LONG HISTORICAL STRATIFICATION OF HUMAN ATTRIBUTES

ZULFIKAR MOINUDDIN AHMED

I provide here some guidelines for my expectations of how Human Nature might be stratified without any effort to prove any of it. You see, the human genome can be profitably seen in several simple ways. First, there is some 99.9% exactly in common across all human beings. Let us give this the name G_c, for genome in common. Then there is variability in 0.1% that define *human diversity*. That is the first elementary fact.

Now we consider evolutionary time scale. Now some large fraction of G_c are actually elements from earlier *mammals* and this will be stratified in extremely early time periods like 200Mya-100Mya. Then we consider a filter by time. We consider time interval

$$T_{long} = [-2000, 000, 0]$$

in units of *centuries*. In each century we will have some genetic code that was novel and stayed in the human genetic code.

This is a natural breakdown. Our actual normal language does not respect this stratification scheme, in part because proteins coded from many different strata will inform particular overt measurable features of humans.

What my Universal Human Moral Results support is that the G_c contains the driving force of moral values of humans and the variation due to the complement, the 0.1% of the genome that vary, is limited to 6.5-9.5% of the total variation.

This gives us a sense for what ethnicity amounts to quite clearly. You see, ethnicity did not exist before around 75kya at all. All our ancestors had a meta-tribe in East Africa then. So all ethnic effects are concentrated in 750 most recent centuries. Most human behaviour is not dominated by genetic expression of this strate alone but is a complex mixture of genes from earlier strata.

Now we consider an arbitrary quantitative metric $f : \mathcal{H} \to \mathbf{R}$ for human beings. In psychology metrics are called 'constructs'. I prefer 'metrics' because it is more clear to many people from many other fields. We assume that the metric is *stable* which is familiar to psychology, where instability of metrics is a significant problem.

We ask, what is the genetic influence of this metric $f(h)$? Well, the natural parsimonious expectation is that for almost all stable metrics f in some appropriate measure for space of stable metrics, we expect most metrics to have dominant effect from G_c. This is a hypothesis, not a claim to truth. We also expect that ethnicity variation will be limited for this reason.

Now there do exist many metrics which have significant differences, but we claim they are rather special. This whole picture, especially when our evolutionary history is taken into account produces quite different natural expectations from those that currently propagate throughout earth. The approach here is not any 'apology for

political correctness' but rather seeing human beings from a perspective that is more serious scientifically than what exists in this primitive age.