

Re: Hamilton's rule

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2005-11/msg00321.html>

- *From:* "Jim McGinn" <jimmcginn@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Tue, 22 Nov 2005 13:19:17 -0500 (EST)
-

Catherine Woodgold wrote:

> Guy Hoelzer (hoelzer@xxxxxxx) writes:
>> Here I think you have contradicted yourself. While you have been convincing
>> me of the validity of your argument along the way, that same argument
>> persuades me that your last point is false. A largely altruistic population
>> would be quite vulnerable to invasion and persistence of low frequencies of
>> alleles for selfish behavior. If what you meant was that the largely
>> altruistic population is unlikely to be replaced by a regime of selfishness,
>> then I would agree.

I see no contradiction. Groups that can't deal with invasion will be selected against, given the precepts of the scenario that Catherine described.

>
> Invasion does happen under certain circumstances.
> However, I think under the conditions (ratio
> between b and c, etc.) under which a rare altruistic
> gene would tend to spread, then a rare non-altruistic
> gene in an altruistic population would tend to
> die out at about the same rate.

Jim

-
- Prev by Date: [*Re: evolutionary success of humans*](#)
 - Next by Date: [*Call for paper in Nanotechnology journal*](#)
 - Previous by thread: [*Re: Hamilton's rule*](#)
 - Next by thread: [*Re: Hamilton's rule*](#)
 - Index(es):
 - ◆ [*Date*](#)
 - ◆ [*Thread*](#)