

Random Variation and a Filter

QTC-010 · *From Quarks to Consciousness*

The universe, life, and how we came to know it

Author: Juan Seguroloa

Version: v1.0 EN · 2 September 2026

Epistemic profile: Established knowledge

License: All Rights Reserved

Article Abstract

Evolution is often compressed into a slogan: random mutation followed by natural selection. The slogan is useful only if both halves are handled carefully. Random does not mean that every mutation is equally likely, that chemistry has no biases, or that organisms change because they need to. Selection is nonrandom, yet it is not a mind, a plan, or the only force in evolution. This article follows the idea from Darwin and Wallace, who had natural selection without modern genetics, through experiments that showed mutations preceding selection and populations changing in real time. It then places fitness, drift, constraint, exaptation, and historical contingency into the same account. The result is a mechanism capable of producing striking adaptation without foresight, inevitable progress, or a perfect engineer.

In 60 Seconds

Populations evolve when inherited differences alter reproductive contribution across generations. Mutations supply some of those differences, but they do not appear because they would solve the organism's current problem. Their probabilities are shaped by molecular chemistry, sequence context, replication, repair, and physiological state. Natural selection is therefore a nonrandom sorting process acting on a biased but non-foresighted input. Darwin and Wallace recognized the sorting mechanism before anyone knew how genes, chromosomes, or DNA worked. Later experiments made the temporal order visible: resistant mutants existed before exposure, while selection amplified them afterward. Other experiments have watched adaptation, reversal, trade-offs, and historical contingency unfold. Yet selection never acts alone. Drift, migration, recombination, developmental constraint, and inherited history also change outcomes. Fitness is local to an environment, not a universal ladder of worth or complexity. Evolution can consequently build organisms that look designed while retaining compromises, repurposed parts, fragile routes, and traces of where their ancestors began.

Why This Question Matters

The phrase "random evolution" invites two opposite mistakes. One treats life as pure accident and erases selection; the other treats adaptation as evidence that useful changes were somehow anticipated. Both reverse the actual logic. Variation appears through physical processes with measurable biases, while environments change which variants leave descendants. Knowing that separation matters for antibiotic resistance, public arguments about purpose, and every later article about inheritance. It also supplies a practical standard: ask when a variant arose, how it was

transmitted, what altered its frequency, and which competing processes could produce the same pattern.

1. What Random Means

The Question

If mutation is random, why do the same useful adaptations sometimes appear repeatedly? The answer begins by separating randomness with respect to need from equal probability. Evolutionary randomness has a reference question: did the change arise because its future benefit was known?

Natural selection requires heritable differences, variation in reproductive contribution, and a relation between the two. A population can therefore change systematically even when the variants were not produced in response to what would help. The mechanism concerns differential persistence across generations, not the intention or origin story of each variation. [1,3,4]

In this context, random mutation means nondirected with respect to current adaptive value. It does not mean causeless, uniformly distributed, or equally likely to help and harm. A base substitution still has a chemical cause; the relevant point is that the molecular event does not inspect the future fitness of the resulting organism before occurring. [5,6]

Mutation spectra are strongly structured. Particular bases, sequence contexts, replication errors, repair pathways, and physiological states make some changes more likely than others. These biases can channel which adaptive routes are reached first, but a biased supply of variants is not the same thing as a system producing the exact change that future selection will reward. [6,7]

Selection is nonrandom because variants differ predictably in survival or reproduction within a specified environment. Even so, an evolutionary outcome can retain chance and history: mutations arrive in a particular order, finite populations sample descendants unevenly, and environments fluctuate. Selection is one causal process among several, not a guarantee that the same endpoint must always appear. [3,4,8,9]

Calling selection a filter captures one useful asymmetry: variants arise before their consequences are sorted. Yet a literal filter is too passive. Organisms reproduce, modify environments, migrate, compete, mate, and change the distribution of variation on which the next round acts. The image is an entrance to the mechanism, not a substitute for it. [3,8,9]

Where That Leaves Us

Randomness therefore describes the relation between mutational origin and adaptive need, not disorder in every molecular detail. Selection supplies directional sorting without foresight, while bias, sampling and history remain active. That distinction was unavailable in its modern form to the people who first described natural selection, because they had the filter before they had genetics.

