

Re: Fw: Edward O. Wilson's "bombshell" on the reality of group

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-06/msg00155.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Thu, 15 Jun 2006 14:37:36 -0400 (EDT)
-

William Morse <wdmorse@xxxxxxxxxx>

References: <e5kkl\$11vr\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
– RKS has covered the main points pretty well. The only one he leaves out is Wilson's differentiation between the unit of selection – which he says is the gene – and the target of selection, which he says is usually the individual but can be the group in some instances.

JE:–

Because of the revised central dogma, selection can only operate on heritable phenotypes and NOT the genotypes which code for them. This is due to the existence of a 100% NON reversible relationship between DNA/RNA and the proteins that they code for. Proteins cannot code for DNA/RNA prohibiting any reversible Lamarckian form of inheritance. This makes the genotype invisible to selection forcing it to only select the phenotype. Today's view that selection can operate on the genotype only constitutes a misused gene centric oversimplified model of fertile organism centric Darwinism. Within empirically based Darwinism the genome of one fertile form codes for one TDF (total Darwinian fitness defined as the total number of fertile adult forms reproduced per adult per population). TDF represents the only refutable fitness that evolutionary theory has. Single genes can only code for polypeptides. More than one gene is required to code for one protein because almost all proteins are composed of more than one polypeptide. This places epistatic (non additive) gene coding at the very forefront of SYNTHETIC genetics and not non epistatic (additive) gene coding. However, it is only the latter which continues to dominate simplified/oversimplified gene centric population genetics models. Only C. H. Waddington's entirely ignored "Post-Neo Darwinistic model" actually allocates a selective coefficient to all the hidden epistatic genes which code for any particular phenotype allowing a minimally organism centric population genetics model to actually exist.

Re: Fw: Edward O. Wilson's "bombshell" on the reality of group

William Hunt and Wirt Atmar have previously argued that haplodiploidy and kin selection are not the only story in the social insects, and it appears that Wilson now agrees.

JE:–

This has been known for over half a century. The inclusive fitness argument that haplodiploidy only verifies Hamilton has always been untrue. I have presented the arguments as to why this is the case within sbe for about 5 years now and remain happy to debate any of them here. Against all reason the massive bias for Hamilton's argument continues.

Unfortunately the article does not go into detail on the type of model Wilson is using to arrive at group selection.

JE:–

The only model which works is the Darwinian monocentric fertile organism level model employing and not excluding, Total Darwinian Fitness (TDF) as the one and only refutable maximand fitness that actually exists within nature

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx