Evolution, Biology & Society

Fall 2008 Newsletter of the ASA Section on Evolution, Biology & Society Volume 5, No.2

In this issue:

Greetings from the Chair

Rosemary L. Hopcroft
University of North Carolina at Charlotte

Our Section Sessions at this year's annual meetings were a great success. Both Section Sessions were well attended and the presentations stimulating. Thanks to Sandy Maryanski and the two organizers, Joan Huber and Richard Machalek, for their work in arranging those sessions. The joint reception with Sociology of Emotions was also very pleasant and located in a beautiful atrium area of the Marriott. Thanks again to Sandy for her hard work in organizing the reception.

The Biosociology/Biosocial processes Regular Session was also very well attended and very interesting (see commentary in this newsletter). In order to clearly include such work in our section, at the business meeting it was voted to change the name of the section to "Evolution, Biology and Society." Biosocial work is currently getting wide attention, as the news coverage of section member Guang Guo and co-authors' recent *American Sociological Review* piece on the genetic correlates of delinquency attests (see People section of this

newsletter). As a result, I have asked Michael Shanahan to organize a session on this work for the Evolution, Biology and Society Section next year. He agreed, and the title of his session will be "Genetically Informed Sociology: Promises, Pitfalls, & Current Realities." I also asked Patrick Nolan to organize a session on social evolution. He also agreed, and his session will be titled "Evaluating and Testing Evolutionary Arguments and Theories."

Unfortunately we are only scheduled for one full paper session at next year's ASA. However, if we can get our numbers back up to 300 by September 30th, we will get two full sessions. So please, recruit everyone you know to join the section! We are open to all scientifically-minded sociologists! If we don't attain the 300 number by the deadline, at the business meeting it was decided to use the Council and Business meeting timeslots for a paper session. So come what may we will have the two sessions described above at next year's ASA.

Our reception next year will be jointly with the Rationality and Society and Mathematical Sociology Sections (quite a switch from Emotions!) The reason for this is because I would like to encourage all scientifically-minded people to join our section, and because I believe both those sections are full of such people. In addition, many of the membership of those sections have been very supportive (and are also members) of our section.

Thanks again to all who have helped make this section a reality. I encourage you all to make full use of the section and its apparatus, including this newsletter.

Sincerely,

Rosemary

Of Note:

Wilson, David Sloan and Edward O. Wilson. 2007. "Rethinking the Theoretical Foundation of Sociobiology," *The Quarterly Review of Biology* 82:4(Dec.):327-348.

This article reviews the intellectual history of sociobiology and reviews the changes in the arguments for and against group selection, with a lot to say about behaviors, so may be of interest to section members.

NEW PUBLICATION SERIES

Transaction Publishers of New Brunswick NJ and London England Announces the introduction of a new series ANTHROPOLOGY AND HUMAN NATURE. It will be edited by Lionel Tiger who is the Darwin Professor of Anthropology at Rutgers University.

The publishers are interested in works of social science, history, and General intellection which provide insight and contribution to the growing literature on what may be and may not be "human nature." Transaction also publishes the journal HUMAN NATURE and is receptive to works of interest to scholars and informed persons provoked by a subject matter only recently returned to active scrutiny. Even though Aristotle announced that "man is by nature a political animal," the emphasis on "political" has heretofore overwhelmed attention to "by nature." This the series hopes to remedy by publishing works widely advertised in the scholarly community and maintained in print durably and with care.

Anyone interested in proposing or contemplating a book appropriate to this adventure should contact Lionel Tiger either at ltiger@rci.rutgers.edu or at the Department of Anthropology, Rutgers University, 131 George Street, New Brunswick NJ 08901-1414.

Response to La Lone and Hall

Joan Huber
The Ohio State University

In reviewing my book about the origins of gender inequality (Huber 2007), Darrell La Lone and Thomas Hall (2008) made a valiant effort to get things right. Yet, their space limitations as well as the need to describe a new explanation of the origins of gender inequality that had been directed to two very different audiences make further clarification essential. They say, for example, that 200 years ago wet nursing was a means of removing women's reproductive constraints. On the contrary, wet nursing, which emerged after the invention of agriculture 10,000 years ago, simply shifted the constraints from rich to poor or slave women and all too often resulted in the death of the wet nurse's infant to boot. No woman has enough milk for two children. I argued that till after the invention of modern medicine in the 1880s, women's activities in their most vigorous years had been constrained by a nearly continuous pattern of pregnancy and lactation that was poorly understood until late in the twentieth century and that remains virtually unknown among sociologists.

With regard to the book's audience, the authors correctly observe that I hoped to persuade those feminists who see gender stratification as a purely social construction to examine the constraints of reproductive physiology on women's use of time. This group had been turned off by biology in the 1970s owing to a plethora of studies "proving" that evolution made male domination inevitable. For example, in their widely-read book about the genetic foundation of male dominance based on baboon studies, Tiger and Fox (1971) claimed that male political dominance from tribe to empire was biologically determined. Politics must seem hopelessly bizarre to women, frighteningly irrelevant to their simple concerns of childcare. Moreover, women lack the capacity for leadership, and to pretend that university co-education is good denies the entire course of evolution.

Feminists in physical anthropology were mortified by such myths and soon disproved them (Fedigan 1992; Hrdy 1990). For example, Rowell (1972) followed baboon troops for five years and never saw a male defend one. Yet the image of man the hunter dominated texts and popular works for years (Hrdy and Williams 1983). By contrast, most feminists in cultural anthropology and sociology banned biology on the grounds that it consigned women to second class status forever. They declared gender stratification to be a purely social construction. This solution is like the Church's banning of Galileo for claiming that, contrary to Scripture, the earth revolved around the sun rather than vice versa. As Galileo sighed later, "Nevertheless, it moves."

But I was just as eager to persuade another audience, the sizable number of evolutionary psychologists and evolutionary sociologists who see gender stratification as the outcome of statistical differences in neurological wiring and hormonal levels. I hoped to convince this group that the search for the origins of gender inequality needs to include the effects of the categorical sex differences in physiology. Influenced by Wilson's (1975) presentation of sociobiology, these scholars used the experimental methods of psychology to investigate differential levels of sex hormones. The methods were scientific, and if the sex differences were statistically significant, the rate of publication was very high (Freese et al. 1999).

However, most of these researchers adopted Wilson's (1975) early views about women's place. Wilson was a brilliant scientist but his views about women reflected the Victorian ideas of his Alabama boyhood, and his discussion of humans at the end of the book appeared to explain and justify male dominance (Huber 2008). Thus, when Pierre van den Berghe (1978, p. 197) introduced sociobiology to sociologists, he could assure them that it supported the conventional wisdom on sex roles: It is natural for papa to wear the pants, and the castrating female is no myth. A woman can threaten a man to the point of sexual dysfunction should she assume the dominant role.

However, by the 1990s, sociobiology had changed in some fundamental ways. Research on the evolution of behavior was profoundly influenced by behavioral ecology and by a more sophisticated understanding of ontogeny and the importance of local environments in the expression of genetic traits (Hrdy 1990, p. 27). This new understanding dominated subsequent literature in biological anthropology but was less well known in evolutionary sociology. Udry (2000, p. 454), for example, exemplified the older approach in claiming that a biosocial macro theory is simple: Humans form their social structures around gender because males and females have biologically-influenced behavioral predispositions, and gendered social structure is a universal accomodation to this fact. Yet, a year later, Miller and Costello (2001) reported that Udry had dealt inadequately with the literature on neuroendocrinology, and political scientist Joshua Goldstein's (2001) comprehensive review of recent studies on the effects of testosterone showed that the effects on male tendencies toward aggression, if any, were slight.

In sum, I am grateful for La Lone and Hall's review and especially for their conclusion that I took biology and genetics seriously without being reductionist. Their hearts are in the right place but the argument remains in need of the clarification provided below.

Gender stratification can be understood only if biodata become part of social analysis. The origin of gender inequality became an issue in the 1970s and by the 1980s, scholars agreed that women's secondary status was universal. But the causes remained (and still remain) unclear, and several masterful analyses (e.g. Collins et al 1993; Smuts 1995) are cited both by constructionists and evolutionists less often than one might hope. Data that appeared late in the twentieth century show that until after the 1880s women's activities had been constrained by a nearly continuous cycle of pregnancy and lactation. The book explains why the cycle evolved, why it excluded women from the activities that bring the most power and prestige in all societies, and how science altered the social effects of the biological fact that until after 1880 only a woman could feed a child the only safe food it could digest. The last chapter discusses the potential and actual political consequences of these profound technological effects on reproductive physiology.

Most moderns are surprised to learn that until about 1900, infants typically were nursed on demand, every 15 minutes on average during the day for about two years, and less often for another two or more years. A mother toted her child or parked it nearby. The pattern had evolved among our primate ancestors because it maximized infant survival. If a forager mother gave birth before the older child could follow her in the daily food search, it died. Only very frequent suckling could prevent ovulation. Owing to the danger of spoiled food, the cycle persisted in settled societies till about a century ago when the invention of sterilization and provision of safe drinking water enabled caregivers to provide substitutes for maternal milk.

The ensuing decline in frequent and prolonged breastfeeeding among U.S. women at all social levels and among all ethnic groups permitted women's massive entry into mainstream activities during the twentieth century. Today, even a breast-fed American infant suckles on average only every three or four hours and for only six months. These massive behavioral changes increased the supply of female labor. The demand for that labor was a consequence of technological and societal trends that made for greater equality in market opportunities (Jackson 1998).

Research revealing the existence of a nearly continuous cycle of pregnancy and lactation overturned scholarly beliefs. In the 1950s physicians and demographers saw the effect of breastfeeding on contraception as an old wives' tale. Evidence that frequent suckling prevented ovulation appeared only in 1961. By the late 1970s detailed studies showed that frequent and prolonged suckling enabled a women to bear only five infants on average instead of the large number Malthus predicted, and by the end of the century biologists were examining the consequences of a drastic change in infant feeding.

A forager woman experienced about 50 menstrual cycles in her lifetime. A modern woman menstruates 450 times, and hormones

flood her body at a rate far exceeding that to which our species had become adapted. Modern patterns increase the exposure of reproductive tissues to estrogenic hormones that increase proliferation of cells. Those that divide more often are more likely to become malignant. Rates of diseases linked to chronic hormone exposure are rising for both sexes. The incidence of cancers likely reflects the transformation of human biology entailed in the profound ecological changes of modernization (Ellison 1999). Adult behavior does not suffice to explain the rising global prevalence of chronic conditions like cancer, hypertension, diabetes and obesity (Worthman 1999). Better knowledge of the physiological effects of natural and artificial hormones may lead to artificial ways to mimic the effects of forager life histories (Neese and Williams 1994). Let us hope.

Women could enter the public arena in large number only after the 1880s. For nearly all of human history, gestation and prolonged lactation had barred women from warfare and politics, inextricably linked after the invention of metal weapons 5,000 years ago. Joshua, Alexander, Caesar, and Napoleon had first dibs on political control, but no longer. The spread of literacy after the invention of the printing press severed the links of warfare and politics. Eminent generals no longer have a ready path to high political position, for aspirants need a temperament more given to persuasion than command. Women's major gains in politics over the past two decades will likely continue.

The sex differences in reproductive physiology, like all the bio-characteristics of our species, remain about the same as they were 100,000 years ago, but modern technology has altered their social consequences. Men can fly though evolution gave them no wings and they can feed infants though their breasts yield no milk.

The gendering of domestic time still gives men a huge boost in competing for prestige and power (Bianchi et al. 2006). Some men try to compensate but many do not. In long term relations of social inequality, one group always has a vested interest in preserving the distribution of resources it brings (Jackman 1994). Were I male, I would doubtless be tempted to preserve those resources too. Nearly half a century ago Si Goode (1963, p. 372) observed that men could care for household and children about as well as women though they have shown no eagerness to do so. It is hard to disagree. The future of gender stratification probably lies in the political arena and even more, in the household itself.

References

Bianchi, Suzanne, John P. Robinson, Melissa Milkie. 2006. *Changing Rhythms of American Family Life.* New York: Russell Sage.

Collins, Randall, Janet Chafetz, Rae Blumberg, Scott Coltrane, Jonathan Turner (name order by lot). 1993. Toward an integrated theory of gender stratification. *Sociological Perspectives* 36:185-216.

Ellison, Peter. 1999. Reproductive ecology and reporoductive cancers. In *Hormones, Health, and Behavior*, eds. C. Panter-Brick and C. Worthman. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Fedigan, Linda. 1992 [1982]. Primate Paradigms. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Freese, Jeremy, Brian Powell, Lala Carr Steelman. 1999. Rebel without a cause or effect: birth order and social attitudes. *American Sociological Review* 64:207-31.

Goldstein, Joshua. 2001. *War and Gender.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Goode, William. 1963. *World Revolution and Family Patterns*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.

Huber, Joan. 2007. *On the Origins of Gender Inequality.* Boulder: Paradigm.

_____. 2008. Reproductive biology, technology, and gender inequality: An autobiographical essay. *Annual Review of Sociology* 34:1-13.

Hrdy, Sarah Blaffer. 1990. Sex bias in nature and history: A late 1980s reexamination of the 'biological origins' argument. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* 33:25-37.

Hrdy, Sarah and George Williams. 1983.Behavioral Biology and the Double Standard. In *Social Behavior of Female*

Vertebrates, ed. Samuel Wasser. New York: Academic.
Jackson, Robert Max. 1998. *Destined for Equality.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
La Lone, Darrell and Thomas D. Hall. 2008. The revolution in evolution: Evolution for everyone: a review essay. Evolution and Sociology 5 (Spring):8-11.
Miller, Eleanor and Carrie Yang Costello. 2001. The limits of biological determinism. *American Sociological Review* 66:592-98.
Nesse, Randolph and George Williams. 1994. *Why We Get Sick*. New York: Vintage.
Rowell, Thelma. 1972. *The Social Behavior of Monkeys.* New York: Penguin.
Smuts, Barbara. 1995. The evolutionary origins of patriarchy. *Human Nature* 6:1-32.
Tiger, Lionel and Robin Fox. 1971. *The Imperial Animal.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
Udry, Richard. 2000. Biological limits of gender construction. *American Sociological Review* 65:443-57).
Van den Berghe, Pierre. 1978. *Human Family Systems.* New York: Elsevier.
Wilson, E. O. 1975. *Sociobiology.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
Worthman, Carol. 1999. Evolutionary perspectives on the onset of puberty. In *Evolutionary Medicine*, eds. W. Trevathan, E.O.Smith, J. McKenna. New York: Oxford University Press.

Commentary from Biosociology/Biosocial Interaction Session at the 2008 American Sociological Meetings

Rosemary L. Hopcroft
UNC-Charlotte

All the papers in this session concern how biological factors interact with social contexts to produce social outcomes. The Laumann et. al. paper examines how the sexual problems of older individuals are influenced by those individuals' social contexts. The Booth et. al paper examines how the relationship between individual hormonal states and family relationships are mediated by other relationships in the family. The Boardman et. al. paper examines how the genetic influence on vulnerability to substance dependence is mediated by the context of a delinquent peer group. The Shiao et. al. paper discusses how possible biological components of race interact with the social construction of race.

To me, examining the interaction of biological and sociological factors on outcomes is the most important area of research for sociology at present. We need more of it. The individual actor as a flesh and blood person must be explicitly acknowledged and included in sociology, as many previous theorists have argued, dating back to George Homans (1967) and earlier. Even Marx understand people as flesh and blood creatures with material and psychological needs. This individual actor as a flesh and blood reality is a product of evolution by natural selection, and as a result comes equipped with a variety of physiological and psychological predispositions. People have needs, wants and desires, and one of those is the need to be social. As a highly social species we are greatly influenced by our social environments, while at the same time we strive to influence those same social environments.

I would also like to note that this kind of research examining the interaction between biological and sociological factors is exactly the kind of research that the Evolution and Sociology section was founded to sponsor. I would like to take the opportunity to invite you all to find out about the section, join the section, and most importantly, do some of this

kind of biosocial research yourselves. I also invite you all to come to our reception Sunday night: it is Sunday night at 6.30 pm, in the Atrium at Boston Marriott Copley Place.

Now, I would like to examine each paper separately, and provide comments on each.

Edward O. Laumann, Linda J. Waite and Aniruddha Das. Sexual Dysfunction among older adults: Prevalence and Risk factors from a nationally representative probability sample of men and women 57-85 years of age.

This study shows the prevalence of sexual problems across different sociodemographic groups of older males and females. The results show that older women's sexual health is more sensitive to social factors, physical health and relationship quality than is true for men.

I assume that this is preliminary research. A great deal of data was collected by the NSHAP (National Social Life, Health and Aging Project) including salivary, blood and vaginal mucosal samples. None of that biodata was analyzed here. This opens the door to much more research on the hormonal and other biochemical and even genetic correlates of sexual problems, and I assume the researchers are planning such research. I also assume that in the future we will see multivariate analyses of this data where both biological and sociological factors are included in the same models.

I would also like to encourage the researchers to bite the bullet and acknowledge the need for an evolutionary framework. It is always useful to remember Dobzhansky's famous comment:"Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution." Evolutionary psychologists have done a great deal of research on the differences in male and female sexuality, and their results appear to me to have great relevance for the research findings presented here. For example, Donald Symons (1979) book the "Evolution of Human Sexuality" and the work of evolutionary psychologists discuss the greater importance of love and emotional intimacy for women's sexuality as compared to men's sexuality – a point that is entirely consistent with the empirical findings presented here.

Alan Booth, Cassandra J. Dorius, Jacob Hibel and Doug Granger. "Direct and Moderated Links Between Parental Hormones and Parent-Child Relationship Quality"

This paper uses data from 400 predominantly white, working and middle class families shows that parental hormones (testosterone and estradiol) are associated with parent-child relationship quality. High maternal estradiol was associated with low quality mother-children relationship quality. The association between mother's testosterone and parent-offspring relationship quality was moderated by child and father's relationship quality and father's marital relationship quality. When fathers had positive relationships with child and wife, there was a strong positive association between mother's testosterone level and mother-child relationship quality. When fathers had negative relationships with child and wife, there was a negative association between mother's testosterone level and mother-child relationship quality.

