

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

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

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-06/msg00305.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sat, 24 Jun 2006 12:25:21 -0400 (EDT)
-

"Peter F" 19eimc_minus19@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:–

Modern day medieval minded martyrs may, however, best be regarded as a symptom of a disease of (combined past) AEVASIVE adaptations.

JE:–
Not necessarily.

Perhaps I was blind to the positively naturally selective effect – IF IT EXIST – that siblings of suiciding–bombing sorts become extra attractive to those potential mates that are genetically inclined to be more than average neurotically (AEVASIVELY) motivated as follows:
To be as fervent about fornication and forming fecund families as they are forcefully religiously believing/rationalizing and thereby efficiently self–anaesthetizing characteristics (boosting the chance of realizing a behavior of blowing up people perceived – also partly because of neural plasticities that allow energetic projections of primal pain to become both hate and hope – to both be "obstacles" and "passports to afterlife–glory" (respectively).

JE:–
Fornication fails when a smaller and not a larger TOTAL number of infertile immatures become raised to fertile adulthood per adult via excessive numbers of them decimating the limited resources available to each adult parent to raise them. Our unique tribal adaptation of employing cognitive exchange allowed mutualising selection. This can be defined as: selection for

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

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

mutually increasing the total number of fertile forms raised from infertile immatures per selectee per population increasing total fitness per adult but not necessarily equally. The largest cost of our unique tribal adaptation was and remains: defense. The more fitness interdependent we became the bigger the payoff per selectee but larger the tribe had to become increasing the cost of defending and maintaining it. A point will be reached where the risk of being maimed or dying in defense of your own tribe becomes selected at the Darwinian fertile form level of selection as a complex psychological adaptation. Religion was probably the very first tribal belief system based on this psychology. It evolved to facilitate cognitive mutualised exchange by providing predictable behaviors, fear of authority (allowing order based on cognition for the 1st time) and a tribal identity. Any attack on this belief in the past constituted an attack on the tribe itself invoking a full defense response. Nothing has changed, the same applies today.

The cost of a mutualised group increases per mutualised individual as the mutualised gains per individual exponentially increase.

Like the slime mould society, ALL these costs HAVE to be paid. Pleiotrophic and epistatic gene effects CAN evolve to enforce payment.

I see how (from your point of view) you see suicidal or fitness lowering acts of "altruism" as a payment of a "mutualising" [actually just the effect of mutations (generically meant) that made it "thus far" – i.e. to be expressed "additively" in this way; OR further IF expressed in ways that are favorable to positive Edserian fitness outcomes (outcomes that are, BTW, accountable only by means of integers).

IF the tribe provides massive (but unequal) total individual fitness gains but also requires costs to be paid BEFORE these gains can be realized THEN nature will enforce these costs at just the Darwinian fertile organism level of selection, if and only if, the TOTAL gains > TOTAL costs per independent selectee per population. Please note that any defined fitness per population where the fitness of each group remains additive per group member is simply NOT a group selective fitness.

I am sure everone can agrees with you that an 'altruistic suicide' _causing_ single mutation carrying mutant individual has abolutely no chance – without

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

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

having
already spawned any with this gene equipped offspring/s – to become a
successful candidate for ancestorhood if it is faced with a situation that
triggers a behavioral expression of this "altruistic suicide gene".

JE:–

The so called gene for altruism has to increase and not decrease the total
fitness of any actor that has it for that gene not to move a population
towards extinction (along with itself). This will not be evident unless the
total fitness of any possessor of it becomes disallowed. Without a total
fitness per parent per population (no matter how you define fitness) an
investment for a mutualised gain can become hopelessly confused with just an
altruistic donation. This can be proven to be the case using Hamilton's Rule
where no total fitness for Hamilton's actor was included within that rule.

I too care little for mathematical oversimplifications with little of no
power to provoke deep and meaningful insight into how we
evolved to be how we are.

JE:–

I disagree. These models can be USED or MISUSED. That is all. What is ALWAYS
EVADED by Neo Darwinistic professionals is any discussion as to what
constitutes EITHER.

But, different to you, I care SO LITTLE that I don't care
to fight against the possibility that such [or a certain such ;–)]
oversimplification can be unintentionally used to the effect
of causing or reinforcing an ignorance of situations (relevant
interactions)..

JE:–

But employing ambiguous oversimplified models to explain away in just non
refutable terms how "altruism" could evolve in nature only constitutes a
gross misuse of any simplified/oversimplified model. The net effect: a
misrepresentation of evolutionary theory to the general public and a
redirection of limited funding for research into less fruitful directions.
Walter ReMine is a documented victim of model misuse. How many others are
there? I will nominate the genius of C. H. Waddington as evolutionary
theories most serious victim. Things become much worse if a new funding
direction becomes based on just a political agenda. The horrible history of
evolutionary theory suggests that we must be prepared for this to be
happening most of the time. Both the fascist (absolute dictate) right and
Looney (everything is relative) left have taken turns to hijack evolutionary
theory for their own political ends. Pretending that this never happened is
an attempt to write a false history. Suggesting that it happened in the past

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

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

but could never happen today is only wishful thinking or a futile attempt to cover something up. It IS happening before our very eyes. After years of domination by the Looney Left pushing useless 100% relative arguments for organism fitness altruism (Haldane was an old style communist and Hamilton supported the new far left), today it is (yet again) the turn of the might-is-right-fascists using irrefutable "Intelligent Design". Herbert Spencer would be pleased. Question: when will politically based nonsense stop? Answer: when refutable theories of evolution, Alone, are allowed as valid theories of *SCIENCE* as Popper (a reformed communist hated today by the new far left) argued so long ago.

snip what I do understand<

This requirement appears to have selected for a-defend-your-group-at-any cost psychology evolving within early human tribal societies producing what only appears on the surface to be "self sacrificing" behavior. This type of behavior has become magnified and become more widespread within super tribal

societies

as the levels of stress become larger as the group size increases. It particularly affects adolescent males who subsist at the bottom of any tribal/super tribal pecking order.

I would prefer to explain such (and plenty of other) behavior from several very different and more meaty (IMHO) angles – but I believe I see (roughly) what you mean.

JE:–
Ok

Regards

John Edser
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxx

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

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