

Did Adam Marry Eve?

We would like to comment on the Research News article by Roger Lewin (2 Oct., p. 24). The existence of a "mitochondrial Eve" relies on a strict female-to-female genetic transmission. Similarly, because of the strict male-to-male genetic transmission of the Y chromosome, one should expect to find a "Y chromosome Adam" by studying the polymorphism of the restriction enzyme cleavage pattern of Y chromosome-specific DNA sequences (provided they were not involved in either meiotic recombination or rearrangement events with the X chromosome) (1). A paradox may result from such studies: "Adam" and "Eve" may have belonged to distinct populations that intermixed a long time after the putative "Adam" and "Eve" came into existence.

This potential paradox can be illustrated by studies establishing the mitochondrial and Y chromosome ancestors of laboratory populations of the inbred house mouse. The mitochondrial DNA of all strains tested show restriction enzyme cleavage patterns identical to those of the wild mice, *Mus musculus domesticus* (2), whereas most classical laboratory mouse strains appear to carry a *Mus musculus musculus* Y chromosome (3). A similar disparity in the distribution of the Y chromosome type and mitochondrial genotype has been observed in the wild European populations across the hybridizing zone separating the two *Mus musculus* subspecies (3, 4).

The biblical concept of Adam and Eve as founders of humanity (and as an illustration of a bottleneck in human speciation) may soon therefore be confronted with experimental data.

OLIVIER Bensaude
Biologie Moléculaire du Stress,
Institut Pasteur,
28, rue du Dr. Roux,
75724 Paris Cedex 15, France
PHILIP Avner
Immunogénétique Humaine,
Institut Pasteur,
75724 Paris Cedex 15, France

REFERENCES

1. D. C. Page *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **311**, 119 (1984).
2. H. Yonekawa *et al.*, *Jpn. J. Genet.* **55**, 289 (1980); S. D. Ferris *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **295**, 163 (1982).
3. C. E. Bishop *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **315**, 70 (1985).
4. F. Vanlerberghe *et al.*, *Genet. Res. Camb.* **48**, 191 (1986).

Fraudulent Science

The proposed guideline of the National Conference of Lawyers and Scientists (NCLS) for "bringing charges anonymously" (AAAS News, 6 Nov., p. 813) against those presumed guilty of scientific fraud is almost as disturbing as the ethical transgression with which it attempts to cope. It suggests McCarthyism redux and contravenes the basic principles of our legal system which protect the right of the accused to face his accuser and which presume innocence until guilt is proved. Sophistry aside, the question arises as to whether NCLS must not also consider a mechanism to determine whether an allegation of fraudulence is not in itself false, made for reasons as varied as envy, vengefulness, perverseness, self-aggrandizement, or even emotional instability.

The *why* of fraudulent science may be as ephemeral as "simple" moral flaccidity, or it may be rooted in substantive and (for the perpetrator) intolerable pressures such as those generated by the competitive quest for funding or the attainment of academic tenure, or perhaps an unbridled need for recognition and kudos. But whatever its origin, survival of the community demands that the noxious practice be prevented if possible and, where found, extirpated root and branch. Clearly, NCLS's goals and burdens are critical to the nation and to science. But with equal clarity, endorsement of what amounts to a Star Chamber proceeding flies in the face of decency, of good law, and, ultimately, of good science.

M. B. Mittleman
35 Sutton Place,
New York, NY 10022

In the AAAS News article about fraud in scientific research, the quote by Benjamin Lewin, editor of the journal *Cell*, in which he states it is sometimes impossible to print a retraction, is of note. Corrections are "dependent upon other researchers in the field to correct the record."

This brings up a more significant and everyday problem, particularly in the medical fields. Many authors come into print, with no intent of fraud, as enthusiastic advocates of certain procedures or medications. Further experience may prove that the glowing expectations did not materialize. However, it frequently takes years before the literature proclaims this fact. Unless, of course, one happens to have corralled the author at the bar and found that he had abandoned the procedure some time ago.

I have proposed that editors promote a "Section of Recantation" in their journals. This would give authors an opportunity to

state, in simple fashion, that their anticipations had not been fulfilled. It would require only a few paragraphs at the most and would save us and the patients from needless expense, time, and inappropriate, if not harmful, procedures.

ALEX WEISSKOPF
Department of Otolaryngology,
University of California,
San Francisco, CA 94402

The Union Movement

While Henry S. Farber (Articles, 13 Nov., p. 915) controls for shifts in the employment sector in his analysis of declining unionization, controls for changes in the rules of the National Labor Relations Board seem lacking. The grounds accepted for unfair labor practices claims have expanded during this period, so the increased rate of filing such claims cited may signify little or no change in employer behavior. Certainly an analysis of the nature of claims filed is in order before the conclusion is drawn that employers resist unionization more strongly now than in the past.

Farber confines himself to considering workers' job satisfaction and expectations of union ability to gain improvements. This unfortunately ignores worker resistance to the political and other nonwork-related baggage that comes with most union organizations. In recent years, unionization has fared better in those states where agency shop contracts are not allowed, which implies that under "right to work" conditions unions succeed in shedding their irrelevant baggage and more accurately represent workers' aspirations.

Changing union behavior may be more effective in reversing the decline in unionization than changing employer resistance or worker attitudes.

RAYMOND R. WHITE
Department of Biology,
City College of San Francisco,
San Francisco, CA 94112-1898

Response: White makes a point regarding an oversight in my original presentation. I report (p. 919) that the number of unfair labor practice claims against employers has increased dramatically and that this is evidence that employer resistance to unionization has increased. However, it is possible that the increase in claims is simply a result of an increased litigiousness by unions with no increase in the number of claims with actual merit. I should have presented evidence I have which shows that the number of claims that the National Labor Relations