

viously be adaptive, and would be selected for. But continuous receptivity is a separate issue from ovulation cues (unless there happens to be some inextricable genetic-hormonal link between the two). Women with less-pronounced ovulation cues would not be as attractive to males and would have fewer offspring. However, women with cues that extended before and after actual ovulation would be more attractive, and therefore would have an advantage in keeping males around. The ultimate outcome of this selection pressure, therefore, could be false signs of ovulation extending over the entire month, but not the loss of ovulation cues entirely.

Marian VanCourt is working toward her doctorate in psychology at the University of Texas, Austin.

References

Barkow, J. H. and Nancy Burley, 1980, Human fertility, evolutionary biology and the demographic transition, Ethology and Sociobiology 1: 163-180.

Burley, Nancy, 1979, The evolution of concealed ovulation, The American Naturalist 114: 835-858.

Darwin, Charles, 1871, The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex, New York: D. Appleton.

VanCourt, Marian, and Frank D. Bean, 1984, Intelligence and fertility in the United States, 1912-1982, to appear in Intelligence

Vining, Daniel R., 1982, On the possibility of the re-emergence of a dysgenic trend with respect to intelligence in American fertility differentials, Intelligence 6: 241-264.

M a i l a l l E S I G

c o r r e s p o n d e n c e t o :

E S I G

B o x 5 1 8 1

A u s t i n , T X 7 8 7 6 3