First, I would encourage the authors to continue their work on the effects of women's testosterone and estradiol. There is a large number of studies on testosterone in men, but few on testosterone and estradiol in women. Second, I would also like the authors to consider evolutionary reasoning. Why might we see the results described here? Once again, the greater importance of social relationships for women's well being, including good relationships with their children, is one that springs to mind (Campbell 2002).

"Peer delinquency and the heritability of dependence vulnerability"
Jason D. Boardman, Tanya M. M. Button, Robin P. Corley and Michael C. Stallings.

This paper notes that substance dependence in adolescence is influenced by both genetic and environmental risks. This paper looks at how both genetic and environmental risk for substance dependence are moderated by social context. In this case, the social context is affiliation with delinquent peers. The results show that affiliation with delinquent peers does moderate the relative contribution of genetic and environmental risks to explaining the variance in substance dependence. The amount of variation in substance dependence explained by genes

was higher for those with both **low** and **high** levels of perceived peer delinquency and lower for those with middle levels of perceived peer delinquency. Heritability was higher in people who perceived their peers to be least delinquent and those who considered their peers to be most delinquent.

These findings are somewhat counterintuitive to me. Other studies I am aware of find greater genetic expression when social pressure is least. For example, Hans Peter Kohler finds greater genetic affects on fertility behavior in time periods where women have more freedom to choose their own fertility. Surely there would be peer pressure by non-delinquent peers not to use substances, and by delinquent peers to use substances, while social pressures might plausibly be less among those with a mix of delinquent and non-delinquent peers.

I would like the authors to consider possible mechanisms for these findings. Would it be possible to empirically examine some of the mechanisms? Did the study also collect information on other activities? Perhaps those respondents with the least delinquent peers are also least likely to have other social activities that divert them from substance use, whereas other respondents with some more delinquent peers also have a variety of other activities that discourage them from substance use? What is the role of sex differences in substance use and tendency to have delinquent peers?

Another small point – I think it would be better to give the standardized proportions of variance explained in Figure 3,not the absolute values of genetic variance.

Jiannbin Lee Shiao et. al.
"The Genomic Challenge to the Social Construction of Race"

In my mind this is the most potentially controversial paper. The paper takes on new research that suggests that identified statistical clusters of genetic markers that structure human genetic variation net of the human species commonalities. They note that biological races amount to statistical clusters of DNA that track the history of human migrations out of Africa. The authors separate the biological reality of race from the social construction of race, however they do suggest that the social construction of race is likely limited by its biological reality.

Granting some biological reality to race has three implications, and these are also outlined in the paper.

1) Statistical membership might cause racial self-identification,

That is, individuals with clusters of genes that give rise to certain phenotypic features are likely to be more likely to self identify as a given race. I think this is fairly uncontroversial, and that most people are willing to grant that racial self identification is related to different genes for hair color, eye shape, etc.

2) The second implication is one that is not well developed in this paper and I would like to see it much more developed. That is, statistical clusters of genetic information that give rise to differential phenotypes may in turn be vulnerable to biologically innate tendencies to distrust non-kin.

Hamilton's rule suggests that individuals are likely to be altruistic to close relatives and less altruistic to more distant relatives. This idea of inclusive fitness can be extended to the larger ethnic group as ethnic group members are more likely to be related than non-ethnic group members.

Also, given that kin tend to share phenotypical features, any person displaying a different phenotype to our own may be subject to this tendency to distrust non-kin.
This idea is best developed in Pierre van den Berghe's (1981) *The Ethnic Phenomenon*, a work that is not cited here but should be. Related ideas are suggested in Joseph Whitmeyer's paper "Endogamy as a Basis for Ethnic Behavior" published in *Sociological Theory* in 1997. This paper suggests that the practice of endogamy or marriage within the group is the key to in-group or ethnic group favoritism. As long as a group is endogamous, individuals are likely to have descendants who share genes, so favoritism to members of the in-group may be seen as an extension of kin selection.

This can also answer the authors' question of why non-phenotypically distinct groups, i.e. groups separated by religion or culture, often act in very similar ways to racial groups. As

long as endogamy is pursued, group members are likely to be currently related and/or their descendants are likely to be related. Furthermore, shifting boundaries of the endogamous group also can help explain the observed flexibility of ethnic, religious or cultural group boundaries over time.

3) The most controversial implication of the paper is that statistical differences in genetic markers might also contribute to behavioral and economic outcomes for group members (for example, success in particular economic niches) or might help explain differences in the pace and character of assimilation

The paper is coy about exactly what those statistical differences might be. It is true that certain ethnic and racial groups tend to specialize in certain economic niches when they migrate to other countries, a fact pointed out by Thomas Sowell in his books "Ethnic America" and "Race and Culture."

Here however, it is very difficult to disentangle any genetic effects on outcomes from the effects of the group's history and culture.

Given these difficulties, and given the fact that biological differences have long been used in nefarious ways, I think it is probably not worth spending a lot of time researching how groups may differ statistically in abilities or behaviors. I have two reasons for this:

1) First, the explanatory potential of any statistical differences in abilities or behaviors between races is likely to be small. This is because I agree with Stephen Pinker and others that the genetic similarities between races dwarf any differences. I think at present not enough attention has been paid to the similarities between races and the biological bases of those similarities. That in itself is a controversial idea in contemporary American sociology. This is less true for gender, which as Pinker and the authors of this paper agree, genetically based differences are far more clear cut and of greater significance than genetically based differences between races.

2) There are too many dangers in trying to distinguish statistical biological differences. The authors are fully aware that information about biological differences fuels the social construction of race into distinct categories and that a racial status hierarchy have been the norm rather than the exception in all human societies. Any slight statistical differences between racial groups are likely to be blown all out of all proportion, and my concern is that any slight statistical, genetically based differences that are discovered in behaviors or abilities will simply fuel the tendency of humans to make categorical distinctions between individuals and the related tendency to distrust members of outgroups.

In sum, I think it is much more important to focus on how all humans have a likely evolved, innate tendencies to make in-group and out-group distinctions based on phenotypical features, cultural and endogamous group boundaries, and generally tend to distrust out-group members. These tendencies fuel in-group versus out-group tensions, conflicts and discrimination which I believe is of greater social significance than any real biologically-based differences between groups.

In conclusion, I would like to congratulate all the authors of these papers for presenting four cutting edge, thought-provoking papers. I would also like to thank the organizer for putting together such a stimulating session. Thanks to all.

References

Campbell, Anne. 2002. *A mind of her own. The evolutionary psychology of women.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dobzhansky, Theodosius. 1973. "Nothing in Biology Makes Sense Except in the Light of Evolution." *The American Biology Teacher* 35:125-129.

Homans, George. 1967. *The nature of social science*. New York, Harcourt, Brace & World.

Pinker, Steven. 2002. *The Blank Slate. The Modern Denial of Human Nature*. New York: Viking.

Sowell, Thomas. 1994. *Race and Culture : a world view. New York: Basic Books.*

Sowell Thomas.1981. *Ethnic America: a history. New York: Basic Books.*

Symons, Donald. 1979. *The Evolution of Human Sexuality*. New York : Oxford University Press.

Whitmeyer, Joseph M. 1997. “Endogamy as a Basis for Ethnic Behavior.” *Sociological Theory* 15(2):162-178.

Van den Berghe, Pierre. 1981. *The Ethnic Phenomenon*. New York: Elsevier, c1981.

****

New Publications of Section Members

Blute, Marion. May 2008. “Concluding Statement: Some Issues That Might be Worth Discussing.” Open Semiotics Resource Centre. Virtual Symposia. Memory, Social Networks and Language: Probing the Meme Hypothesis II. http://www.semioticon.com

Blute, Marion. Forthcoming, Nov. 2008. “Is It Time For an Updated ‘Eco-Evo-Devo’ Definition of Evolution by Natural Selection?” *Spontaneous Generations: A Journal for the History and Philosophy of Science* 1(2). http://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/SpontaneousGenerations

Davis, Jeff and Daniel Werre. 2008. "A Longitudinal Study of the Effects of Uncertainty on Reproductive Behaviors". *Human Nature* (December).

Fenelon, James V. and Thomas D. Hall. 2008. “Revitalization and Indigenous Resistance to Globalization and Neo-liberalism.” American Behavioral Scientist 51:12(Aug):1867-1901.

Guo, Guang, Daniel Adkins. “Statistical Link Established between a Human Outcome and a Molecular Genetic Variant?” *Sociological Methods and Research.* In press

Guo, Guang, Roettger Michael, and Tianji Cai. “The Integration of Genetic Propensities into Social Control Models of Delinquency and Violence among Male Youths.” A*merican Sociological Review*. Accepted.

Guo, Guang, Yuying Tong, and Tianji Cai. “Gene by Social-Context Interactions for Number of Sexual Partners among White Male Youths: Genetics-informed Sociology.”*American Journal of Sociology*. Accepted.

Guo, Guang, Glen H. Elder, and Nathan Hamilton. “Gene-Environment Interactions: Friends’ Alcohol Use Moderates Genetic Contribution to Adolescent Drinking Behavior.” *Social Science Research.* Accepted.

Guo, Guang , Xiao-Ming Ou, Michael Roettger, and Shih Jean C. “The VNTR 2-Repeat in MAOA and Delinquent Behavior in Adolescence and Young Adulthood: Associations and MAOA Promoter Activity.” *European Journal of Human Genetics.* Accepted.

Guo Guang, Tong, Y, Xie CW, and Lange LA. 2007. “Dopamine transporter, gender, and number of sexual partners among young adults.” *European Journal of Human Genetics* 15: 279-287.

Guo, Guang, Roettger, M, and Shih JC. 2007. “Contributions of the DAT1 and DRD2 Genes to Serious and Violent Delinquency among Adolescents and Young Adults.” *Human Genetics* 121: 125-136.

Guo, Guang , Wilhelmsen, Kirk, and Hamilton, Nathan. 2007. “Gene-lifecourse interaction for alcohol consumption in adolescence & young adulthood: five monoamine genes.” *American Journal of Medical Genetics* Part B: Neuropsychiatric Genetics 144B: 417-423.

Guo, Guang. 2006. “Genetic similarity shared by best friends among adolescents.” *Twin Research and Human Genetics* 9: 113-121.

Guo, Guang and Daw, J. “Genetic Source of Reading Disability & a Proposal to Use NLSY-Children to Study Genetic and Environmental Influences on Reading Disability” in Penn State’s thirteenth annual National Symposium

on Family Issues titled “Early Disparities in School Readiness: How do Families Contribute to Successful and Unsuccessful Transitions into School?” edited by Alan Booth. In press.

Guo, Guang, Kari E. North, and Seulki Choi. 2006. DRD4 Gene Variant Associated with Body Mass: The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. Human Mutation 27: 1-6.

Guo, Guang and Tong Y. 2006. “Age at First Sexual Intercourse, Genes, and Social & Demographic Context: Evidence from Twins and the Dopamine D4 Receptor Gene.” *Demography* 43: 747-769.

Hall, Thomas D. and James V. Fenelon. 2008. “Indigenous Movements and Globalization: What is Different? What is the Same?” Globalizations 5:1(March):1-11.

Hopcroft, Rosemary L. Forthcoming. “Gender Inequality in Interaction: An Evolutionary Account.” *Social Forces.*

Hopcroft, Rosemary L. Forthcoming. “The Evolved Actor in Sociology.” *Sociological Theory.*

****

People

Guo, Guang, Roettger Michael, and Tianji Cai. “The Integration of Genetic Propensities into Social Control Models of Delinquency and Violence among Male Youths.” *American Sociological Review.* Accepted. has had significant press attention, including:

July 14, 2008, ASA press release
Reuters: July 14, 2008, the original article by Maggie Fox in the section of News, Maggie telephone-interviewed Guang Guo in his hotel room in Beijing, China
CNN morning news: July 18, 2008; study described by CNN Chief Medical Correspondent Dr. Sanjay Gupta; Guang Guo telephone-interviewed by CNN senior producer Chris Gajilan working for Dr. Gupta in Beijing, China
WUSA Channel 9, Washington, DC, the CBS affiliate: TV show
Ottawa Citizen: Telephone interview and article
ABC News: online article
U.S. News & World: online report
Washington Post: online report
Scientific American: online story
Fox News: article
USA Today: article
Yahoo news: a story that quotes the Reuters piece
MSNBC: news story
The News&Observer: telephone interview with Guang Guo; article on July 28, 2008
NSF (Social, Behavioral & Economic Sciences [SBE]): news from the field
NIH News
U.S. Department of Health & Human Services: news
Science Daily (a comprehensive science website reporting new research): article
American Sociological Association Webpage: Front page story (ASA news)
University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill Webpage: Front page story (UNC news)
China View (Chinese Xinhua News Agency, official news agency of China): article
Cankao Xiaoxi (major Chinese newspaper reporting news abroad: article
CBS 6 WTVR, Richard Va
WRAL (North Carolina local TV station)
WKBT TV Channel
WTKR NewsChannel 3
WAVE 3 TV Lousville, KY
Kron 4 (the bay area’s news station): article
The Edmonton Journal: article
RCN RADIO- COLOMBIA, Latin America: telephone interview
Iowa Health: article
WAVY 10 TV channel
Austin News
MSN News
Social Work Today: A Nation leading newsmagazine social workers, Article, July 29, 2008
MedIndia, India, July 15
Genetischer Hintergrund bei delinquenten Jugendlichen?
Telepolis, Germany - Jul 15, 2008

******

Thomas D. Hall was named to the Edward Myers Dolan Chair in Anthropology at DePauw University for 2007-2008 & 2008-2009.

