

Re: Article: No sex for 40 million years? No problem

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2007-03/msg00147.html>

- *From:* "Alan Meyer" <ameyer2@xxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Mon, 26 Mar 2007 00:17:00 -0500 (EST)
-

"Robert Karl Stonjek" <rstonjek@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message [news:ett4q8\\$3ft\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:ett4q8$3ft$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

... The study challenges the assumption that sex is necessary for organisms to diversify ...

I am a neophyte in the study of biology and evolution, but I wasn't aware that such an assumption was made by our standard theories.

Don't bacteria evolve without sex? Don't many single celled eukaryotes evolve without sex? Don't some multi-cellular plants and animals evolve without sex? Aren't many types of mutation caused by radiation, ultra-violet light, or errors in mitosis without requiring any sex?

It has been demonstrated that even bacteria can exchange DNA. However, if there were no evolution without sex, there would be no differences in DNA to exchange.

This reminds me of a major announcement made by a professor of agriculture at the University of Illinois when I was a student there in the early 70's. He told the newspapers that he had found a way to make unpalatable beans palatable. When asked what he did, he said he boiled them in water for 20 minutes. He had apparently thought that boiling beans was a new and unique discovery.

Alan

.