

Response: The letters by Varmus and Paul and by Gallo reflect behind-the-scenes competition and conflicts well known to most U.S.-based researchers. I believe that in both cases my description of events does not require correction. —**Michael Balter**

### Characterizing Scientific Knowledge

David Edge (Letters, 8 Nov., p. 904) agrees with me (for which I thank him) about the appropriate response of scientists to false statements by creationists. But he then intimates, citing as evidence a review by M. N. Wise, in *Isis* (1), of *Higher Superstition* (2), that Norman Levitt and I commit there high crimes of scholarship—ad hominem argument, failure to engage in “open, fair, honest, and well-informed disputation”—and asserts that we “demean” and “will eventually destroy . . . science and reason.”

Since we and Edge live on opposite sides of the Atlantic, I doubt that he has observed us in disputation; I suspect that he cannot have read the book to which he refers with such charm, since his accusations refer only to a tendentious and defensive review of it.

Neither Wise nor anyone else has shown that the arguments of *Higher Superstition* are ill-informed or dishonest, and it is not for lack of trying. Edge (and anyone else) has been free since 1994 to respond by showing how we are wrong, which they have not done. To date, among the scores of published reviews, including a few by persons who disliked the book, not one has identified an outright error or instance of dishonesty. The criticisms are about “tone” and “danger” to science and reason, meaning, in this case, danger to the brand of “science studies” we addressed. Ad hominem arguments come not from us, but from our science study critics.

One wonders how scientists, and honest scholars generally, are supposed to respond after more than a decade of “scholarship” that characterizes scientific knowledge as a mere cultural construct, an oppressive, masculinist, hegemonic tool of capitalism and the military, remote from the needs and wisdom of indigenous peoples. Are they supposed to dissect creationist slanders but remain decorously silent about all else?

Who is “demonizing” whom?

**Paul R. Gross**  
53 Two Ponds Road,  
Falmouth, MA 02540-2221, USA  
E-mail: prg@virginia.edu

### References

1. M. N. Wise, *Isis* **87**, 323 (June 1996).
2. P. R. Gross and N. Levitt, *Higher Superstition* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 1994).

W. Penn Handwerker says (Letters, 22 Nov., p. 1286) that Norman Levitt made a logical error in his dismissal of postmodernism as just so much whimsy and classroom fluff. The same charge could be made against Handwerker's critique. Assuming it's true that everything culturally determined is founded on human understanding, it does not follow that everything found on human understanding is culturally determined. A parallel situation would be to say that because all mothers are women, it must be the case that all women are mothers. Why don't we be reasonable and compromise by saying that some things are culturally determined and some are not?

**Floyd Centore**

Department of Philosophy, St. Jerome's College,  
University of Waterloo,  
Waterloo, Ontario, N2L 3G3, Canada

### Neurons and Reaction Times

As noted in Marcia Barinaga's Research News article of 18 October (p. 344), the

Does yur autoated  
DNA seqencer leave  
u guessing?