Social Evolutionism and its Critics: Deconstructing and Reconstructing an Evolutionary Interpretation of Human Society

Section members may qualify for a free exam copy of Steve Sanderson's new book, Social Evolutionism and its Critics: Deconstructing and Reconstructing an Evolutionary Interpretation of Human Society by sending relevant course title, expected number of students, and semester/quarter to be taught to Patriciag@paradigmpublishers.com

Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Approach

Section members who are teaching criminology and who want to emphasize a biosocial approach, including evolutionary arguments about crime causation, may request a review copy of Anthony Walsh & Lee Ellis (2007). Criminology: An Interdisciplinary Approach. Email: Jennifer.Reed@sagepub.com

The New Evolutionary Social Science: Human Nature, Social Behavior, and Social Change

Heinz-Jurgen Niedenzu Tamás Meleghy
Peter Meyer (Editors)

For a long period of time, social scientists declared their autonomy from the life sciences, thereby neglecting important biological constraints on human nature. Many sociological theories suggest a nearly complete malleability of patterns of social life. Recently, however, Stephen K. Sanderson's "Darwinian conflict theory" set out to synthesize sociological theories with key findings from biology into an overarching scientific paradigm.
Configuring and expanding this groundbreaking theory, the contributors to this volume are well-known European and American experts in evolutionary science. They develop in this book new bases for understanding social change and the world's future through a better integration of the life sciences and social sciences

978-1-59451-396-1 (Hardcover) $81.00
$68.85 June 2008 224 pp.
http://www.paradigmpublishers.com/Books/BookDetail.aspx?productID=151521

Heinz-Jürgen Niedenzu is Associate Professor of Sociology at the University of Innsbruck, Austria.
Tamas Meleghy is Professor of Sociology at the University of Innsbruck, Austria.
Peter Meyer is Professor of Sociology at the University of Augsburg, Germany.

SEX DIFFERENCES
Summarizing More than a Century of Scientific Research

Lee Ellis, Scott Hershberger, Evelyn Field, Scott Wersinger, Sergio Pellis, David Geary, Craig Palmer, Katharine Hoyenga, Amir Hetsroni, and Kazmer Karadi

This book is the first to aim at summarizing all of the scientific literature published so far regarding male-female differences (and similarities).

No exclusions were made in terms of subject areas, cultures, time periods, or even species.

Results from over 22,000 studies are summarized within approximately 3,000 tables, with each table pertaining to a specific possible sex difference. The book's length is 1,019 (+14) pages plus a CD insert containing a 650 page file of references to all of the studies cited throughout the book.

Publisher: Lawrence Erbaum Associates (Taylor and Francis), 2007.
For pre-publication orders:
http://www.psypress.com/9780805859591

Free exam copies available for professors

New 11th Edition
Human Societies
An Introduction to Macrosociology

Patrick Nolan and Gerhard Lenski

This classic text has been fully revised, updated with new data, and refreshed in design for student-friendly reading.

On the Origins of Gender Inequality

Joan Huber

Joan Huber challenges feminists toward a richer understanding of biological origins of inequality—knowledge that can help women achieve greater equality today.

Visit our Website and click on "Order an Exam Copy"
www.paradigmpublishers.com

The Seventh International Congress of Systematic and Evolutionary Biology will be held in Veracruz, Mexico, July 6-10, 2009.

Michael Hammond will be organizing a symposium on evolution and the social sciences, and there will be a session of contributed papers as well as opportunities for poster presentations on evolution and the social sciences. The Congress will be like a total immersion seminar on evolution. It will be a wonderful day-after-day opportunity for sociologists to track evolutionary thinking on a host of different topics, co-evolution, information and evolution, biodiversity, sexual selection, complexity theory, and just about every other contemporary issue in evolutionary studies. It will also be a great chance to get some feedback on your papers and posters from evolutionists in other disciplines from around the world. The organizing committee has cut a good deal on accommodation costs at the hotel-convention center in Veracruz, and hopefully, there will be some funds available to defer registration costs for symposia participants. Altogether, this Congress will be an attractive and comparatively inexpensive international opportunity to take part in the 2009 celebrations of Darwin and the current development of evolutionary thinking. The website will be up soon, but in the meantime, contact michaelhammond@rogers.com for more information.

Find the Complete Works of Charles Darwin on-line at
http://darwin-online.org.uk/