

A BASF statement says the product shows "exceptional tear strength," but repeated questioning could not persuade a company spokesman to back the statement with figures.

If the new process does come into use, losses are foreseen for companies that concentrate on spinning and weaving, such as Burlington Mills and J. P. Stevens and Company, and firms that supply them with synthetic fibers, such as Du Pont and Monsanto.

The gainers are likely to be the so-called integrated textile companies, those that make everything from fiber to cloth, like Japan's Toyo Rayon and Britain's Courtauld's, as well as chemical companies with strong positions in plastics, such as BASF and Union Carbide. ◇

## DRUGS

### The physician as addict

Although the typical drug addict in the United States is from the lower socioeconomic level, unmarried, city-bred and 18 to 25 years of age, the physician addict is different. He is about 38 years old, married, may or may not come from a city, and is of the higher income group.

The rate of drug abuse or addiction among physicians is from 30 to 100 times that of the general public, a California attorney told the Federation of State Medical Boards recently. The American Medical Association estimates that some 60,000 of the country's 316,000 doctors misuse drugs of various kinds.

The drug abuser among physicians has a pre-disposing personality for addiction, and suffers from overwork and fatigue. Since drugs are readily available, they are an occupational hazard. Usually the doctor has been in practice some years before he takes up the habit.

The encouraging thing about this group of addicts, however, is that in many cases they can be rehabilitated. Richard K. Turner, deputy attorney general of California, says the earlier that state medical boards can prove cases against such doctors, the better the chances for rehabilitation.

About 95 percent of the first offenders are placed on probation, Turner says. About 85 percent of the second offenders have their licenses either suspended or revoked.

One study of 68 physicians discharged from the Public Health Service Narcotics Hospital in Lexington, Ky., reveals that morphine and demerol are the most commonly used drugs. Many of these doctors also used barbiturates and alcohol in addition to the narcotics.

## I.Q. DISPUTE

### Genetics vs. headstart

The embers of the oldest dispute in psychology—nature versus nurture—have been fanned to white heat once again, this time by a Berkeley professor. And the flames are beginning to lick through the academic woods, creating heat and even a little light.

The pyrotechnic scholar is Dr. Arthur R. Jensen, a psychologist at the University of California's School of Education.

His view of the overwhelming primacy of nature—or heredity—as a determinant of intelligence is set forth in a 123-page article in the Winter 1969 issue of the prestigious HARVARD EDUCATIONAL REVIEW.

After arguing that environmental factors are not nearly as important in determining the Intelligence Quotient as genetic factors, Dr. Jensen analyzes the environmental influences which may be most critical in determining I.Q. He concludes that prenatal influences may contribute the largest environmental factor, but genetics dominate nevertheless.

A basic finding of Dr. Jensen's research is that environment acts as what he calls a threshold variable. Extreme environmental deprivation can keep a child from performing up to his genetic potential, but an enriched educational program cannot lift him above this potential.

Dr. Jensen emphasizes the point that new educational methods must be developed which take advantage of the mental abilities of children from deprived backgrounds.

But there is more to the Jensen study than just another vote for heredity in its ancient struggle with environment for the allegiance of behavioral scientists. Dr. Jensen also contends that the Federal Government's widely publicized effort at compensatory education for the children of deprived minority groups is a failure.

He attacks what he sees as the central notion upon which these programs are based: the idea that I.Q. variations are almost completely a result of environmental differences and the cultural bias of the tests themselves (SN: 3/8, p. 243). He also argues that it would be better to teach specific skills to the children born into poverty than to try to raise their I.Q. scores through emphasis on abstract learning.

As though all this were not enough to bring the intellectual pot to a boil, Dr. Jensen speculates that social class and racial variations in intelligence cannot be accounted for by differences in environment.

"The idea that the lower average

intelligence and scholastic performance of Negroes could involve not only environmental, but also genetic factors has indeed been strongly denounced," Dr. Jensen says, "but it has been neither contradicted nor discredited by evidence." And, he adds, "the fact that a reasonable hypothesis has not been rigorously proved does not mean that it should be summarily dismissed."

Asked whether he was concerned that racists might seize upon portions of his research and, by quoting them out of context, belabor those who seek to improve race relations, Dr. Jensen says: "I don't want to give these people the power of censorship over my research. I know many fine scholars who didn't submit research because of the fear that it might be misinterpreted. I think it is important that people read my article before making interpretations of it."

He observes that the part of his study that dealt with racial differentials on I.Q. scores constituted less than five percent of the total research, although this was the part that has received the most attention. Dr. Jensen was also careful to note in his paper that "since, as far as we know, the full range of human talents is represented in all the major races of man and in all socioeconomic levels, it is unjust to allow the mere fact of an individual's racial or social background to affect the treatment of him."

Dr. Jensen's genetic explanation for intelligence variation does not satisfy Harvard's Dr. Jerome Kagan, who is among those invited by the REVIEW to counter Jensen's points in the upcoming spring edition. Dr. Kagan illustrates his objections with an analogy to physical stature:



Harvard

*Dr. Kagan: Nurture does it.*