

Re: Haldane's Dilemma and quantitative genetics

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-06/msg00343.html>

- *From:* "Walter ReMine" <science@xxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 30 Jun 2006 11:31:04 -0400 (EDT)
-

Perplexed in Peoria wrote:
... See the thread entitled "Intensity of selection ..."

Yes, I'm following your thread with interest. I've seen various approaches to calculating the rate of evolution, such as using Fisher's "Fundamental Theorem of Natural Selection". Those attempts have been flawed, in my view, (as discussed in my book). But your approach seems refreshingly new, perhaps worth publishing as a paper -- though I'm still noodle-ing about it.

Yet it displays a serious problem -- Haldane's Dilemma. Sved's invocation of truncation is EVEN MORE wildly unrealistic in favor of evolution -- and is such an implausible model that the only time evolutionists' mention it is when they're trying to brush aside Haldane's Dilemma as "solved". Otherwise they set aside Sved's paper entirely. Would it be harsh to call such behavior 'two-faced'?

I'll treat this as a serious question, though I realize it was meant rhetorically. Yes, I think it would be two harsh. Unless you wish to call the bulk of mankind two-faced. It is part of the human psyche to remember and repeat confirming evidence and to discount and forget contrary evidence. Creationists do it, and evolutionists do it too. They do it because they are all members of the species ironically named *H. sapiens*.

I understand. It's one thing to make mistakes and oversights, everyone does that from time to time. But it's quite another matter when an ENTIRE FIELD, with many practitioners, ALLOWS those to continue for decades. And it's worse still when they've been PUBLICLY TOLD about it (by people such as myself) for well over a decade.

For example. Either evolutionists embrace Sved's model, or they don't.

Re: Haldane's Dilemma and quantitative genetics

If they don't, then they obviously cannot claim it as a realistic "solution" to Haldane's Dilemma.

...[so-and-so] is a creationist, and hence stupid by definition, and this confirms it!".

I understand. Yes, I've seen that tactic a lot. In fact, EVERY TIME I come here, someone (such as the moderator Josh Hayes, and several others) pile-on immediately in some attempt to smear me -- rather than solve Haldane's Dilemma. They say things like, "not everything that [ReMine] does is intellectually dishonest", and so forth -- terms of speech not generally used here on other occasions. Is this language obligatory when dealing with outsiders? Is that the lengths evolutionists must go to evade Haldane's Dilemma?

-- Walter ReMine
The Biotic Message
<http://SaintPaulScience.com>