

Re: "Algorithms" in Molecular Biology?

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-05/msg00181.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 20 May 2006 17:50:10 -0400 (EDT)
-

"kramer" kodream@xxxxxxxxxx wrote:–
Subject: Re: "Algorithms" in Molecular Biology?

snip<

I guess my point is, you can't define the term algorithm, because the concept subsumes the concept of definition. If you can't sit in it, its not a chair, if it doesn't fold up into a double helix its not DNA. If it can't be measured it can't exist. If a cell doesn't produce and consequently consume ATP it doesn't live. If a virus doesn't rewire the operation of a cell its not a virus.

JE:–

An algorithm is only a simplified/oversimplified model of a theory i.e. a proposed theory of either HOW or WHY something observed in nature can be explained, where respectively, a variable or a constant term has been artificially deleted from that theory to form the model/algorithm. If you cannot sit in it then a chair is only non verified, i.e. it is NOT refuted. The chair may be wrapped in plastic stopping you sitting on it because you slide off whenever you attempt to do so. Being able to empirically distinguish between a non verification and a refutation lies at the heart of any rational epistemology and provides the most common area of epistemological error.

If you can sit on it this does not mean that it has to be chair. It may be a table or a keg of beer because you can sit on any of these. Neither a verification of a non verification is definitive. Any concept that provides MEANING must be able to be:

- 1) Verified.
- 2) Non Verified.
- 3) Refuted.

The Platonic square of opposition that I posted to sbe a while ago is

Re: "Algorithms" in Molecular Biology?

ancient. It provides a logical description of these three basic tests. The test to refutation as to what a chair is supposed to be, can be any contradiction as to what a chair has been defined to be, i.e. what a chair is defined NOT to be. In the sciences BOTH must be empirically verifiable (be able to be documented within nature as a non random and not just a random, pattern). If a chair is not a table or a keg of beer by simple definition where all of these objects form a non random pattern as a percept (sensory information) then a verification of any of these refutes that the object in question is a chair. If the definition of a chair is now changed to include a table or a keg of beer then a verification/non verification of any of these remains NON definitive. If no contradiction as to what a chair is supposed to be is allowed (IOW your epistemology becomes 100% relative to just nothing specified by you) disallowing any empirical contradiction of a chair to even exist then "anything goes" because what a chair is becomes reduced to irrefutability, i.e. it becomes reduced to just a dictate. This means it can be anything that you say that it is. Witch hunts and their attendant horrors are based on it as is today's popular reincarnation: racialism. The epistemological base of both is popular Post Modern relativism summed up by the ditty "everything is relative". The opposite is true: everything remains based on CONTESTING absolute ASSUMPTIONS. Please note that because MORE and just one such assumption is always required, these are not just absolute DICTATES.

The oldest con trick in the book is to expand what you say a chair is via a continuous ad hoc redefinition so that the meaning that is supposed to be provided now includes its own refutation, continuously evading any test to refutation. Here intellectual anarchy replaces the evolution of theories via their refutation allowing group orientated intellectual thuggery to replace individual based learning and inquiry. When this happens within a tribal based species like our own within which selection has favored tribal conformity over non conformity and the creation of a warrior class of mostly hyped up younger males to protect the tribe as a whole and enforce (at the direction of mostly older males) tribal mores, then what we call "civilization" is just dumped resulting in mass violence. The larger the group the more the devastating the violence will be to all because it will destroy critical interdependency within that group.

The problem with evolutionary theory over the last 50 years or so is that it has become almost entirely dominated by mathematicians who have no need for refutation simply because mathematics is not a science. The consistent misuse of the many useful but sadly, misused simplified/oversimplified models that they produce has allowed heuristic gene centricity and/or ill defined polycentric theories to contest and replace Darwin's refutable mono-centric fertile organism centric theory of evolution by natural selection. It can easily be proven that all of these models/algorithms are simplified/oversimplified from just this ONE theory.

Yet again I call reader's attention to Waddington's empirical research and models he produced over 50 years ago. I posted Waddington's "Post Neo-Darwinian" model within the thread "Waddington's Revision of Haldane" without comment, some time ago. Not one single professional that posts here

Re: "Algorithms" in Molecular Biology?

has commented on it and I do not know of a single reference to this model within the literature. This proves to any rational and unbiased person that Waddington's model was and remains, chronically evaded. It is easy to see that this remains the case: it corrects the misuse of Haldane's heuristic gene centric population genetics model which remains the basis of today's population genetics. Without gene centrality Neo Darwinism fails. I would like to thank Jim Menegay who alone has demonstrated the necessary integrity to discuss Waddington's model. Evasion is simply not an option for the sciences.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx