

This issue of PLS, 23:1, is materializing in mailboxes in late spring 2005, about a year behind but otherwise nearly on time, our long march to punctuality continuing apace. 23:1 shows publication dates — *online-before-print* publication dates — beginning 7 December 2004.

With the earliest paper, “Evolution and the American social sciences: An evolutionary social scientist’s view,” Bradley A. Thayer inaugurates a new feature, *Field Notes*, assessing biopolitics as a scholarly species: its range, vitality, academic-environmental endangerments, and manifest opportunities. He finds natural-history denial still frighteningly routine — and still routinely advised, mentor-to-protégé — in the social-sciences branch of the American academy.

Next, Peter G. Brown asks a question — “Are there any natural resources?” — whose answer is instructively more complex than we all regularly presume. He follows this answer to a newly recognized good, “the commonwealth of life,” wherein resource preemption fails its test as a human right.

In complementary contrast to Brown, Y. Michael Barilan mounts a defense of speciesism, a concept that has been having a hard time in moral philosophy, especially among environmental ethicists and animal-rights philosophers. His paper, “Speciesism as a precondition to justice,” is an unembarrassed departure from fashion. “Justice can be blind to species no more than to circumstance,” Barilan argues.

D. Birenbaum-Carmeli follows with a scientometric contribution, “On the prevalence of population groups in the human-genetics research literature,” finding that “[s]tudy-population selection may in some cases be explained by, or may complicate, political predicament.”

Stephen J. Ziegler and Robert A. Jackson ask, “Who’s not afraid of Proposal B?” They refer to a November 1998 citizen initiative that would have legalized physician-assisted suicide (PAS) in Michigan, finding that many presumptive supporters turned against the measure in the run-up to election day for reasons calling into question the salability of future PAS initiatives.

In “Speaking power to sex in Auckland,” N. Patrick Peritore reports, through “Q” methodology, that “[s]hared elite male-female interest in social control and hierarchy maintenance may affect mating strategies sufficiently to obscure more expected sex-specific differences in attitudes and behaviors.” Which is to say, proverbially, that the rich do indeed have things figured out.

African Americans’ opinions about human-genetics research are assayed, in a paper of the same name, by Paul Achter, Roxanne Parrott, and Kami Silk. Their conclusions are intuitively sensible yet, with loss of neither intuition nor sensibility, paradoxical: “[M]ost Americans trust government to act ethically in sponsoring and conducting research, including genetics research, but ... African Americans are particularly likely to see government as powerfully protective in some settings yet selectively disingenuous in others.”

Richard Sherlock once again delivers book reviews for an array of interests: biological weapons programs legal, illegal, and fictional; bioethics normative, applied, and meta; reproduction lean and fat; public philosophy bold and boring; genes patented and genomes owned; and degradations environmental with diseases political-economic.

R. H. Sprinkle
Editor-in-chief