

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

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-11/msg00262.html>

---

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
  - *Date:* Thu, 17 Nov 2005 01:10:28 -0500 (EST)
- 

name\_and\_address\_supplied@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:–

>> Perplexed in Peoria wrote:

>> 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  
>> the past into the future.

> Ah, I was talking about how natural selection doesn't care about  
> causation, only correlation.

JE:–

Which was not correct.

> We, on the other hand, might care about  
> causation, for instance if we wanted to predict the evolution of a  
> particular trait.

JE:–

Darwinian theory predicts a heritable trait can change in an evolutionary way (a way that is NOT represented as just a random pattern of change within one population) as this one trait effects the Total Darwinian Fitness of fertile forms in a dependent and NOT a independent way, i.e. the selection of one trait remains 100% dependent on every other heritable trait within each selected fertile form, no exceptions. The formal term for this is: gene fitness epistasis which remains total per gene per genome. However, within HR it has been deleted as a deliberate oversimplification to allow cause and effect to become reversed within HR, i.e. allow "genes to use bodies to maximally reproduce genes" producing organism altruism via selfish geneism when empirically the contrary proposition remains verified: "bodies use genes to maximally reproduce bodies" predicting selfish organisms which produce altruism at the heuristic gene level of selection. The reproduction of fertile forms alone represents nature's empirically based maximand and \*NOT\* Hamilton's inclusive and just 100% relative and heuristic replication of genes over organism generations of these genes.

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

- > In addition to the two questions and associated approaches you mention
- > above, there is a third question — and that is: Why is natural
- > selection interested in trait X. The answer is: Trait X is correlated
- > with fitness. This is the general principle at play in all the models
- > that you could construct to answer your question: How will trait X
- > change over time under the influence of natural selection?

JE:—

The trait x is NOT just "correlated" to fitness it is causally determined by fitness. The problem is the gene centric Neo Darwinists can only provide a "hand waving" and irrefutable definition of fitness. OTOH Darwinism can provide an objective and refutable definition of it: Total Darwinian Fitness (TDF). Gene centric models simply oversimplify TDF and then proceed to utterly misuse this oversimplification by allowing the tautology produced by it to be invalidly employed as a theory of nature in its own right. Again I request NAS and JM to revisit Felsenstein's propositions from which he derives HR and ask them to concur or deny that they are just tautological. I will repeat that doing this test and making their findings public is a test of their integrity.

NAS should address the problems of HR that I have outlined which are: the oversimplification (deletion of a constant term) discussed above and two other critical simplifications (the deletion of two variables):

a) The error of the deletion of n within b/n is required to be corrected to be able to convert the group centric b into an organism centric b allowing it to be compared to the organism centric c where subsequently Hamilton converts both to gene centric using relatedness:

$$rb/n > r'c/n'$$

where:

r = relatedness of the actor to the recipients

b = a group centric organism fitness gain (an increase in b organisms reproduced to n recipients as a whole) to just the one organism centric actor.

n = number of organism recipients.

r' = 1 the relatedness of the actor to itself.

c = the organism cost to the actor of the b extra organisms reproduced by n recipients which is group centric and not organism centric. The variable c represents a cost because it is the number of organisms not reproduced by the actor, i.e. an organism centric cost to an organism actor. However, the group centric b fitness remains entirely controlled by the independent action of Hamilton's group of recipients made up of n Darwinian organisms with which the actor is dealing in an attempt to inclusively reproduce just one allele by proxy.

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

$n' = 1$  the number of actors which however can be  $> 1$ . Note: only when  $n' > 1$  does the logic as to why  $n$  cannot be deleted become obvious.

In any CORRECT transformation of  $b$  and  $c$  to just a heuristic gene centric exercise using  $r$ ,  $b$  must be divided by  $n$  just as  $c$  must be divided by  $n'$  to be logically self consistent and mathematically correct. The only single case where Hamilton's allele can increase, even on just a 100% relative basis, is when the actor inclusively selects itself which is just normal Darwinian reproduction. Eventually Hamilton's tautology moves full circle proving it to be just an absurd Empirical proposition as are all tautologies incorrectly proffered as valid theories of nature in their own right.

2) The deletion of  $e$  within  $r^e$

where:

$e$  = gene fitness epistasis where in nature (empirically) ALL genomic genes, without any exceptions, have a fitness dependency to at least one other gene on one other chromosome within the same genome.

NAS et al should note that the deletion of  $n$  represents a fatal ERROR of Hamilton et al whereas the deletion of TDF and  $e$  respectively, constitute a deliberate oversimplification and simplification which remain uncorrected and therefore misused to this day.

Regards,

John Edser  
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx

- 
- Prev by Date: [\*\*Re: 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\*\*](#)
  - Next by thread: [\*\*LVB phylogeny program: new Web page and email address\*\*](#)
  - Index(es):

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

- ◆ *Date*
- ◆ *Thread*