

# Re: Culture is not consciously developed? Q for Wilkins

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2006-11/msg00081.html>

---

- *From:* "John Edser" <[edser@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:edser@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Mon, 6 Nov 2006 13:42:09 -0500 (EST)
- 

"whitesickle@xxxxxxx" whitesickle@xxxxxxx

Guy Hoelzer:–  
Drift always happens in every  
population all of the time without exception. This is not an opinion,  
rather it is a necessary consequence of the finiteness of all

populations.

It is selection that can come and go along with heritable variation for  
fitness.

Michael Ragland:–  
I'm not real familiar with the concept of drift but what is it "useful"  
for. Does it confer either an advantage, disadvantage or both on a  
population?

By definition, the term "genetic drift" can only represent the random  
process of sampling error. If you take a population of just about anything  
and then reduce it by randomly removing some of the members, the number of  
similar types in the reduced population will mostly be different to those in  
the original population. The smaller the sampled population the larger the  
drift effect becomes. Random sampling error can be verified in only one way:  
the observation of a single idealized pattern known as a "random pattern".  
Since evolutionary theory is predicated on a change in the number of types  
within one population over time (temporal change) sampling error matters.  
The question is, in exactly what way does it matter? Since drift is just a  
random process it can only randomly reduce/remove alleles from a population,  
i.e. produce TEMPORAL RANDOM VARIATION and NOT RANDOM EVOLUTION simply  
because "random evolution" is a contradiction of terms. The NON random  
process of natural selection operates on as many types of random heritable  
variation that exist. Unlike drift selection provides NON random

## Re: Culture is not consciously developed? Q for Wilkins

evolutionary changes observable as NON random patterns where each pattern can be unique. However, gene centric Neo Darwinism regards the random temporal pattern produced by drift to represent evolution when it can only validly represent temporal variation. Neo Darwinists have incorrectly redefined evolution to become ANY change in gene freq. within one population, no matter if that change is just random. At the stroke of a pen evolutionary theory was reduced from a Darwinian non random and empirically refutable process to just an irrefutable random mathematical process stopping the evolution of evolutionary theory.

I've often read evolution is glacial in its slowness. Is this due to the low rate of natural selection i.e. mutations that come along with heritable variation for fitness?

JE:–

As EMPIRICAL observations enter theory, natural selection acting on any form of variation (which includes random temporal variation) has been observed (as expected) to be much faster than predicted by selection acting on just a mythical gene-by-gene basis. The unexpected tiny size of the human genome (20,000–30,000 polypeptide coding genes) and the paltry number of these genes which are different in chimps threw out Haldane's gene centric "dilemma" simply because it never existed. Haldane required large genomes (100,000's of genes) and much larger differences than those observed between Human and chimp genomes because the heritability concept he used remained oversimplified as additive (after Fisher). It takes many more genes to code for the phenotypes concerned whenever you restrict the coded information to be just additive where these additive associations can only evolve slowly. OTOH, it only takes a small number of genes to code for the same observed phenotypes, where these genes can evolve much more quickly if they are allowed to be coded in a non additive way. The real reason why non additive genetic associations remain ignored is because they destroy gene fitness independence and the gene centric theory along with it. The vast majority of heritable traits have to be coded by just a small number of NON additive genetic associations in order to be able to explain the tiny size of the human genome and microscopic number of genes which are different to a chimp.

Also, its my impression natural selection is adaptive to the environment in conferring fitness yet there are some populations which retain naturally selected mutations which are no longer adaptive to their environment. In such cases they can die out. Why is natural selection so slow?

JE:–

Genes work together in a non additive fitness way. Just because one gene appears to be "bad" when associated with some genes does not mean that the

Re: Culture is not consciously developed? Q for Wilkins

same gene remains "bad" when associated with others. IOW there is no such thing as a "bad gene", just a less fit set of gene associations and bad theories which delete non additive gene associations as non heritable.

Do you think genetic engineering could be a form of 'natural selection' in the future selecting traits which make us adaptive to our environment?

JE:-

As Guy Hoelzer has agreed, everything, including "genetic engineering" remains subject to the Darwinian non random process of natural selection. It seems to me a great pity that Guy continues to refuse to discuss exactly the same argument in reference to the selection of meiotic drive genes.

snip<

Regards,

John Edser  
Independent Researcher

edser@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx