

# Re: Evolution versus target function

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2007-01/msg00026.html>

---

- *From:* Carsten Thumulla <[carsten@xxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:carsten@xxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Wed, 3 Jan 2007 13:47:00 -0500 (EST)
- 

Hallo g!

Am Sun, 31 Dec 2006 00:54:51 -0500 schrieb g:

"Carsten Thumulla" <[4\\_trash\\_only@xxxxxxxx](mailto:4_trash_only@xxxxxxxx)> wrote in message  
[news:pan.2006.12.25.18.04.53.595909@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:pan.2006.12.25.18.04.53.595909@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

[http://thumulla.com/Darwin%20-%20and%20whats%20next\\_EN.html](http://thumulla.com/Darwin%20-%20and%20whats%20next_EN.html)

In the above link, mention is made of systems with target functions.

I AM NOT able to make any sense of an evolutionary process -- neither biological nor non-biological mechanical -- which has the capability of establishing for itself any purpose. "Purpose" is a quality associated with \*consciousness.\*

Ufff -- you changed the subject -- and hit the point -- i see.

This is a hard question. The destination /must/ not be a /conscious/ (purposed) destination.

If you drift on the atlantic ocean, you can reach england by the gulf stream. But this does not means, the gulf stream intends (consciousness) to bring g to england.

If it does not make sense to 'make sense of an evolutionary process' the evolutionary process has no sense -- no purpose.

Have we a problem of understanding of sense / purpose?

While I would not argue for a certainty that \*genes\* have any consciousness, nor any power to reason, nor any capacity to experience \*purpose\*, I must concede that humans and other animals do demonstrate that "consciousness" and "reason" do exist in at least one level of the universe...

## Re: Evolution versus target function

I think so -- but this must not mean, that the least level has consciousness or there is a conscious system in the background. We don't know this -- but there is no rational reason for this assumption.

[]

While we COULD SUPPOSE that there might be some kind of "mind" at the cellular level, or at the level of RNA, I do not know of any research result that has found any empirical evidence that the kind of "thought or emotion" sensed by humans as aggregate cell colony organisms occurs ALSO at the intra-cellular or inter-cellular level. Neither has any scientist discovered any evidence that the "mind phenomenon" applies to such things as intergalactic interactions, nor between raw chemical elements, nor among molecules, nor among sub-molecular particles, nor among thermodynamic phenomena.

Our behavior and the whole mind is a product of a fitting process -- a fitting to this universe. Therefore our mind is a product of this universe -- of its conditions.

We are able to understand our 3 dimensional world but we have problems with Minkowski's world. We have problems to imagine Einstein's world.

Trust me, please. I am not about to wax metaphysical here.

What I am about to say is quite sound and reasonable... namely that, \*we do not have any empirical evidence that "mind" is NOT manifest at any other level than the human-as-cellular-colony-organism level, either.

right

If this 'human-as-cellular-colony-organism level' is a product of the universe, the information came from the universe. This does /not/ mean, that this information is /pure/ (developed) in this universe. /This/ is developing, /this/ is evolution. I do not speak from a universal intellect, I speak from the /conditions/, they /can/ develop intelligence. That's a /big/ difference -- like the transport of goods with a (un)conscious stream. ;)

[]

I tend to have a bias against wanting to believe it is even possible. But it would not be "scientific" to HAVE any bias and refuse to recognize it as such.

Before we say, "Ridiculous!" we need to reflect that much known to

## Re: Evolution versus target function

science today was once deemed ridiculous.

—!—

But, NO... I am NOT about to propose here any theoretical construct presupposing that there might be manifestations of "mind" (vis a vis, conscious thought, emotion, organized purposeful planning, at any level other than the one we humans experience — qua humans — and physiologists find evidence of electro–chemical phenomena which they can predict to accompany certain kinds of thought and emotion. Let me only say that I am not inclined to think that molecules, atoms, or cells have the capacity to "sense cognitively" an adaptive opportunity, nor an adaptive need, and form in advance an organized, purposeful intentional and effective genetic strategy (or RNA–level strategy) for getting there.

We should not ever torture the plea 'electro–chemical phenomena' if we want to declare this phenomena.

We can not declare evolution with gene country. Evolution is more than mutation and selection!

The system getting 'adaptive need' by adaption. The general evolutionary criterion demand adaption >> the general evolutionary criterion demands also "be adaptable" (adapt yourself (recursively)). This is the speech of the evolution, of the recursively core of evolution!

The nail learns by evolution to beat himself in the wall — that's it!

Only with this demanding (recursion) the general evolutionary criterion can project / transport himself into the systems.

I SHALL say... that we cannot totally and conclusively find any empirical way to RULE IT OUT, either. So, therefore, it is not quite absolutely far fetched.

Not empirical — but after the empirical way we need to prove our theory — and one time our theory delivers /more/ then we put in. We can extrapolate with the theory.

The theory follows also the evolution, first try and error — later purposed developing.

Just suffice it to say, that my preferences are to believe that genes (and morphologies in reproducing repeatedly over a large expanse of

## Re: Evolution versus target function

time) are NOT... repeat NOT capable of sensing, for example, at a time when no creature ever has flown... and no genomic order ever before has been developed to result in a morphology that could fly... and genes

But in the start conditions could be written "more mobility would be better".

would be able to sense that the ability to fly would be a nice survival trait, and thence conceive, compute, calculate, formulate and establish and execute an effective strategy to PRODUCE over millions of years the right combination of themselves to render someday some progeny who can take off and fly.

Not rendering — developing! — rendering of a recursive core.

Evolution is no hazard — they /use/ hasard.

What is selection without a criterion? Nothing! Without a criterion is no selection existent! The essence is the criterion — nothing else!

Therefore we must ask, what other mechanisms are possible, to transport the information from the criterion to the system. That's it, what I have done in the book.

On this way we approach to the essence of evolution, the recursively core.

[]

To speak of a system as having a purposive TARGET.

If one wishes to speak of purposive TARGETS, then let him acknowledge that he has thought through logically that this explicitly implies that morphologies, or their cells generally, or their RNA, or their DNA has THE QUALITY OF BEING ABLE TO RECOGNIZE AND ENGAGE IN DOING SOMETHING ABOUT ACHIEVING A PURPOSE.

Is the gulf stream purposed?

It depends from the view — from the content of the word purpose.

The Water has nothing, no target, no purpose.

The physical rules have a target (in sense of destination) — to minimize the sum of all field forces, but there is no purpose.

While a system — in the abstract, or in the physical application — may be designed by a human to have a "purpose..." and, while a system which

## Re: Evolution versus target function

has come about by natural means may tend to produce a certain result, or "opportunize" within certain parameters. The "machinery" of non-conscious biological organic mechanisms cannot have a "purpose."

Could it be, that our use / understanding of 'purposive TARGET' makes problems?

When comes sense in the world? How comes sense in the world?

Only by us!

Could it be, that our differentiation between purpose and unpurpose is a "fata morgana"?

If we accept, that our consciousness is a product of the evolutionary process, we accept, that this was in the recursive core of it.

Otherwise we must accept, that consciousness is just a effect of fields.

'The Battle of Systems' shows, that we inherit our purpose /and/ consciousness from the dead physical world.

[]

I have objected previously (many months previously) to the frequent references made by some thinkers about evolution to certain species' having "evolved" certain adapted traits because they "needed to, in order to survive.

Is this (there) a order to survive? Does it /not/ /reach/ that the survivors survive? (recursion) You make with 'order to survive' the same mistake, that you blame me. Newtons apple has no purpose to fall down, just the worm will stay up.

If we are going to treat evolution as something opportunistic, only... then it seems only reasonable to use language that does assign "mind" to what occurs. And, having done some studying of the nature and effect of the art of "propaganda," I do not believe I am being unreasonable when I say that we humans ARE impacted by subliminal suggestion. And the terminology we use can influence the way we think and act, whether we realize it, and admit it, or not.

yes (purpose)

Oh well... this assertion will probably stir up the usual hornets nest of protestations about how scientists "know what they mean when they use

## Re: Evolution versus target function

certain terms, and no layman should judge or object to their using any word they wish to mean among themselves whatever they want their words to mean."

And I DO agree with that. I DO recognize that personification is useful in communications about inanimate, or non-human things.

Ok, but 'personification' smells a little bit.

Also, I am quite sincere in saying that it does not matter to me WHAT words anyone uses to mean whatever he/she wishes them to mean. What I would assert, however, is that many who use such terms as "targeting systems" in referring to adaptations, rarely ever disclaim what they might mean by that, and go to great lengths sometimes in building an entire theoretical apologetic around what strikes ME as an assumption that organisms and their genes DO set up and seek out certain prognosticatory strategies.

Examples? The evolutionary literature ABOUND with examples.

to be continued ...

regards  
Carsten

—

exit close quite bye cancel escape

.