2. Darwin Had a Filter, Not Genetics

Darwin's 1859 argument connected variation, struggle, and differential reproduction before Mendelian inheritance, chromosomes, DNA, or molecular mutation were integrated into biology. That achievement was conceptual rather than genetically complete. The later synthesis did not merely decorate natural selection with new vocabulary; it supplied a transmissible particulate mechanism that Darwin's generation did not possess. [1,12,13]

Credit also begins before the Origin. In 1858, writings by Charles Darwin and Alfred Russel Wallace were presented jointly to the Linnean Society. Their evidence, wording, and later influence were not identical, but an accurate history neither erases Wallace nor pretends that the two contributions were interchangeable in every respect. [1,2]

Darwin could observe that offspring resemble parents and that breeders accumulate differences, yet he did not know the physical mechanism maintaining hereditary information. His provisional pangenesis hypothesis imagined particles from body parts contributing to reproduction. It was a serious attempt to solve a real gap, and it was wrong as a modern account of inheritance. [1,10]

Lamarck's transformist framework was also more substantial than the caricature of an animal wishing itself into a new form. Darwin himself allowed use, disuse, and inherited effects in parts of his work. Modern population genetics and chromosome theory replaced these schemes with a different hereditary architecture rather than winning because earlier naturalists had never thought carefully about change. [10–13]

Some environmentally influenced states can pass across generations through epigenetic mechanisms. Their stability, scope, and biological importance differ among systems, however, and they do not establish a general process that writes specifically useful changes into genomes. Bounded transgenerational inheritance corrects an overly rigid picture of heredity without restoring adaptive Lamarckism as a universal rule. [11,14]

Where That Leaves Us

Darwin and Wallace identified a sorting principle while the carrier and rules of inheritance remained obscure. Later genetics made the mechanism testable at a finer scale and also exposed the limits of pre-genetic proposals. The decisive next step was experimental: determine whether useful variants appear after a challenge summons them, or already exist before selection begins.

3. Mutations Arrive Before the Need

The Question

A resistant colony appears after bacteria meet a virus or antibiotic. Did the exposure create the needed mutation, or did it reveal a rare variant already present? The two stories can produce the same final plate, so the experiment must recover the history that preceded it.

Luria and Delbrück compared the variation among many independent bacterial cultures. If resistance were induced only when phage arrived, resistant counts would cluster around a similar value. Instead, some cultures contained jackpots produced by early mutations whose descendants multiplied before exposure. The distribution carried a timestamp: resistant variants had arisen before the selecting virus. [15]

Replica plating supplied a spatial version of the same logic. Colonies grown without the selective agent were copied onto new plates, and resistant growth repeatedly appeared at corresponding positions. Investigators could return to the unexposed source colony. Selection revealed and enriched a pre-existing lineage rather than instructing each cell to manufacture the required mutation. [16]

Antibiotic resistance follows the same distinction at a larger historical scale. Resistance genes and resistance-conferring variants can be older than clinical antibiotics, because microbes and

antimicrobial compounds have long evolutionary histories. Medical use then creates intense selection and ecological opportunity, amplifying, combining, and moving variants that need not have originated in response to a prescription. [15–17]

Stress complicates the rate without reversing the logic. Cells can change repair, replication, recombination, or growth under adverse conditions, increasing mutation or shifting the spectrum of changes. That regulation can raise the chance that some useful variant appears, but it is not evidence that the genome identifies the exact future solution and writes it on demand. [5,18]

CRISPR-Cas immunity is genuinely acquired and sequence-specific: fragments associated with previous invaders can guide later defence. Yet that molecular memory records past encounters; it is not foresight about an unseen adaptive need. Calling every acquired biological response Lamarckian obscures the distinct mechanisms that experiments are able to separate. [19]

Where That Leaves Us

Fluctuation, position and historical archives all place variation before the selective challenge, while stress responses and immune memory add bounded mechanisms rather than foresight. Once timing is visible, selection stops being an abstract story about survivors. It becomes a process that can be watched across space, generations and reconstructed ancestral states.

