

berry House, the program has staff offices, meeting rooms, a special library, plus computer facilities and a natural home away from home for participants.

Over the years, the Summer Program has led to some marriages and has had its share of summer program groupies. Parties have been held for the mass of participants at locations ranging from Don Stokes's house to Ann Arbor parks. There are many entertaining stories about unusual faculty and students over the years, but the better stories cannot be put down in writing.

The spirit of the Summer Program might best be captured by reviewing some of the slogans used on summer program t-shirts in recent years (based on suggestions from the summer students). Starting with the mundane "ICPSR Summer Camp" (1979 and 1980) to the self-congratulatory "Nonlinear People in a Linear World" (1981), from the individualistic "Different Slopes for Different Folks" (1982) to the punning "Running Dogs of Empiricism" (showing a dog running up a regression line) and the esoteric "Fat-tailed non-Gaussians are Not Normal" (1983). The Reagan era was noted in the 1984 slogan "E(epsilon)=0, Expect Nothing," with the back of the shirt showing the ICPSR letters in the Olympic circles with the words SUMMER GAMES beneath. Another motto harked back to the spirit of the 1960s: "Still Looking for the True Parameters." 1985 featured the faddish "Stat Busters" and the leering "We Fit Any Curve." The 1986 t-shirt for the linear modelling crowd was "And God Said: $b=(X'X)^{-1} X'Y$ " and the back "And It Was BLUE." But the best may be apocryphal: "I Had a Linear Relationship But . . . I Violated Homoskedasticity."

The Consortium's Summer Program has had an enormous impact over the years. At the same time, it is continually energizing itself for the future, as it considers the directions for social science research training for the next quarter of a century. □

Statement on Violence

International Society for Research on Aggression

Editor's Note: The following statement on violence was drafted by a group of behavioral scientists on behalf of the International Society for Research on Aggression. Comments and reactions are welcomed and should be addressed to David Adams, Psychological Lab, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT 06457.

Believing that it is our responsibility to address from our particular disciplines the most dangerous and destructive activities of our species, violence and war; recognizing that science is a human cultural product which cannot be definitive or all-encompassing; and gratefully acknowledging the support of the authorities of Seville and representatives of the Spanish UNESCO; we, the undersigned scholars from around the world and from relevant sciences, have met and arrived at the following Statement on Violence. In it, we challenge a number of alleged biological findings that have been used, even by some in our disciplines, to justify violence and war. Because the alleged findings have contributed to an atmosphere of pessimism in our time, we submit that the open, considered rejection of these mis-statements can contribute significantly to the International Year of Peace.

Misuse of scientific theories and data to justify violence and war is not new but has been made since the advent of modern science. For example, the theory of evolution has been used to justify not only war, but also genocide, colonialism, and suppression of the weak.

We state our position in the form of five propositions. We are aware that there are many other issues about violence and war that could be fruitfully addressed from the standpoint of our disciplines, but we restrict ourselves here to what we consider a most important first step.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that we have inherited a tendency to make war from our animal ancestors.

Although fighting occurs widely throughout animal species, only a few cases of destructive intra-species fighting between organized groups have ever been reported among naturally living species, and none of these involve the use of tools designed to be weapons. Normal predatory feeding upon other species cannot be equated with intra-species violence. Warfare is a peculiarly human phenomenon and does not occur in other animals.

The fact that warfare has changed so radically over time indicates that it is a product of culture. Its biological connection is primarily through language which makes possible the coordination of groups, the transmission of technology, and the use of tools. War is biologically possible, but it is not inevitable, as evidenced by its variation in occurrence and nature over time and space. There are cultures which have not engaged in war for centuries, and there are cultures which have engaged in war frequently at some times and not at others.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war or any other violent behavior is genetically programmed into our human nature. While genes are involved at all levels of nervous system function, they provide a developmental potential that can be actualized only in conjunction with the ecological and social environment. While individuals vary in their predispositions to be affected by their experience, it is the interaction between their genetic endowment and conditions of nurturance that determines their personalities. Except for rare pathologies, the genes do not produce individuals necessarily predisposed to violence. Neither do they determine the opposite. While genes are co-involved in establishing our behavioral capacities, they do not by themselves specify the outcome.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that in the course of human evolution there has been a selection for aggressive behavior more than for other kinds of behavior. In all well-studied species, status within the group is achieved by the ability to cooperate and to fulfill social functions relevant to the structure of that group. "Dominance" involves social bondings and affiliations; it is not

simply a matter of the possession and use of superior physical power, although it does involve aggressive behaviors. Where genetic selection for aggressive behavior has been artificially instituted in animals, it has rapidly succeeded in producing hyper-aggressive individuals; this indicates that aggression was not maximally selected under natural conditions. When such experimentally created hyper-aggressive animals are present as a social group, they either disrupt its social structure or are driven out. Violence is neither in our evolutionary legacy nor in our genes.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that humans have a "violent brain." While we do have the neural apparatus to act violently, it is not automatically activated by internal or external stimuli. Like higher primates and unlike other animals, our higher neural processes filter such stimuli before they can be acted upon. How we act is shaped by how we have been conditioned and socialized. There is nothing in our neurophysiology that compels us to react violently.

IT IS SCIENTIFICALLY INCORRECT to say that war is caused by "instinct" or any single motivation. The emergence of modern warfare has been a journey from the primacy of emotional and motivational factors, sometimes called "instincts," to the primacy of cognitive factors. Modern war involves institutional use of personal characteristics such as obedience, suggestibility, and idealism, social skills such as language, and rational considerations such as cost-calculation, planning, and information processing. The technology of modern war has exaggerated traits associated with violence both in the training of actual combatants and in the preparation of support for war in the general population. As a result of this exaggeration, such traits are often mistaken to be the causes rather than the consequences of the process.

We conclude that biology does not condemn humanity to war, and that humanity can be freed from the bondage of biological pessimism and empowered with confidence to undertake the transformative tasks needed in this International

Year of Peace and in the years to come. Although these tasks are mainly institutional and collective, they also rest upon the consciousness of individual participants for whom pessimism and optimism are crucial factors. Just as "wars begin in the minds of men," peace also begins in our minds. The same species who invented war is capable of inventing peace. The responsibility lies with each of us.

Seville, May 16, 1986

David Adams, Psychology, Wesleyan University, Middletown, CT, USA

S. A. Barnett, Ethology, The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

N. P. Bechtereva, Neurophysiology, Institute for Experimental Medicine of Academy of Medical Sciences of USSR, Leningrad, USSR

Bonnie Frank Carter, Psychology, Albert Einstein Medical Center, Philadelphia, PA, USA

Jose M. Rodriguez Delgado, Neurophysiology, Centro de Estudios Neurobiologicos, Madrid, Spain

Jose Luis Diaz, Ethology, Instituto Mexicano de Psiquiatria, Mexico D.F., Mexico

Andrzej Elias, Individual Differences Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw, Poland

Santiago Genoves, Biological Anthropology, Instituto de Estudios Antropologicos, Mexico D.F., Mexico

Benson E. Ginsburg, Behavior Genetics, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT, USA

Jo Groebel, Social Psychology, Erziehungswissenschaftliche Hochschule, Landau, Federal Republic of Germany

Samir-Kumar Ghosh, Sociology, Indian Institute of Human Sciences, Calcutta, India

Robert Hinde, Animal Behavior, Cambridge University, UK

Richard E. Leakey, Physical Anthropology, National Museums of Kenya, Nairobi, Kenya

Taha H. Malasi, Psychiatry, Kuwait University, Kuwait

J. Martin Ramirez, Psychobiology, Uni-

versidad de Sevilla, Spain

Federico Mayor Zaragoza, Biochemistry, Universidad Autonoma, Madrid, Spain

Diana L. Mendoza, Ethology, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Ashis Nandy, Political Psychology, Center for the Study of Developing Societies, Delhi, India

John Paul Scott, Animal Behavior, Bowling Green State University, Bowling Green, OH, USA

Riitta Wahlstrom, Psychology, University of Jyvaskyla, Finland □

Resources Published About Women on Campus

The Project on the Status and Education of Women develops and distributes materials that identify and highlight institutional and federal policies as well as other issues affecting women's status on campus. Discounts are available for multiple copies of individual papers and packets. All orders for publications should be prepaid and checks made out to AAC/PSEW. Send orders to Project on the Status and Education of Women, Association of American Colleges, 1818 R Street, NW, Washington, DC 20009. For additional information on the publications listed below, call (202) 387-1300.

Project Publications

The Newsletter

On Campus With Women, quarterly (12 p.). Single copy available free (includes subscription information).

Climate Issues Packet—\$6.00

- The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women? Examines ways in which male and female students are treated differently in the classroom by faculty—both men and women. Includes recommendations for change. 1982, 24 p.
- Selected Activities Using "The Classroom Climate: A Chilly One for Women?" 1984, 4 p.