Daisyworld Misunderstood: Gaian Homeostasis is Inevitable
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The streamlined tuna is fit for purpose, needs a selective explanation. The boulder rolling to the bottom of a hill doesn’t. Too many misunderstand Daisyworld-style explanations [1] of Gaian regulation as the former type. But Daisyworld is the latter: from some initial conditions a pattern of Daisyworld-homeostasis is inevitable, no selection needed.

Misunderstanding follows failure to distinguish between Viability and Feasibility [2].

Define Viability_D(T) as the steady-state quantity of D-daisies at T-temperature. In turn, daisies have effect(D) on T (e.g. black daisies are warmer). The D<->T interactions are parameterised by some perturbation L (e.g. solar Luminosity). Define Feasibility-Range FR(D,effect()) as the range of L-values supporting stable equilibrium with D>0: ‘feasible Luminosities supporting steady Viability>0’.


Any (+/-) effect that D has on T can only increase (never decrease) Feasibility-Range. This agrees with classical Daisyworld-homeostasis [1] (that used ‘anecdotal’ examples open to accusations of cherry-picking); but is now fully generalisable [2] (including to any number of D_i or of T_j without selection).

A change in effect() may increase Feasibility-Range whilst decreasing Viability. They are different, indeed orthogonal, though commonly confused: even Gaian advocates [3] misleadingly claim “Daisyworld is a special case in that traits selected at an individual scale also lead to global regulation”. Actually interactions with Darwinian evolution are very different than this implies, and even random unselected trait-effects support such global regulation. Advances in Gaia theory are essential for understanding past, present and future homeostasis of this planet; but are hindered by such misunderstandings and misplaced appeals to selection.
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