



Recycling goes weekly

The recent Biophile recycling drive was such a success that the Biophile Club has decided to collect aluminum cans and newspapers on a weekly basis after spring break. Someone will be in the Bryan parking lot each Saturday from 12:00 to 1:00 for pick-up.

There will be a special meeting this coming Wednesday, February 28, at 9:00 p.m. in the Passion Pit. Pictures will be taken for the *Quaker*,

and the budget for next year will be discussed.

"The Plutonium Connection," a Time-Life Multimedia film, will be shown on Wednesday, March 14 at 9:00 p.m. in the Gallery. The film tells the story of how a student at MIT designed a workable nuclear bomb. This is an excellent film which depicts an issue of vital importance to the public.

Summer Jobs

Job openings scarce

By GORDON PALMER

Now is the time to start applying for summer jobs. In fact, Dick Coe in the Placement Office revealed Friday that the deadline for most federal summer jobs has already passed by.

The federal jobs that are left are mostly of a scientific or technical nature. These require significant science and/or math backgrounds, usually in a specialized area.

There are no jobs left in National Parks, either, but there are some

openings in State Parks. These include lifeguards, temporary forest rangers, park attendants, and historical tourguides, and can be applied for until March 1.

Other opportunities for the outdoor-oriented are camps, hotels, and resorts. Especially numerous are the camp openings. Some helpful skills include lifeguarding, sports, crafts, and liking kids. Requests for counselors frequently come into the Placement Office, and on March 14 from 9-11 a.m., representatives

continued from page two

your complaint to where they will do some good, to the food committee

Shirley, try not to take it out on us trying to earn some money. Maybe if you were nicer we would be too, and then we both would have a better day.

Sincerely,
Mae Sexauer

Hackman rebuts

Dear Editor,

In replying to Don Gibbon's letter in the Feb. 13 issue of the *Guilfordian*, I would like to address the fact of the politicalization of science. Because of the public uproar over the investigations and claims of sociobiologists and geneticists, the mention of and proposal for study in this area has become taboo in scientific circles. I contend that not only is the freedom of speech a point in question but also the freedom of scientific inquiry.

Dr. Gibbon addressed the matter of the freedom of speech quite well,

so I will not reiterate his statements. My main concern is with a phenomena wherein "... science had been invaded by political considerations." This passage is quoted from an article in the December issue of Harper's magazine. It is entitled "Burning Darwin to Save Marx" and was written by Tom Bethel. I urge everyone to read this article which can be found in the library.

In this article Bethel divides American history since 1896 into four 'phases.' He shows in each how science has been used to substantiate the socio-political 'truths' of each particular time. The last phase Bethel places us in now. He calls it The Age of Compulsory Equality, which refers to the elaborate bureaucratic structure devoted to creating and enforcing equality along the lines of the Civil Rights Act as well as encompassing feminist concerns. Bethel says that society is so 'taken' by this idea of equality among all things that to mention the possibility of differences among people along racial lines especially, is unallowable.

A current exponent in the field of sociobiology is Edward O. Wilson of Harvard. In several books Wilson has attempted to take the ideas from Darwin's *Origin of Species* in which the evolution of *bodies* is explained, to explain the *behavior* of animals. In his latest book, *On Human Nature*, Wilson applied these same principles exclusively to mankind. Thus it can be seen why sociobiology is not a field of inquiry in harmony with this age of Compulsory Equality. "Genes play a big role in sociobiology, and (they) are supposed to be tiny blueprints that more or less prescribe what we can or cannot do. Genes won't be denied." Wilson, however, explains that sociobiology is really a modest proposal involving the age old ideas of nature vs. nurture. "We may be *inclined* to behave in certain ways, because of genetic control, ... but these inclinations can easily be overruled by learning." Bethel adds that this idea of there being some kind of genetic predisposition sounds plausible and yet meets only with opposition. Till more research is done who knows

what ideas may arise. But science unfortunately has become the tool of politics. It has been used to prove only those truths in harmony with the climate of opinion.

Bethel cites in his article the fact of peer review among scientists which occurs in the evaluating of research proposals. Most money for research at the university level now comes from the federal government and research proposals are judged very much according to the socio-political atmosphere. The 'peers' who review incoming proposals do not wish to upset that delicate balance which keeps the coffer's of the federal government open to them. The infusion into the scientific community of "Marxist" and "Socialist" scientists is also contributing to the current opposition to studies in genetics and race.

Thus, it can be seen, that because William Schockley and Edward O. Wilson differ in their scientific pursuits from the spirit of egalitarianism they are rebuked not only by society but by their peers. Darwin, Schockley, and Wilson are all being "burned" because they differ. Science has become so politicized as to become stultified and antithetical to the ideal spirit within which it itself was born. The scientific community owes it to the populace paying taxes for its research, to determine the truth or falsity or Schockley's and Wilson's claims. The government cannot so tightly define the paradigms within which science operates. Currently, science is only as good as it serves to support current social and political thought.

"Truth" is not discovered in an atmosphere such as now prevails. I believe in the freedom of speech as the fundamental right from which all others stem and this includes the freedom of scientific inquiry. Schockley and Wilson have the right to investigate and to make public their findings.

Since when are there criterion for judging whether a person's remarks should be heard publically? There is not now and I hope in the name of liberty there never will be.

Carrie E. Hackman

