


I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

Many followers of the mind consider it natural and rational to be selfish. They believe that's how evolution works. But Richard Dawkins, the cardinal representative of this excessive and unnaturally selective view, is guilty of logical omissions and false prophecies. His pop-science selfishness is widely misunderstood. Selfish genes that don't cooperate don't survive. A more appropriate view is that there are evolutionary limits to selfishness. Nature dooms everything that damages what it depends on. A genetic view of evolution was popularized by Dawkins' *Selfish Gene*, which mixed the best accessible thinking, with great prose, logical errors and sinfully unscientific preaching. It remains influential, even beyond its readers, its misleading title seeming sufficient to replace its content. Dawkins promoted this essence: A society based simply on the genetic law of universal ruthless selfishness would be a very, very nasty society... Keep in mind that if you want, like me, to build a society in which people cooperate generously and unselfishly for the common good, you can count on a little help from the biological nature... But Dawkins' doctrine of eternal

selfish death, a kind of evolutionary original sin, contains errors. It extrapolates from incomplete categories, and makes a mistake so common, it has its own name, misleading composition. Dawkins' devil is not in the details, but in moving too far away from them. Dawkins defines: X as altruistic if he behaves in a way that increases the well-being of another such person at the expense of his own. Selfish behavior has the exact opposite effect. His scheme sees only two outcomes, selfish or altruistic, and zero-sum: X benefits from the loss of Y. This accurately describes genes competing with variations of themselves for a single dominance slot in future populations. But does the whole creation fit into this scheme? Obviously not, as it excludes: X and Y both lose; X and Y both get together. Many biologists confuse collaboration with altruism, but by Dawkins's definition, win-win cooperation is neither selfish nor altruistic. However, this logical space is crucial for all kinds with a team survival strategy. Oddly enough, Dawkins describes how each selfish gene depends on many other genes in an intricate joint-enterprise spread, and notes that the benefits accrued to any gene that works well with most other genes it depends on (minimum 181), but it still makes irrationally incompatible prophecies as we can expect... little help from a biological nature to cooperation. Dawkins doesn't carry it completely for the cooperative components of his book is not as well known as its misleading title, but his unsecular sermon lent the shield of science a lot bad bad Especially the false idea of a universal ruthless aspect of biology, a kind of evolutionary original sin that dooms everything that lives to live in a selfish world. Collaboration abounds, and all genes depend on it. Dawkins falls in love with the misleading composition. It improperly extends the properties of parts to whole. An absurd example: every atom in a cup glass is invisible, so the cup is invisible. Dawkins projects his preferred selfish property of zero-sum genes onto everything built by genes, and falsely concludes everything that has evolved... must be selfish. But all genes also cooperate. And besides, no gene-level property can be safely projected onto anything that has genes, or whatever they do. Biology is not so simple. It mixes competition and collaboration. In later editions, Dawkins partially backs away from his central egotistical dogma, saying, Without departing from the fundamental laws of selfish gene theory... cooperation and mutual assistance can flourish. The theory of the game proved that his prophecy of little help from biological nature was false. Collaboration generously can be an evolutionarily stable strategy, with higher performance than selfishness. Dawkins' partial reversal details sadly unsimple did not spread as successfully as his original sermonizing. On the 30th anniversary of the publication, he admitted that being born selfish was misleading and asked readers to please mentally remove that rogue proposal and others like him. Pointing out these others will help. It is time for all the necessary corrections to be preached as zealously as previous mistakes. The cooperative, interdependent command aspect of genes involves careful generalization. Just as no gene can survive alone, there can be no members of any interdependent species. What might be called the natural dependency principle can be useful for mapping the evolutionary limits of selfishness: nature ultimately eliminates everything that damages what it depends on. Such command logic is embedded in human social instincts, which should limit what is considered rational vested interest. But many leading mind practitioners for some reason consider it rational to damage what they depend on. Their unqualified reasoning yields poor results in many social problems coordinating life like the tragedy of Commons.The pop science of selfishness needs updating. Team cooperation and survival and selfishness are natural and rational. Each of them is sometimes suitable for circumstances. Dawkins says he could name his book The Co-operative Gene. Evolution would have been better understood if he had done so. Illustration by Julia Suits, New Yorker Cartoonist and author of The Extraordinary Catalogue of Peculiar Inventions.Previously in this series: in our nature to be self-deficientInheriting second natureShay Ruly NatureIt's in our nature to need StoriesTools are in our natureYYY Nature We Nature for Us: Evolution on both sides of the streetJustice is in our natureBehavioral Telescope shows how collaboration works These examples can contain rude words based on your search. These examples may contain search-based colloquial words. in his 1976 bestseller The Selfish Gene. الجينات الأنانية 1976 الجينات الأنانية. And that's what Richard Dawkins was about in his 1976 bestseller, The Selfish Gene. الجينات الأنانية 1976 الجينات الأنانية. Theory was proposed by Robert Trivers in 1974 and expands the more general selfish theory of genes and has been used to explain many observed biological phenomena. اقترح استحدث دوكنيز في كتابه الجين الأناني كلمة ميم (المعادل السلوكي للجين) كوسيلة لتشجيع الفُراء على التفكير في. In his book Selfish Gene, Dawkins came up with the word meme behavioral equivalent of gene) as a way to encourage readers to think about how Darwinian principles can be extended beyond the gene area. في كتابه الجين الأناني على مستوى أعلى. وقدم لأول. Richard Dawkins, whom you'll hear later in the day, invented the term memes, and put forward the first really clear and vivid version of this idea in his book The Selfish Gene... في كتابه أنانية الصفة الوراثية والاستنتاج العميق الذي خرجت به هو أنه إن نجح ذلك, فيمكن. No results have been found for this value. Word Index: 1-300, 301-600, 601-900, MoreExpress Index: 1-400, 401-800, 801-1200, MoreFaz Index: 1-400, 401-800, 801-1200, More the selfish gene arabic pdf

normal\_5f8724f279639.pdf

normal\_5f89e135ef463.pdf

normal\_5f8b45bd3928c.pdf

oregon scientific weather radio wr601n manual

water soluble and fat soluble vitamins pdf

panduan photoshop cs4 bahasa indonesia pdf

nuclear and radiochemistry friedlander pdf

manual taller suzuki bandit 400 pdf

kings of comedy download

bond market in india pdf

country road uke chords

nikana prime build 2018

es file explorer apk uptodown android

migration push pull factors worksheet

dama dmbok pdf free download

reading a ruler worksheet answer key

the flight from conversation sherry turkle summary

water treatment plant pdf

super mario daisy costume

economic census 2020 pdf

2019 and 2020 calendars side by side

dark souls 3 co op builds

28543000213.pdf

54504085140.pdf