

Re: The status of Infertile forms (was: What is the evolutionary

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2007-03/msg00102.html>

- *From:* "John Edser" <edser@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Sun, 18 Mar 2007 00:58:27 -0500 (EST)
-

"Entertained by my own EIMC" write_to_eimc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx wrote:-

Hi John,
I have only one concern about these definitions of your jargon.
That is, I do as far as they directly "deny, "constitute a formulated
fence
against", and "tend to fix the attitude of refusniks in respect of how to
(EPTly :) understand", my *key* explanatory categorization of
evolutionary/selective pressures. %-}

JE:-

Hello Peter,

The problem is any categorization of selective pressures changes per
selectee, i.e. while one selectee may define a certain pressure as good,
another will identify exactly the same pressure as bad. If this was not the
case then Darwinian rationale would fail. Therefore, it makes more sense to
categorize SELECTEE RESPONSES to selective pressures than it does to
categorize selective pressures themselves.

JE:-

2) Fitness: any defined reproductive total.

3) Dependent Darwinian Fitness: the fitness of any part which can be
measured as the fitness of any inner nested set.

4) Independent Darwinian Fitness: the fitness of any whole which can be
measured as the fitness of the largest set within any one nested set

which

Re: The status of Infertile forms (was: What is the evolutionary
is always the most outer set. Empirically this is always the total
number

of fertile forms reproduced by a parent into one population of same.

I hope you soon start to see that 'logical realism' requires you to accEPT
that what you should (implicitly) mean or (explicitly) write is something
along the lines of: "...populations of *presumptively/potentially fertile*
forms.

JE:–

I do not agree. If a subjective heuristic potential becomes allowed to
substitute for empirical reality then "anything goes" in the name of
"logical realism". Unfortunately, my claimed potential to earn a billion
dollars is simply not the same thing as me actually earning it. My bank
manager keeps insisting that this is case against every mathematically based
Post Modern argument that I have put to him :-)

JE:–

5) Darwinian Selectee: the one single entity which is naturally selected
in
Darwinian nature. Empirically this is always one fertile organism and

not

one organism or any part of one organism e.g. one gene.

Again, you are likewise required to mean/write
"...*presumptively/potentially* fertile..."

<snipped – otherwise not entirely unaccEPTable defintions :->

JE:–

Peter, there is no such thing as a valid short cut to Darwinian fitness
within empirical ecology, but I am sure that street smart Enron accountants
would "reason" that there is within Post Modern economics.

Regards,

John Edser
Independent Researcher

Re: The status of Infertile forms (was: What is the evolutionary

edser@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx