable Darwinian theory providing predictions of non random gene freq. changes within one population a just an effect and NOT as a cause. That "cause" is TDF which represents a Darwinian maximand fitness. This means that TDF cannot be selected to be reduced as Hamilton et al continue argue that it can be within however, just a misused heuristic exercise. I argue that TDF represents the only EMPIRICALLY refutable maximand that actually exists within evolutionary theory where I have outlined a test to refutation for this conjecture. NAS argues that inclusive fitness is such a maximand. I have pointed out to him that a relative fitness cannot constitute a maximand simply because you cannot differentiate it from a minimand within a 100% relative proposition where a minimand represents a contrary proposition to a maximand so it cannot be both.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx

• *Follow-Ups:*

◆ *Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule*

◇ *From:* Perplexed in Peoria

• Prev by Date: *Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule*

• Next by Date: *Re: Vent Life? Not the O2 dependent part*

• Previous by thread: *Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule*

Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule

- Next by thread: ***Re: Removing Lewontin's Fallacy From Hamilton's Rule***
- Index(es):
 - ◆ *Date*
 - ◆ *Thread*