4. Selection Can Be Watched

On a giant growth plate containing bands of increasing antibiotic concentration, bacterial populations expanded until they met a dose they could not cross. Resistant descendants then arose near the frontier and opened the next territory. The filmed pattern made adaptation visible while also showing path dependence: where a mutation appeared and which background carried it affected later access. [20]

Long-term evolution experiments preserve frozen ancestors and sample descendants over thousands of generations. Researchers can revive both and compare growth, genomes, and ecological behaviour directly. Replicate populations adapt to a shared environment yet diverge in detail, providing controlled evidence for selection without pretending that repetition removes chance or historical difference. [21]

The evolution of aerobic citrate use in one *E. coli* population illustrates layered contingency. Earlier changes made the lineage permissive, a rearrangement enabled weak citrate use, and later changes refined the phenotype. The innovation was neither a single mutation that would work in every background nor an inexplicable leap without selectable intermediate history. [22,23]

Field selection can reverse as conditions change. In Darwin's finches, beak traits associated with reproductive success under one pattern of rainfall and food availability need not remain favoured when the environment shifts. Measuring the same traits through time replaces a ladder of permanent improvement with conditional responses to local ecological circumstances. [8,24]

Peppered moth experiments likewise connect colour, background, and bird predation. Later field work strengthened the causal case without requiring every detail of every historical experiment to have been flawless. The example matters because it is one measured episode among many, not because a single textbook photograph carries the entire evidential burden for natural selection. [4,25]

Where That Leaves Us

Experiments and field records show selection changing populations, but they also show reversals, multiple routes and dependence on prior states. What spreads in one place or decade may fail in another. The next conceptual trap is therefore the word fitness, which sounds like a universal score although biology measures it only within a particular population and environment.

5. Fitness Is Local, Not Progress

The Question

“Fittest” sounds like strongest, healthiest or most advanced. In evolutionary analysis it means none of those things by itself. A trait earns an advantage only through its expected contribution to descendants in a stated setting, and the same trait can change sign when that setting changes.

Fitness is an expected reproductive contribution, defined for a genotype or phenotype in a population and environment. It can be estimated through survival, mating success, fecundity, offspring survival, or combinations of these components. It is not moral worth, bodily perfection, or an after-the-fact label for whatever happened to remain. [8,9]

Antibiotic resistance makes locality concrete. A resistance mechanism may slow growth when the drug is absent, while compensatory mutations can later reduce that cost. Whether the resistant lineage wins depends on concentration, competitors, treatment history, and compensation. Adaptation improves performance relative to a circumstance; it does not grant every advantage at once. [26]

The sickle-cell example contains an even sharper trade-off. In malaria-endemic settings, one copy of the relevant allele can reduce the risk of severe malaria, while two copies can cause sickle-cell disease. Selection can therefore maintain a polymorphism because the reproductive consequences differ among genotypes and environments, not because one allele is universally best. [27]

Sexual selection can favour costly ornaments, displays, or competition when increased mating success outweighs reduced survival. A trait that makes an animal more conspicuous or metabolically burdened may still spread. Natural and sexual selection are not opposing intelligences; they are components of differential reproductive contribution that can pull measured traits in different directions. [28]

Nor does evolution contain a built-in command to increase complexity. Trends can occur within particular lineages or measurements, sometimes because life begins near a lower bound and variation can expand upward. But each claimed trend needs its own metric, baseline, and mechanism. More descendants, not more complexity, is what selection directly discriminates. [29]

Where That Leaves Us

Fitness is a local accounting of descendants, so adaptation can include costs, balanced polymorphisms and traits that trade survival for mating. Nothing in that accounting supplies a universal scale of progress. It also cannot explain every frequency change, because finite populations sample inheritance unevenly even when variants have identical or nearly identical selective effects.

6. Selection Is Not Alone

Genetic drift is the stochastic change of allele frequencies produced by finite sampling across generations. Its effects are strongest when effective population size is small, because each reproductive sample represents a larger fraction of the population. Controlled populations and mathematical theory both show divergence even without a consistent selective advantage. [30,33]

Bottlenecks and founder events intensify that sampling. A sharply reduced population can lose variants by chance, while a small founding group may carry frequencies unlike the source population. Later growth does not recreate the missing history automatically. Selection can act afterward, but it acts on the altered variation that survived the demographic event. [30,33]

At the molecular level, neutral theory proposed that many substitutions spread and become fixed through drift rather than positive selection. Neutral does not mean functionless in every sense, and the theory does not deny adaptation. It changes the default explanation for a large class of molecular differences and supplies quantitative expectations for comparison. [31]

Nearly neutral theory adds that mutations with small effects can behave differently as effective population size changes. A weakly deleterious variant may be efficiently removed in a large population yet drift in a smaller one. The balance between drift and selection therefore varies among lineages, genomes, loci, and historical intervals rather than having one universal setting. [31,32]

Genomic evidence for selection must consequently be tested against demography, linkage, recombination, and background processes. A sweep-like pattern or unusual summary statistic can have more than one cause. Robust inference compares explicit models and independent evidence; merely naming a deviation from a simple null does not identify natural selection as its unique source. [37]

Where That Leaves Us

Selection remains indispensable, but drift and demography change the same genetic frequencies and can imitate some molecular signatures. Explanation requires alternatives, not a reflexive adaptation story. The same discipline applies to organismal form: inherited development and prior history limit what variation can be built, so evolution works with available structures rather than redesigning life from nothing.

7. Constraint, History and Imperfect Design

The Question

If selection rewards useful variants, why are organisms full of awkward routes, vulnerable compromises and repurposed parts? Because selection does not search every imaginable design. It modifies inherited development one viable step at a time, inside a history that makes some paths accessible and others unreachable.

François Jacob compared evolution to tinkering: new functions are assembled from materials already at hand. The metaphor points to a structural fact. Variation begins from an inherited organism whose genes, tissues, and developmental interactions must remain viable enough to

reproduce. Selection can refine what appears; it cannot summon arbitrary components from an unconstrained design space. [34]

Exaptation names a change in use. A feature may have been selected for an earlier function, or may have arisen without being shaped for its later role, and then become co-opted. The term prevents present usefulness from being projected backward as the reason the feature originally appeared. Function has a history, not just a current description. [35]

The adaptationist critique asks researchers to test alternatives before treating each trait as a direct optimal solution. Developmental constraint, drift, physical correlation, trade-offs, and shared ancestry can all contribute to a form. This is not an argument that adaptation is rare; it is an argument that the causal burden must be earned case by case. [36]

Complex functions need not arrive in a single leap. Intermediate stages can perform different or weaker tasks, duplicated parts can diverge, and existing structures can be co-opted. Digital-evolution experiments demonstrate that selectable intermediate pathways can generate complex operations under known rules, although they do not establish that any particular biological feature followed the same route. [34,35,38]

Constraint and contingency therefore make imperfection evidentially useful. A globally engineered system might erase its construction history, but evolved systems often retain detours and dependencies. Researchers can compare lineages, development, fossils, and genes to reconstruct those routes, while resisting the temptation to turn every plausible narrative into a demonstrated adaptation. [34–36]

Where That Leaves Us

Tinkering, exaptation and tested alternatives explain why useful organization can coexist with compromise and inherited detours. Complex outcomes can accumulate through selectable stages without a blueprint. The final task is to combine that history with the earlier distinction between variation and sorting, showing precisely how a mechanism without goals produces the appearance of purpose.

8. A Mechanism Without a Goal

Natural selection can produce a close fit between organisms and environments without representing a future state. Variants arise through proximate molecular and developmental processes; those variants that contribute more descendants tend to become more common. Repetition across generations stores the consequences of past sorting, giving adaptation its cumulative power without requiring useful mutations to be anticipated. [1,3,5,6]

The phrase “survival of the fittest” becomes circular only when fitness is defined as whatever survived. Evolutionary studies instead measure components such as survival, mating success, fecundity, or growth independently and test whether they predict later frequency change. A prediction can fail, which is exactly what prevents the explanation from reducing to a tautology. [8,9]

No single word captures the full process. Mutation and recombination create or rearrange variation; inheritance transmits it; selection changes contributions nonrandomly; drift samples finite populations; and migration connects them. Their relative strengths vary. The explanatory

achievement lies in measuring the processes and their interactions, not assigning every outcome to a universal selective optimizer. [3,30–32]

Constraint and history then shape the menu on which those processes act. Two populations facing similar pressures may start from different variants, developmental architectures, or earlier mutations and follow different routes. Convergence is possible, but so are divergence and reversal. Evolution has causal direction in particular settings without possessing a final direction for life as a whole. [34,36]

This article has separated the origin of variation from the filter that changes its frequency. It has not yet followed all the routes by which biological information is copied and exchanged. QTC-027 takes up that later problem: vertical inheritance builds a tree, while horizontal transfer and viruses add grafts, networks, and conflicts without abolishing descent. [3,30,31,32,34,36]

Where That Leaves Us

Evolution is neither pure accident nor planned improvement. Nondirected variation enters populations through biased physical processes; selection sorts consequences; drift, migration, constraint and history alter the route. Together they can accumulate design-like fit without a designer or destination. The next question is how inherited information remains reliable enough to preserve that accumulation while still changing.

What We Know, and How

- Mutations are physically caused and statistically biased, but their occurrence is not generally directed toward the adaptive value they will later have.
- Natural selection is measurable differential reproductive contribution, and experiments can distinguish it from mutation, drift and demographic history.
- Adaptation can accumulate through selectable intermediates, co-option and trade-offs without foresight or a universal trend toward complexity.

What We Still Don't Know

- For many historical adaptations, the exact sequence of intermediate variants, environments and population sizes cannot be reconstructed completely.
- The relative contributions of mutation bias, selection, drift, migration and constraint remain system-specific empirical questions.
- How often transgenerational epigenetic effects materially redirect long-term evolution varies among lineages and remains bounded by mechanism and persistence.

What Could Change Our Minds

- Routine, replicated production of specified future-beneficial mutations because of their exact usefulness would overturn the nondirected-mutation claim.
- Evidence that drift, demography and historical starting conditions add no explanatory power would radically simplify the present account.
- A universal, independently measurable trajectory of increasing complexity would revise the rejection of built-in evolutionary progress.

If You Remember Only One Thing

Variation is not produced because it will help; selection has no foresight; and evolution also reflects drift, trade-offs, constraint, migration and history.

Related Articles

- QTC-009 — What Do We Actually Mean by Life?
- QTC-027 — From Information to Inheritance: Tree, Web and Viruses

References

- [1] Charles Darwin. On the Origin of Species, first edition. Chs. I-IV; first-edition text (1859). <https://darwin-online.org.uk/content/frameset?itemID=F373&viewtype=text&pageseq=1>
- [2] Charles Darwin; Alfred Wallace. On the Tendency of Species to form Varieties; and on the Perpetuation of Varieties and Species by Natural Means of Selection. Journal of the Proceedings of the Linnean Society of London, Zoology 3:45-62 (1858). DOI 10.1111/j.1096-3642.1858.tb02500.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-3642.1858.tb02500.x>
- [3] R. C. Lewontin. The Units of Selection. Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics 1:1-18 (1970). DOI 10.1146/annurev.es.01.110170.000245. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.01.110170.000245>
- [4] John A. Endler. Natural Selection in the Wild. Princeton University Press (1986). <https://press.princeton.edu/books/paperback/9780691083872/natural-selection-in-the-wild>
- [5] Richard E. Lenski; John E. Mittler. The Directed Mutation Controversy and Neo-Darwinism. Science 259(5092):188-194 (1993). DOI 10.1126/science.7678468. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.7678468>
- [6] Ruth Hershberg. Mutation—The Engine of Evolution: Studying Mutation and Its Role in the Evolution of Bacteria. Cold Spring Harbor Perspectives in Biology 7:a018077 (2015). DOI 10.1101/cshperspect.a018077. <https://doi.org/10.1101/cshperspect.a018077>
- [7] A. Stoltzfus; L. Y. Yampolsky. Climbing Mount Probable: Mutation as a Cause of Nonrandomness in Evolution. Journal of Heredity 100(5):637-647 (2009). DOI 10.1093/jhered/esp048. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jhered/esp048>
- [8] Russell Lande; Stevan J. Arnold. The Measurement of Selection on Correlated Characters. Evolution 37(6):1210-1226 (1983). DOI 10.1111/j.1558-5646.1983.tb00236.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1983.tb00236.x>
- [9] H. Allen Orr. Fitness and Its Role in Evolutionary Genetics. Nature Reviews Genetics 10:531-539 (2009). DOI 10.1038/nrg2603. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2603>
- [10] Charles Darwin. The Variation of Animals and Plants under Domestication, volume 2. Ch. XXVII, provisional hypothesis of pangenesis (1868). <https://darwin-online.org.uk/content/frameset?itemID=F877.2&viewtype=text&pageseq=1>
- [11] Richard W. Burkhardt, Jr. Lamarck, Evolution, and the Inheritance of Acquired Characters. Genetics 194(4):793-805 (2013). DOI 10.1534/genetics.113.151852. <https://doi.org/10.1534/genetics.113.151852>

- [12] Ronald Aylmer Fisher. *The Genetical Theory of Natural Selection*. Clarendon Press (1930). DOI 10.5962/bhl.title.27468. <https://doi.org/10.5962/bhl.title.27468>
- [13] Theodosius Dobzhansky. *Genetics and the Origin of Species*. Columbia University Press (1937). <https://lccn.loc.gov/37027265>
- [14] Edith Heard; Robert A. Martienssen. Transgenerational Epigenetic Inheritance: Myths and Mechanisms. *Cell* 157(1):95-109 (2014). DOI 10.1016/j.cell.2014.02.045. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2014.02.045>
- [15] S. E. Luria; M. Delbrück. Mutations of Bacteria from Virus Sensitivity to Virus Resistance. *Genetics* 28(6):491-511 (1943). DOI 10.1093/genetics/28.6.491. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/28.6.491>
- [16] Joshua Lederberg; Esther M. Lederberg. Replica Plating and Indirect Selection of Bacterial Mutants. *Journal of Bacteriology* 63(3):399-406 (1952). DOI 10.1128/jb.63.3.399-406.1952. <https://doi.org/10.1128/jb.63.3.399-406.1952>
- [17] Julian Davies; Dorothy Davies. Origins and Evolution of Antibiotic Resistance. *Microbiology and Molecular Biology Reviews* 74(3):417-433 (2010). DOI 10.1128/MMBR.00016-10. <https://doi.org/10.1128/MMBR.00016-10>
- [18] Patricia L. Foster. Stress-Induced Mutagenesis in Bacteria. *Critical Reviews in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology* 42(5):373-397 (2007). DOI 10.1080/10409230701648494. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10409230701648494>
- [19] Rodolphe Barrangou; Christophe Fremaux; Hélène Deveau; Melissa Richards; Patrick Boyaval; Sylvain Moineau; Dennis A. Romero; Philippe Horvath. CRISPR Provides Acquired Resistance Against Viruses in Prokaryotes. *Science* 315(5819):1709-1712 (2007). DOI 10.1126/science.1138140. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1138140>
- [20] Michael Baym; Tami D. Lieberman; Eric D. Kelsic; Remy Chait; Rotem Gross; Idan Yelin; Roy Kishony. Spatiotemporal Microbial Evolution on Antibiotic Landscapes. *Science* 353(6304):1147-1151 (2016). DOI 10.1126/science.aag0822. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aag0822>
- [21] Richard E. Lenski; Michael R. Rose; Suzanne C. Simpson; Scott C. Tadler. Long-Term Experimental Evolution in *Escherichia coli*. I. Adaptation and Divergence During 2,000 Generations. *The American Naturalist* 138(6):1315-1341 (1991). DOI 10.1086/285289. <https://doi.org/10.1086/285289>
- [22] Zachary D. Blount; Christina Z. Borland; Richard E. Lenski. Historical Contingency and the Evolution of a Key Innovation in an Experimental Population of *Escherichia coli*. *PNAS* 105(23):7899-7906 (2008). DOI 10.1073/pnas.0803151105. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0803151105>
- [23] Zachary D. Blount; Jeffrey E. Barrick; Carla J. Davidson; Richard E. Lenski. Genomic Analysis of a Key Innovation in an Experimental *Escherichia coli* Population. *Nature* 489:513-518 (2012). DOI 10.1038/nature11514. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature11514>
- [24] Peter R. Grant; B. Rosemary Grant. Unpredictable Evolution in a 30-Year Study of Darwin's Finches. *Science* 296(5568):707-711 (2002). DOI 10.1126/science.1070315. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1070315>

- [25] L. M. Cook; B. S. Grant; I. J. Saccheri; J. Mallet. Selective Bird Predation on the Peppered Moth: The Last Experiment of Michael Majerus. *Biology Letters* 8(4):609-612 (2012). DOI 10.1098/rsbl.2011.1136. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2011.1136>
- [26] Dan I. Andersson; Diarmaid Hughes. Antibiotic Resistance and Its Cost: Is It Possible to Reverse Resistance? *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 8:260-271 (2010). DOI 10.1038/nrmicro2319. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrmicro2319>
- [27] A. C. Allison. Protection Afforded by Sickle-cell Trait Against Subtertian Malarial Infection. *British Medical Journal* 1(4857):290-294 (1954). DOI 10.1136/bmj.1.4857.290. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.1.4857.290>
- [28] Charles Darwin. The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex. Volume 1; sexual selection sections (1871). <https://darwin-online.org.uk/content/frameset?itemID=F937.1&pageseq=1&viewtype=text>
- [29] Daniel W. McShea. Metazoan Complexity and Evolution: Is There a Trend? *Evolution* 50(2):477-492 (1996). DOI 10.1111/j.1558-5646.1996.tb03861.x. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1996.tb03861.x>
- [30] Sewall Wright. Evolution in Mendelian Populations. *Genetics* 16(2):97-159 (1931). DOI 10.1093/genetics/16.2.97. <https://doi.org/10.1093/genetics/16.2.97>
- [31] Motoo Kimura. Evolutionary Rate at the Molecular Level. *Nature* 217:624-626 (1968). DOI 10.1038/217624a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/217624a0>
- [32] Tomoko Ohta. Slightly Deleterious Mutant Substitutions in Evolution. *Nature* 246:96-98 (1973). DOI 10.1038/246096a0. <https://doi.org/10.1038/246096a0>
- [33] Peter Buri. Gene Frequency in Small Populations of Mutant *Drosophila*. *Evolution* 10(4):367-402 (1956). DOI 10.2307/2406998. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2406998>
- [34] François Jacob. Evolution and Tinkering. *Science* 196(4295):1161-1166 (1977). DOI 10.1126/science.860134. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.860134>
- [35] Stephen Jay Gould; Elisabeth S. Vrba. Exaptation-a Missing Term in the Science of Form. *Paleobiology* 8(1):4-15 (1982). DOI 10.1017/S0094837300004310. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0094837300004310>
- [36] S. J. Gould; R. C. Lewontin. The Spandrels of San Marco and the Panglossian Paradigm: A Critique of the Adaptationist Programme. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 205(1161):581-598 (1979). DOI 10.1098/rspb.1979.0086. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.1979.0086>
- [37] Rasmus Nielsen. Molecular Signatures of Natural Selection. *Annual Review of Genetics* 39:197-218 (2005). DOI 10.1146/annurev.genet.39.073003.112420. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.genet.39.073003.112420>
- [38] Richard E. Lenski; Charles Ofria; Robert T. Pennock; Christoph Adami. The Evolutionary Origin of Complex Features. *Nature* 423:139-144 (2003). DOI 10.1038/nature01568. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature01568>

