

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

1975

H. S. GUTOWSKY	DONALD LINDSLEY
N. BRUCE HANNAY	RUTH PATRICK
DONALD KENNEDY	RAYMOND H. THOMPSON
DANIEL E. KOSHLAND, JR.	

1976

ALFRED E. BROWN	FRANK PRESS
JAMES F. CROW	FRANK W. PUTNAM
HANS LANDSBERG	MAXINE SINGER
EDWARD NEY	ARTHUR M. SQUIRES

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

WILLIAM D. CAREY

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editors: PATRICIA ROWE

News and Comment: JOHN WALSH, LUTHER J. CARTER, DEBORAH SHAPLEY, ROBERT GILLETTE, NICHOLAS WADE, CONSTANCE HOLDEN, BARBARA J. CULLITON, SCHERRAINE MACK

Research News: ALLEN L. HAMMOND, WILLIAM D. METZ, THOMAS H. MAUGH II, JEAN L. MARX, ARTHUR L. ROBINSON, GINA BARI KOLATA, FANNIE GROOM

Book Reviews: KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, LYNN MANFIELD, JANET KEGG

Cover Editor: GRAYCE FINGER

Editorial Assistants: JOHN BAKER, ISABELLA BOULDIN, MARGARET BURESCH, ELEANORE BUTZ, MARY DORFMAN, SYLVIA EBERHART, JUDITH GIVELBER, CORRINE HARRIS, NANCY HARTNAGEL, OLIVER HEATWOLE, CHRISTINE KARLIK, MARGARET LLOYD, JEAN ROCKWOOD, LEAH RYAN, LOIS SCHMITT, RICHARD SEMIKLOSE, YA LI SWIGART, ELEANOR WARNER

Guide to Scientific Instruments: RICHARD SOMMER

Membership Recruitment: GWENDOLYN HUDDLE; *Subscription Records and Member Records:* ANN RAGLAND

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

MARGARET STERLING

Advertising Sales Manager: RICHARD L. CHARLES

Sales: NEW YORK, N.Y. 10036: Herbert L. Burklund, 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858); SCOTCH PLAINS, N.J. 07076: C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); CHICAGO, ILL. 60611: Jack Ryan, Room 2107, 919 N. Michigan Ave. (312-DE-7-4973); BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF. 90211: Winn Nance, 11 N. La Cienega Blvd. (213-657-2772); DORSET, VT. 05251: Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581)

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phones: (Area code 202) Central Office: 467-4350; Book Reviews: 467-4367; Business Office: 467-4411; Circulation: 467-4417; Guide to Scientific Instruments: 467-4480; News and Comment: 467-4430; Reprints and Permissions: 467-4483; Research News: 467-4321; Reviewing: 467-4443. Cable: Advancesci. Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. See also page xi, *Science*, 26 September, 1975. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Room 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE-6-1858.

Social Determinism and Behavioral Genetics

The fusion of evolutionary theory with genetics has yielded several profound insights into the nature of man. We now know that most traits are determined by interaction between genes and the environment, rather than by either acting independently. Moreover, the traditional view of race, as a set of stereotypes with minor variations, has been invalidated by the knowledge that races differ statistically and not typologically in their genetic composition. Finally, the rapid evolution of our species implies wide genetic diversity, with respect to behavioral as well as to morphological and biochemical traits.

Unfortunately, the idea of genetic diversity has encountered a good deal of resistance. Some egalitarians fear that its recognition will discourage efforts to eliminate social causes of educational failure, misery, and crime. Accordingly, they equate any attention to genetic factors in human behavior with the primitive biological determinism of early eugenicists and race supremacists. But they are setting up a false dichotomy, and their exclusive attention to environmental factors leads them to an equally false social determinism.

Ironically, this opposition parallels that of theologians a century ago: both saw the foundations of public morality threatened by an implication of evolution. But neither religious nor political fervor can command the laws of nature. One might accordingly expect scientists, knowing this very well, to encourage the public to accept genetic diversity—both as an invaluable cultural resource and as an indispensable consideration in any approach to social equality. Yet in a recent "NOVA" program on the Public Broadcasting Service a distinguished population geneticist denied the legitimacy of human behavioral genetics, scorned the belief that musical talent is inherited, and even minimized the contributions of genetics to agricultural productivity. Similarly, members of a group called Science for the People, criticizing a study of possible behavioral effects of chromosomal abnormalities, wrote* of the "damaging mythology of the genetic origins of 'antisocial' behavior," as though one must choose between genetic and social causation rather than study their interaction.

To be sure, in behavioral genetics premature conclusions are all too tempting, and they can be socially dangerous. Moreover, even sound knowledge in this field, as in any other, can be used badly. Accordingly, some would set up lines of defense against acquisition of the knowledge, rather than against its misuse. This suggestion has wide appeal, for the public is already suspicious of genetics. It recognizes that earlier, pseudoscientific extrapolations from genetics to society were used to rationalize racism, with tragic consequences; and it has developed much anxiety over the allegedly imminent prospect of genetic manipulation in man. Hence one can easily visualize an American Lysenkoism, prescribing an environmentalist dogma and proscribing or discouraging research on behavioral genetics. But such a development would deprive us of knowledge that could help us in many ways: for example, to improve education (by building on the diversity of individual potentials and learning patterns), to decrease conflicts, to prevent and treat mental illnesses, and to eliminate guilt based on exaggerated conceptions of the scope of parental responsibility and influence.

In the continuing struggle to replace traditional myths by evolutionary knowledge the conflict over human diversity may prove even more intense and prolonged than the earlier conflict over special creation: the critics are no less righteous, the issues are even closer to politics, and guilt over massive social inequities hinders objective discussion. What the scientific community should do is not clear. At the least we might try to help the public to realize the value of scientific objectivity, separated from political convictions, in understanding human diversity. Long ago men began to understand chemical diversity when they gave up the search for a philosopher's stone, which they had hoped would transmute other elements into gold. Today in human biology we face a similar problem in learning to build on facts as well as on hopes.—BERNARD D. DAVIS, *Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts 02115*

*J. Beckwith, D. Elseviers, L. Gorini, C. Mandansky, L. Csonka, J. King, *Science* **187**, 298 (1975).