prison has an identical twin, it's likely his cotwin will also be in prison. If the twin is fraternal (with 50 percent shared genes, on the average), the likelihood is not nearly as great that he'll be in prison, too, but it's greater than chance. How could one possibly account for this difference with environmentalist explanations? The strong genetic component in criminality has already been proven up to the hilt.

The role of genetics in personality and intelligence has been extensively demonstrated in the last 30 or 40 years. The information is available in numerous textbooks. In almost all traits an appreciable genetic influence exists, varying from 70-80 percent in the case of intelligence, to about 20 percent in the case of superego.

Now, the question is: why aren't these facts known to the American people? Why have academe and the media withheld this information? In Britain, when I was growing up in the '20's, it was common sense to place considerable importance upon heredity in choosing a person to marry, in choosing the occupation for which one was suited, and so on. I was astonished when I came to America to find that eugenics was almost a bad word. One may trace this situation to the sociologists, to Boas and others, and to pressure from minority groups who oppose anything aristocratic.

I think there is a problem widespread in certain societies, notably in America, which consists of the denial, for political or other reasons, of the influence of genetics on human behavior. Of course, the Declaration of Independence has written in it Jefferson's and Franklin's statement that "all men are created equal." Now, neither of

those men could possibly have believed that literally, as their other writings amply attest. But to my amazement, I find that two out of three people I ask take that statement to mean that they're genetically equal. The ideal of equality of opportunity has been distorted to mean biological equality. Roger Williams has written a telling little book [Free and Unequal, by Roger J. Williams, 1953; Liberty Press, Indianapolis] about inequality and freedom. He points out that the French Revolutionary trio of ideals of "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity" is internally inconsistent--a society can't have both liberty and equality. Given that people are born unequal in their innate abilities, the only way for a government to bring about equality is by coercion, but ultimately it's futile.

There may also be deeper, unconscious sources of opposition to any form of biological determinism. For example, the individual may feel that heredity somehow restrains him, so he will prefer to deny its influence. But obviously the only reasonable way to deal with Nature is to accommodate to its laws, as we do to the law of gravity. If one refuses to acknowledge the importance of gravity and blithely jumps off a cliff, one will find himself in serious trouble. Our society may be jumping off a cliff, so to speak, with regard to its denial of the role of genetics in human behavior.