


# CONFLICT AND COOPERATION I.






natural selection essentially a competitive process  $\Rightarrow$

cooperation between organisms is one of nature's most peculiar features


social insects, humans

mutualism





# Eg.: slime molds



# How can, in spite of conflict between organisms, cooperation evolve?

Charles Darwin: struggle for life

but also cooperation between a cow and her calf (cooperation between relatives))

Neodarwinism: evolution in populations, selection affects individuals

× till the 1960s, this assumption rather implicit (cf. Wright's „interdemic selection“)

Darwin, Wallace, Konrad Lorenz etc.: „benefit of species“, „survival of species“....

William Forster Lloyd (1833) → **Garrett Hardin** (1968):

## Tragedy of the commons

adding 1 sheep to the herd  $\Rightarrow$  direct benefit for the owner  
 $\times$  costs (drop of pasture) shared by the whole group

$\Rightarrow$  if people behave with respect to their benefit independently and rationally, eventually the sources are necessarily depleted



**Garrett Hardin (1968)**  
**Tragedy of the Commons**



Solution = voluntary restriction by herders  $\rightarrow$

**Why should such behaviour be favoured by selection?**




## 1962 – Vero Copner Wynne-Edwards:


*Animal Dispersion in Relation to Social Behaviour*

flocking, dispersion, restriction of reproduction, altruism

cooperation explained as the selection of whole groups rather than individual selection (in extreme form „adaptation for species’ survival“)




V. C. Wynne-Edwards



reaction:

1964: William D. Hamilton,  
John Maynard Smith



kin selection

1966: George C. Williams



genes are important!

1976: Richard Dawkins






# GROUP SELECTION

V.C. Wynne-Edwards:

dispersion in order to avoid depletion of sources

production of fewer offspring than potentially possible

alarm calls, fish shoals





## „stotting“

Thomson´s gazelle, springbok, mule deer, pronghorn etc.



**Individual advantage!**

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=qr5Sru8gGSk>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jMliB9DnRXg>

guards of the Arabian babbler (*Turdoides squamiceps*)  
and meerkats (*Suricata suricatta*)

*T. squamiceps*



alpha  
male

**Individual advantage!**




sentinel


*Suricata suricatta*




## Theoretical arguments against group selection:

**altruism** = behaviour increasing recipient's fitness and, at the same time, decreasing donor's fitness





Wynne-Edwards: Altruistic behavior will evolve because group selection favors it (i.e., more “selfish” populations go extinct.)



Williams: Within-population selection favors the “selfish” allele and increases it more rapidly than whole-population events, so the “selfish” allele will become fixed.

Low heritability and longer generation time of the group relative to heritability and generation time of individuals  $\Rightarrow$  changes at the individual level much faster


$\Rightarrow$  infiltration of selfish individuals, extinction of the altruistic population



# Conditions for group selection:

rapid alternations of extinction and re-creation of demes

Eg.: fig wasps (Agaonidae)




virtually no migration:

$c$  ... cost for an individual  
 $(b - c)$  ... benefit for the group



island model:

$$\frac{b - c}{c} > 2 Nm$$



**Conclusion: interdemic (group) selection will be stronger than intrademic (individual) selection only if the group benefit relative to the individual cost is higher than the average number of migrants per generation.**


# Michael Wade (1977): group selection experiment in the red flour beetle (*Tribolium castaneum*)



But in nature the role of group selection probably minimal



# KIN SELECTION



J.B.S.  
Haldane

(c) rsr.org

If I rescued my two brothers from drowning in the river, it would be the same as to rescue myself!



## William Hamilton (1964):

Hymenoptera: haplo-diploid system of sex determination:  
females  $2N$ , males  $N$

⇒ relationship:

worker – worker =  $\frac{3}{4}$

queen – descendants =  $\frac{1}{2}$


worker – drone =  $\frac{1}{4}$



**inclusive fitness** = fitness of an individual and his/her relatives


altruism between relatives = **kin altruism**





## coefficient of relationship:

Degree of relationship	Relationship	Coefficient of relationship (r)
0	identical twins; clones	100% <sup>[4]</sup>
1	parent-offspring <sup>[5]</sup>	50% ( $2^{-1}$ )
2	full siblings	50% ( $2^{-2}+2^{-2}$ )
2	3/4 siblings or sibling-cousins	37.5% ( $2^{-2}+2\cdot 2^{-4}$ )
2	grandparent-grandchild	25% ( $2^{-2}$ )
2	half siblings	25% ( $2^{-2}$ )
3	aunt/uncle-nephew/niece	25% ( $2\cdot 2^{-3}$ )
4	double first cousins	25% ( $2^{-3}+2^{-3}$ )
3	great grandparent-great grandchild	12.5% ( $2^{-3}$ )
4	first cousins	12.5% ( $2\cdot 2^{-4}$ )
6	quadruple second cousins	12.5% ( $8\cdot 2^{-6}$ )
6	triple second cousins	9.38% ( $6\cdot 2^{-6}$ )
4	half-first cousins	6.25% ( $2^{-4}$ )
5	first cousins once removed	6.25% ( $2\cdot 2^{-5}$ )
6	double second cousins	6.25% ( $4\cdot 2^{-6}$ )
6	second cousins	3.13% ( $2^{-6}+2^{-6}$ )
8	third cousins	0.78% ( $2\cdot 2^{-8}$ )
10	fourth cousins	0.20% ( $2\cdot 2^{-10}$ ) <sup>[6]</sup>



dependence on degree of relationship between donor and recipient  
(= on probability they share genes)

Hamilton's rule:

$$rb > c$$

$r$  = relationship;  $b$  = benefit;  $c$  = cost

relation between relationship and group selection:  $r > \frac{b - c}{c}$



# Eusociality:



Hymenoptera

Isoptera (termites)



mammals: naked mole-rat (*Heterocephalus glaber*),  
*Fucomys* mole-rats (Bathyergidae)

*H. glaber*

*Fucomys* sp.



Florida scrub jay (*Aphelocoma coerulescens*)  
(Florida):  $c = 7\%$ ,  $b = 14\%$



# INTRAGENOMIC CONFLICT

conflict between individuals within populations

conflict between relatives (siblings, mother – descendant)

conflict between males and females (sexual selection)

cooperation and conflict at the genomic level:

George Williams:

body mortal × genes (almost) immortal

„gene view“





## Richard Dawkins:


the term **selfish gene** (book *The Selfish Gene*, 1976):

body only as a vehicle for spreading replicators (genes)  
which cannot spread on their own

therefore selection affects genes rather than the whole organism  
genes must cooperate (the eight analogy)

**BUT!** the term „selfish“ must be understood as a metaphor!


sometimes some genetic element behaves „unfair“  
→ **ultraselfish DNA**





Gregor Mendel



Law of segregation



Intragenomic conflict results in higher frequency of some genomic elements in the next generation



Gregor Mendel



drive

95%

5%

drag

segregation (transmission) distortion



Intragenomic conflict may have many forms, eg.:

### Interference

= prevention of transmission of an alternative allele


### Gonotaxis

= preferential transmission to germinal lineage

## MEIOTIC DRIVE

### Overreplication

eg. transposons



# Interference

## 1. Autosomal

**SD (segregation distorters) genes:**

males *Drosophila melanogaster*

preferential transmission 95–99%

*distorter* and *responder*


spermatogenetic block in cells with  
disabled allele

often emergence of modifiers

SD genes = „outlaw genes“

**„Spore killers“ (*sk* genes):**

*Neurospora crassa*



# *t* haplotype:

male house mouse




~ proximal third of Chromosome 17

preferential transmission 95–99%

4 paracentric inversions  $\Rightarrow$  recombination only 2%


responder + several distorters

*t/t* males sterile  $\Rightarrow$  more than 15 lethal genes






diverse genetic structure leads to different drive results:



TRD mechanism different from drosophila:


responder = *Smok* (fused gene)

regulation of gene cascade involved  
in flagellum formation



distorter

responder



## 2. Maternal-effect killers


*Medea* gene:

Maternal-Effect Dominant Embryonic Arrest

*Tribolium castaneum*

mother  $M/+$

the gene eliminates all descendants who do not possess it – the  $+/+$  individuals die in the second larval instar





### 3. Sex-biased inheritance

uniparentally inherited genes are interested just in reproduction of the particular sex  $\Rightarrow$  **sex ratio distortion**


X chromosome drive  $\Rightarrow$  female-biased sex ratio  $\Rightarrow$  selection will favour return to the original state


#### **cytoplasmic male sterility (CMS)**

in 5-10% populations of monoecious plants  
mixed populations with sterile male plants

this sterility caused by mutant mitochondrial genome


advantage when the plants with sterile male sex invest more to pollen than to seeds  $\Rightarrow$  transmission of more mitochondria





if mother has 1 son and 1 daughter number of copies of her mtDNA remains the same

**CMS**



if mtDNA causes exclusive daughter production number of her copies is doubled in each generation

similar effect is caused by *Wolbachia*  
intracellular parasite of arthropods  
kills males who do not possess *Wolbachia*  
reduction of competition for sources –  
kin selection



besides killing males *Wolbachia* can have other phenotypic effects:

**feminisation:** infected males are developing as females or infertile pseudofemales

**parthenogenesis:** eg. in *Trichogramma* wasps males rare (likely due to wolbachias) → wolbachias help females to reproduce parthenogenetically, ie. without males

**cytoplasmic incompatibility:** inability of males with wolbachias to reproduce with females which does not possess them or which have wolbachias of other strain → **reproductive barrier, speciation**



# Overreplication

## Transposable elements (transposons)

incorporating of copies to other genome site  
([Barbara McClintock](#): „jumping genes“ in maize)

usually not removed from genome  
→ molecular fossils

usually huge numbers  
human: > half of genome

horizontal transfer, also between species

in some cases effect on gene regulation



## 1. DNA elements


„cut-and-paste“

enzyme transposase

*Ac* a *Ds* elements in maize (B. McClintock), *mariner* in animals,  
*P* elements in *Drosophila*

## 2. Retroelements

„copy-and-paste“



through RNA stage, reverse transcription (reverse transcriptase)

template stays at the original place  $\Rightarrow$  increase of copy numbers

## Retroelements

LTR-retrotransposons: *copia* in *D. melanogaster*

retrotransposons: LINE – L1 in human: 17% of genome

SINE: short, do not code for own reverse transcriptase

*Alu* sequence in human – 12% of genome; B1, B2 in mouse


### 3. MITE (miniature inverted-repeat transposable elements)

*Stowaway, Tourist*



gene effects can extend outside organisms –  
**R. Dawkins:** *The Extended Phenotype*

Eg.: cases of caddisfly larvae, spider webs



normal



LSD



mescaline



caffeine



chloral hydrate



amphetamine






marihuana (THC)




flukes: parasited individuals bulid thicker shells

*Toxoplasma gondii*: decrease of host's reaction time




similarly parasitic flukes:

eg. abdomen of parasited ant *Cephalotes atratus* turns red so that resembles edible berry (other species change ants' behaviour → they climb up a grass blade where they are eaten by cattle or sheeps)





ant *Monomorium santschii*: absence of workers  
→ invasion of foreign ant nests, „command“ to kill  
own queen and to adopt the invader queen



Duke of Burgundy (*Hamearis lucina*) caterpillars:

on head an organ producing a narcotic nectar; another pair of glands causing increased aggressiveness against all organisms except the caterpillar itself → protection („bodyguard“), several days of ants' drug addiction, ants do not leave the caterpillar

