

Re: Nei's "new mutation theory" resurrects William Bateson

Source: <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.bio.evolution/2008-01/msg00056.html>

- *From:* "Entertained by my own EIMC" <write_to_eimc@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx>
 - *Date:* Fri, 18 Jan 2008 01:47:19 -0500 (EST)
-

I don't think anyone with a decent ability to survey "the scence" of relevant and sufficiently scientifically established principles, theories, insights, correlations (etc...) – or, IOW, to even just "skim the '~SEPTIC~' surface" – would deny intrinsic biases in the process of evolution.

And, yes, drift *does exist* but only to any significant extent if its potential "daftness" is deemed adaptive enough by natural selection (– an ever excellent example of which is our retinal blindspot).

On this background, the principle of natural selection, amplified in its explanatory power by the notion of selection "pressures" (yet another metaphorical enlightenment promoting term), allows *some* of us to grasp this topic in a *complementary* "EPT" (~=evolution pertaining theoretical) way.

That is, to understand these things by a (as if) "summing" [over (fauna–phylogeny–relevant) histories]" naturally selectively relevant and by genetically mutating individual lifecycles as if crucially exploited/realized/"taken" (from directly to indirectly so) intrinsic and environmental potentials or "opportunities" to procreate
+
synaptic hibernation imploring type predicaments
+
by such adversity (that is, approximately, inescapable, irregularly occurring, and not reproductively survived unless *inducing* of "synaptic hibernation", predicaments) normally conditioned–in (as in automatically imprinted) "primal pain" alt. "Pain" (or CURSES, by me) – i.e. conditioned–in within the attention selection serving system of individuals in such predicaments.

P.S.

[The two perfectly synonymous nouns, "primal pain" and "Pain" (with a capital), are jargon formerly usually used by Arthur Janov. Nowadays he seems to prefer to use just (or mainly) "imprints"; For good reasons, it seems to me.]

It is likely that both John Edser's and Arlin's (amongst untold other's)

Re: Nei's "new mutation theory" resurrects William Bateson

view of these energy-patterning matters may be such that it warrants me surmising that they have mental (not retinal) blindspots that prohibit an optimally wide, balanced and in-depth overview of us all (including of themselves) and other aspects of What Is (and was and will be) going on.

"Arlin" <arlin.stoltzfus@xxxxxxxxxx> wrote in message
[news:fmo73r\\$2g4\\$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:news:fmo73r$2g4$1@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)

On Jan 15, 2:30 pm, "John W Edser" <ed...@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

This [Baer, et al] explains how, in the "new mutations" view that (because it works so well) tends to dominate the thinking of molecular evolutionists, the rate of evolution is understood to be a product of two factors, a rate of origin uN , and a probability of fixation, p . This view may be applied, not just to neutral evolution, but to adaptive changes (eqn. 7, p. 627).

JE:–
Mathematics is not a science. Mistaking good mathematics for good science is repeated ab nauseum within polycentric Neo Darwinian argument. Initially, as

I agree that mathematical formalisms are insufficient to convey theories, mechanisms or causal relations in science (see Pearl's excellent book *_Causality_*).

I also agree that it is insufficient to describe mutation with a single parameter. I made this point several posts back, when I said that while N is a scalar, u has "many dimensions". In particular, mutation exhibits biases that have a predictable influence on the outcome of evolution.

Attempts to elevate selection to the status of a special force uniquely governing evolution must fail because, in fact, selection is not uniquely governing evolution.

JE:–

Re: Nei's "new mutation theory" resurrects William Bateson

Then what does? Just nothing at all?

Either answer the question or provide reader's with an apology.

Well, I explained dual causation already, but apparently that didn't sink in. In any case, readers don't have to take my word for it. Edser asked for hard empirical falsifiable science, and here it is:

Rokyta, D. R., P. Joyce, S. B. Caudle, and H. A. Wichman. 2005. An empirical test of the mutational landscape model of adaptation using a single-stranded DNA virus. *Nat Genet* 37:441–444.

Rokyta, et al. carried out one-step adaptive walks in an experimental system, and compared the results to a theoretical model of adaptation developed by Allen Orr. They excluded Orr's version on the basis of its Darwinian assumption that mutation is "random" in the sense of uniform (no biases). Instead, the model had to be adjusted to account for mutation bias, which has a predictable influence on the outcome of adaptation. The relevant mutational effects include a transition:transversion bias, and differential multiplicity of mutational paths to alternative states (if that's not clear, its explained in Stoltzfus, A. 2006. Mutationism and the Dual Causation of Evolutionary Change. *Evol Dev* 8:304–317).

Note that Orr's model is a neo-mutationist ("new mutations") model, and that Rokyta's results concern adaptation, not neutral evolution.

Thus, selection does not "100 % control" evolution. Instead, the hard empirical falsifiable science shows that the trajectory of evolutionary change jointly reflects both the introduction of variants (including effects of mutation bias) and the reproduction of variants (selection and drift). This is because evolution is fundamentally a two-step process, and both steps count. Nevertheless, Darwinists are deeply committed to the monistic doctrine that, in the words of Ayala "The ultimate source of explanation in biology is the principle of natural selection" (Ayala, F. J. 1970. *Philosophy of Science* 37:1–15.), therefore any attempt to invoke another principle (bias in the introduction of variation as a cause of non-randomness) must be denied, or twisted into a reference to selection, as Edser tries— and fails— to do. There is no metaphysical necessity to this monistic causal doctrine of Darwinists such as Edser. In other scientific contexts we would allow, for instance, that human behavior is jointly caused by genes and environment, or that (in a physics context) the trajectory of a particle can be caused by two distinct forces acting on the particle simultaneously.

Arlin

Re: Nei's "new mutation theory" resurrects William Bateson