

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-05/msg00109.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 15 May 2006 13:42:52 -0400 (EDT)
-

"Peter F" 19eimc_minus19@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:–

PF:–

My answer:

What you are most substantially referring to is an only very crudely proven to exist part of how we function and evolved.

JE:–

The Darwinian fertile organism concept of Total Darwinian Fitness (TDF)

is

not at all crude but many of the misused simplified/oversimplified gene centric models derived from it are.

I did not have TDF in mind. I referred to epistasis and more lately epigenomics (epigenetics). (Could have taken more care to specify.)

JE:–

Ok.

IOW, there is relatively difficult (or impossible) for people to have detailed absorbing/preoccupying discussions about epigenomics (or epigenetics) and epistasis.

JE:–

Science is all about providing different and therefore contesting

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

theories

which can be empirically separated from each other only because they are fully testable against nature. This means each idea provides three classes of test:

- 1) Verification.
- 2) Non verification.
- 3) Refutation.

I suppose you meant 2. in the sense of a model so flawed that it is "not even wrong" – i.e. not amenable to neither experimental nor observational corroboration. (?)

JE:–

Yes. All oversimplified models suffer from this because they have no constant algebraic term e.g. Hamilton's Rule where TDF was and remains artificially deleted and replaced by just nothing at all. You cannot provide a relative rule and then not specify what it is supposed to be relative to. What Hamilton's Rule is empirically relative to is TDF. When this becomes included within the rule it becomes:

$Rb > K - c$

Where $K = TDF$

Using this corrected rule where what the Hamilton's Rule is relative to is now specified within that rule, organism fitness altruism cannot evolve.

Popper took great pains to point out that irrefutable propositions can explain away just about anything you like at no risk to a preferred idea. When these non refutable beliefs are adopted by the sciences they have to be enforced BECAUSE they cannot be tested to refutation. This is done within the public sector by creating mandarins who allocate the money or decide what will be published. It is here that a group bias can destroy more innovative ideas provided by lower ranked individuals who are perceived as a threat, or allow popular irrefutable theories to replace older refutable theories e.g. Hamilton's Rule. Gross levels of these mutually detrimental effects are only found within totalitarian states. Within Democratic states it varies with the level of competition that is allowed to exist.

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

Do you imply that the degree of 1. and 3. can, in case of some hypotheses and theories, philosophies/worldviews, be sufficient enough to be conclusive to all but unsuitably AEVASIVE minds: e.g. inePTly AEVASIVE minds and so called "crack-pots" (who BTW are EPTly defined as persons strongly addicted to a relatively complex idea that is typically more or less subtly contradicting or neglecting of some aspect/s of reality, and that has sprouted within their own AEVASIVE minds).

JE:–

I state, without any exceptions, that any valid scientific theory must be able to be tested by all three. As an example the ever popular null hypothesis can only be verified or non verified. This is because a refutation requires a verification of a positive event entirely excluded by the theory under test, e.g. an object with a velocity larger than c or within the biological sciences a parent with a lower TDF being selected over a parent with a higher TDF within the same population. Please note that this does not mean that the null hypothesis remains invalid. It means that it cannot replace a test to refutation. Tests to just verification/non verification can help or hinder depending on if they are used or misused. The rule is: a simplified/oversimplified model cannot contest or replace the theory it was simplified/oversimplified from.

Dr Moran's assumption that any genetic change produced by random sampling error constitutes evolution and not temporal variation represents a misuse of an assumed random process. Interestingly, this is because a random process can only be non verified. It cannot be verified. Any observed non random pattern could have been produced by EITHER a random or non random process. Therefore nobody can assume that the observation of a random pattern verifies either because it verifies both. Note also that if a random process is observed to provide a non random pattern it was proven never to have been a random process in the first place, e.g. the observation of meiotic drive genes proved that the assumption that meiosis was a random process was incorrect. The incorrect labeling of a process is not the same as a refutation of that process.

The fact remains that refutation is alone, definitive. But just to be able to supply it you must also be able to supply a verification and a non verification. IOW if you can supply a refutation then you must also be able to supply a verification and a non verification. This means that just to be able to claim that you understand the theory you are putting forward, you must be able to supply what would constitute a verification of it, a non verification of it and a refutation of it. Irrefutable theories remain critically incomplete so when applied they always remain ambiguous. An incomplete idea cannot be accurately transferred to another mind. What happens when you attempt to do so is that everybody makes up their own version of any missing bits so that everybody ends up with a different theory. The net result is that political pressure groups form in an attempt to bully others to adopt a particular version that is politically correct.

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

<snip>

Moreover, people normally prefer to preoccupy themselves with what they have become proficient at; and what is sometimes both their money-making profession, a support for social-status, and an activity that provide pleasure and/or frees them from emotional unease (anxiety).

JE:–

Over specialization and rewarding only this has allowed the sciences to become fractional and uncoordinated providing the double whammy waste of duplication and stifled innovation. One fairly recent example was the human genome battle between public and private sector science. I attribute

this

to the recalcitrant attitude of Watson acting as a mandarin for the unnecessarily costly publicly funded human genome project. Deleting the basic requirement for refutation within a mostly

monopolistic

public sector science establishment will allow irrefutable politically correct ideas to stifle the sciences while at the same time allowing

wild

politically correct speculation to dominate refutable theory.

I would never dismiss the possibility that a 'herd mentality' might be at play too.

(I just never bother with trying to list every to me conceivable component of the relevant aspects of human Evolutionary Psychobiology Type issues.;)

JE:–

Might be? This effect has been measured. Without double blind crossover the testing bias for a favored idea becomes automatic even when using the most

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

experienced researchers. It can be as high as 1/3, which interestingly, is about the same as the placebo effect.

If one so adds the easily provable (just by pointing ;-)) prevalence of "primal pain" [=trauma-specific neural imprints, or CURSES – with their/its natural, and naturally

social

etc., causes] it then becomes apparent that addiction (basically motivated by half-formed perception of an endogenous potential to overwhelming dread and self-defeating distress) may ALSO "be at play". That is, "at play" to keep the lid on exactly 'the part' of what is in Pandora's box that you are proposing should be let out in the open.

JE:–

Peter,

I do not claim to understand your terminology. However I agree that irrefutable theories can only serve prejudice and incompetence. My point is that irrefutable models cannot complete and replace the theory they were simplified/oversimplified from without producing disastrous results for the sciences.

JE:–

Just as good money moves out when the bad money moves in, individual

ideas

move out when group selected ideas move in.

I don't deny that you are fighting for a worthy cause.

I only wish the cause you picked for yourself were even more EPT-aligned than what it is. :->

JE:–

Maybe it would be if I could understand what an "EPT-aligned" position is.

Regards,

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

Re: Sex for diversity or diversity repression?

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx