

demonstrated its own characteristic hormonal response pattern. We emphasized that neither male group showed the typical female response pattern (which itself counters a popular myth about gay men). Indeed, the title of our paper is clear about what we report: "Neuroendocrine response to estrogen and *sexual orientation* [emphasis ours]." It is not possible to understand or "explain" the development of heterosexuality without also knowing something about the development of homosexuality.

The notion that we fail to consider alternative physiological or nonbiological explanations for our findings is without merit. Our report explicitly stated, "Since we may have measured an adult hormonal correlate of sexual orientation that is causally independent of sexual differentiation, a causal relation [between the endocrine response and sexual orientation] should not be inferred. Unknown physiological factors in the adult may account for the differential responses of LH [lutening hormone] and testosterone reported here" (page 1498). In addition, we carefully enunciated a multitude of interpretations of the data in our report and to the news media.

Herek writes that scientists can shape media coverage of research by carefully framing research questions and explicitly stating alternative explanations of data. To some extent this may be possible, and we share Herek's concern about what the press chooses to emphasize in its coverage of research. But we do not write press reports. Nevertheless, while journalistic coverage of our research varied in quality and accuracy, it was, for the most part, responsible. As Herek points out, however we interact with the media in our effort to educate and inform, we cannot be held responsible for journalist's reactions, nor for reactions of readers who will not be persuaded by logic, scientific evidence, or reason.

If there is an underlying assumption behind this research project, it is that there may be influence from the hypothalamic-pituitary-gonadal axis on sexual orientation. Overall, our research interests focus on many aspects of sexuality and the development of sexual orientation. This report is but one brief paper among many related to patterns of sexual orientation, nearly all of which are psychological and sociological studies.

We agree and regret that prejudice is rampant against lesbians and gay men in our society. Yet many lesbians and gay men have applauded our report of a biological correlate of homosexual orientation. We understand that they see it as an inroad against the vicious attacks of certain organizations that condemn ho-

mosexual orientation as purely willful, sinful, and objectionable. If homosexuality should some day be demonstrated to be a biological variant of human sexuality, in the way left-handedness is a biological variant of handedness, acceptance of alternative sexual lifestyles may become a reality.

BRIAN A. GLADUE

Department of Psychology, Laboratory of Psychoendocrine Research, North Dakota State University, Fargo 58105

RICHARD GREEN

Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Science, State University of New York, Stony Brook 11794

RONALD E. HELLMAN

South Beach Psychiatric Center, Brooklyn, New York 11201

Academic Freedom

Harold Shapiro's editorial (6 July, p. 9) praises the university for being an "intellectually open community" and urges that it not become "the ally of a particular point of view." Shapiro writes that academic freedom is threatened by "interest groups" who exhort the university to take "official positions" on such issues as South Africa and militarism. It seems to me that he is misdiagnosing the situation.

A university, of course, is more than a community of scholars and students; it is also a political and economic institution in society. Such an institution is not and cannot be neutral on social issues. It has funds to invest, and it either does or does not invest some of them in South Africa. Either way it is making a moral and political statement as well as a financial one. Does the university have an ROTC program? If so, it has taken an institutional stand in favor of U.S. military preparedness and the uses to which it is put, and it is clearly an ally of the "particular point of view" that shapes these policies. To me it appears that the non-ideological position for a university would be refraining from actual participation in ROTC or other military programs, while remaining intellectually open to all points of view. Yet many academics regard ROTC as acceptable, but find attempts to remove it undesirably "political." Why is this?

I certainly agree with Shapiro that we must defend academic freedom. But this cannot be done by the impossible attempt to avoid taking stands on moral or political issues. Surely the first step in addressing such issues as military programs or investment policy should be to discard the myth of the nonpolitical uni-

versity and to look at the situation more realistically. We might find, for example, that ROTC is a price universities must pay in order to function, or that South African investments are too profitable to forego. (I believe neither.) But let us not delude ourselves that the institution has escaped being "the ally of a particular point of view."

JOHN LAMPERTI

Department of Mathematics and Computer Science, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire 03755

The question of whether or not a university should "take sides" must certainly include the question of who (if anyone) speaks for the university and how the spokesperson arrives at decisions. In some cases the regents or trustees take an unusually significant position, in others it is a president or chancellor, and occasionally it is a faculty or student group. Until the spokesperson question can be answered, the question of taking sides is moot.

Shapiro concludes that in order to maintain its intellectual openness the university should not take sides. It is not clear that this precludes acceptance of basic operating (or moral) principles that would guide policy decisions. A belief in, and application of, justice would support an affirmative action policy. What can be lost in intellectual openness by acknowledging this relationship? Without acceptance of at least the basic virtues, the integrity of educational institutions is easily lost. With these, creativity and community can operate with greater freedom.

Damage to higher education as an institution has resulted from well-publicized dogmatic positions. The Nixon library has yet to find a university home. Jean Kirkpatrick may not be hosted on campus. So it seems that with the described switch to academic freedom, there is no less dogmatism—just a different kind. In no way does the new dogmatism, or any other, support inquiry, creativity, and community.

JOSEPH B. HARRIS

Department of Biology, University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point 54481

As a careful reading of my editorial reveals, I did not say that universities should refrain from taking stands on all moral issues, merely that we must be cautious about adding to the number of issues on which we have already taken a stand. I still believe that this is good advice.

HAROLD T. SHAPIRO

University of Michigan, Ann Arbor 48109