Re: Set Nesting and Set Intersection Within Evolutionary Theory

Source: http://sci.tech−archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006−10/msg00121.html

- *From*: "g" <gillawton@xxxxxxxxxxxxx>
- *Date*: Sun, 15 Oct 2006 17:40:46 −0400 (EDT)

> ;−) Here we go again.
>
> Well, Guy, you have my sympathy. But you had to have known this
> was coming. I'm just glad I didn't say that!

I understand the algebra of sets.
I understand the concept of hierarchy.
I understand the concept of tree (as a way of charting links of various kinds between things, such as successive generations of things).
I understand the concept of nested sets somewhat... in relation to an adjacency list model (for example in representing a personnel 'reporting' hierarchy).
I understand that any adjacency set model −− even though it represent something that is propagated in only one direction can be traced backward, where there is some utility in doing so.

However, I can make no sense of any attempt to extract a concept from one of these distinctly different kinds of models and attempt to apply it within another. Also, if Guy makes a statement (quite valid and clear, it seems to me) relating to the algebra of sets, and John counters it with something relating to a nested set model, that strikes me as being comparable to comparing how many grapes we should expect to find growing on the ends of the thorns of a particular variety of cactus.

The vicissitudes of finding a computer programming model for a natural phenomenon are overwhelming until and unless one can find a phenomenon which −− for special purposes −− behaves as an independent dynamic.

The reason I say "for special purposes" is that nothing, ultimately, in the universe behave independently from the rest of it. However, if variables are so miniscule as to be immeasurable and insignificant for a specific purpose, then we can treat a model as a self−sufficient, and independent dynamic.

FOR EXAMPLE: Using Newtonian physics, we can treat Earth's moon's orbit as being a dynamic impacted only by the net effect of Earth's gravity and the moon's gravity, in describing a shaped pattern such that Earth may be treated as standing still, while the moon is treated as moving in an orbiting around it. In reality, however, the earth is orbiting the sun, the sun is in an orbit around an epicenter of mass of this galaxy, this galaxy is moving at a tremendous rate of speed around some epicenter not yet determined... and a model representing ALL this action, but showing only the paths of Earth and moon with respect to the universe's epicenter would look to us like manifest total chaos. So, for various PURPOSES, we create our little model which looks quite simple and actually is useful and easy to understand. That model (treated as though Earth is standing still) not only is inaccurate with respect to any other point and time in the universe but, also, is not actually consistent. This is because Earth and its moon are never, at any two moments, acting in the identical same configuration of all the other force−sources in the universe. Nothing else is standing still. And even the influences of other force−sources are not arriving concurrently with their happening. Assuming that gravity travels at the same speed as the speed of light −− the force of the sun's gravity, acting upon Earth at ANY instant, is not a result of where the sun is now, but of where it was some eight minutes or so previously. And the sun, Earth, Earth's moon are impacted to some extent by gravitation that left its sources up to billions of years ago. But this, lag effect, also can be left out of our modeling of Earth's moon's orbit around it. Else any model, graphical or mathematical, accounting for all the "arriving" influences at any given series of instances, would be so complex that no human could perceive and sense to it at all.

The upshot of all this is that any model regarding procreation over a period of time cannot possibly take into account all sexual conceptions, all embryological events, all organism developments, etc. Neither can a model be useful or intelligible if it is not confined to a particular set of variables and constants, and a particular mathematical or graphical set of postulates and operations.

I am totally willing to consider −− as one of the reasons for my inability to follow John's argument over whatever it is he is arguing with Guy −− that I am simply too ignorant and too unintelligent to follow John's facts and arguments. At the same time, I also am totally willing to consider the possibility that the reason I am incapable of following John's facts and arguments is because they are not followable... by virtue of the fact he may be mixing models which are not mutually compatible. And, if the latter is the case, then it would help me to follow John's facts and arguments if he would take the time to inform Guy, and the rest of us, of just exactly what aspects of
actual procreative adjacencies he is taking into account, and exactly which model of comparison and analysis he is using) to the exclusion of any others which are not logically mixable with it.

Also (if my inability to follow John's points is correctible to any extent by him) it would help me if John stated what actual, real world purpose (if

any) his proposed facts, arguments, model of arranging them, characteristics, adjacency relationships, are intended by him to provide to Guy, and us.

Any subject humans would attempt to communicate among themselves about can EASILY be drawn off into areas containing epistemic barriers (unknowns and unknowables), containing logic barriers (the limitations of logical models to in every case predict beyond the sufficiency of the experiential facts we have to put into it)... etc. What is most difficult, and most satisfying to us all, is to be presented with a model fitting a stated purpose, with a stated set of relationships (adjacent or otherwise), and capable of making some sense of something like Earth's moon's orbit, in a way (however fallacious) that simplifies (for the intended purpose) whatever one wishes to convey.

g

g

.