Re: Heritability of fitness

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006−01/msg00227.html

- *From*: "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Wed, 11 Jan 2006 13:51:51 −0500 (EST)

"Peter F" <fell_spamtrap_in@xxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
news:dp9522$2k7j$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>
> "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
> news:dp6lul$1q8n$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx
>>
SNIP
>
> And so, when by pairing (and as if elaborately placing or even plaiting)
> this preference together with my motivation to make a serious point
> about an insidiously 'pressuring' (unconsciously co−motivating) presence
> of a both profoundly important and ignored (both super−complex and
> super−slippery) feature of people's psychophysiology, and the
> phylogenetic origin of this feature (the extremely common lifetime
> origin of this "pressuring"), then I feel I ought to be forgiven. :−)

Not only do I not forgive you... I also see nothing requiring forgiveness. You have done no wrong. In fact you provide comic relief. Hidden inside your writing style are some highly sophisticated and thought provoking ideas. But you style in such a way as to overwhelm.

Being versed as you are in the matter of human psychology you KNOW all too well the impact upon understanding of "interference." Therefore, I perceive that you cram into short expressions (some familiar and some of your own coinage) so many ideas that your reader has a choice between expanding each of your "special" terms and expressions, then breaking a single over−loaded sentence of yours into
several digestable−size parts, and then reorganizing the profusion of ideas into paragraphs that read without blowing all the peripheral perception banks.

And just about the time I begin to take seriously something you are saying, and start to take it apart to decipher it, I realize you have slipped in something that strikes as totally frivolous.

My first experience with reading something that was INFINITELY clear and precise and instantly understandable occurred in 1957, when I read S. Freud's UBER DEN TRAUM, in the English.

I commented to an English PhD professor about the joltingly clear choice of words and have never forgotten his comments on it, which I now put in quotation marks to distinguish from my own words, but must paraphrase:

"The clarity you find in that book is not necessarily an indication that Freud's writing style was that way. It is an indication that the translator, or tranlators, not only rewrote Freud's style, but improved on it and, in that process, very well may have had to remove some ambiguities and unclear passages."

That did make sense to me, and still does. French does NOT translate directly into English. The translator(s) had to first analyze carefully not merely what Freud SAID, but also what he must have MEANT, and then say that in the best possible way it could be said in English. And since the translators did not have to come up with the ideas and figure out the best possible way of organizing them, he only had to focus on finding the best words to use to follow the order of presentation. This leads me to believe that if an English−writing author were to hire someone to translate a book of his into another language, say French, and then had to translate it back again into English from the French, without recourse to how he wrote it the first time... he would probably come out with an enormously more clearly presented subject matter.

I don't KNOW that. But it seems to me it would be probably.

In your case, when I try to follow your "crammed" style, my mind just wanders, and I don't do the LABOR of translating it into language that would produce ideas and images in a 'flowing' manner that would not jerk my thinking in several different directions within a single sentence. I COULD work at it. I just am too lazy, I guess. So I read for the humor, and enjoy that... even not being sure when your intent is to be humorous, and when you actually want to generate some thought.

You are far from ignorant. In fact you may just be too smart to be read and appreciated in accordance with how (and how fast, and how broadly) your word brush works.

My desire is to try to BE as understood... as much the way I am thinking as I write, as I know how.
You may have noticed that I have begun to elaborate more than I used to, and to approach a single point from two or three angles (which is redundant, but in a way that is not merely duplicative). Sometimes in the past when I have NOT done that, I have read back later only to see that I said something that gave a very different meaning than I meant (sometimes even OPPOSITE to what I meant).

I read what you write very rapidly, and do not work at it. If you want me to be able to get the most of it, you will not allow too much to get crammed together in such a way as to result in a large amount of "interference."

g

>
> Hence, I shall end − end this by my own EIMC sponsored intercEPTing
> reply to your post − by mentioning that any typical, intact, and
> normally developed human ASS is the cell−structural correlate of (or
> central control/switching station for) a neural individual's innate
> (even embryogenesis endowed) and acquired repertoire of preoccupations,
> and of our capacity to, on one hand, selectively pay transiently
> conscious actention, and, on the other hand, becoming and remaining
> selectively unconscious − including to be selective unconscious of pain
> in self and others.
> −−−−−−−−−−−−−−−
>
>> >
>> > One other comment − I would have thought that there must be enough
> natural
>> > environmental change out in the wild, and enough variation capable
>> > of exploiting that change, that fitness heritability would be large
>> > enough to measure − at least over timescales in which the new
> environment
>> > is constant. But apparently the 'signal−to−noise' ratio is just too
> high.
>> >
>
>>>From your semantics I seem to pick up that the signal is too soft.
>
> Whenever a study finds that a particular population's "fitness
> heritability signal" is not detectable, this can sensibly mean only one
> thing:
> 1. That, for as many generations as a study of a population's size in
> response to a specific (as far as known or specifiable) environmental
> change covers, the population does neither increase (positive amplitude
> signal ;) nor decrease [negative value of this most interesting measure
> ;−)] but remains stable − hence is "not detected".
>
> The "noise" must in this case surely refer to the scientists' snoring.
>
> Or perhaps the concept was stuffed from the start? ;−)
>
> Happy New Year!
>
> P
>
>

.

- ***References***:
  - ♦ ***Re: Heritability of fitness***
    - ◊ *From:* Peter F

- Prev by Date: ***Re: National Association of Biology Teachers***
- Next by Date: ***Re: The Future of Human Evolution***
- Previous by thread: ***Re: Heritability of fitness***
- Next by thread: ***Re: Heritability of fitness***
- Index(es):
  - ♦ ***Date***
  - ♦ ***Thread***