

SCIENCE

Published by the **American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS)**, *Science* serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Membership/Circulation

Director: Michael Spinella
Fulfillment: Marlene Zendell, *Manager*; Gwen Huddle, *Assistant Manager*; Mary Curry, *Member Service Supervisor*; Pat Butler, Helen Williams, Laurie Baker, *Member Service Representatives*
Promotions: Dee Valencia, *Manager*; Hilary Baar, Angela Mumeka, *Coordinators*
Research: Kathleen Markey, *Manager*; Robert Smariga, *Assistant*
Financial Analyst: Jacquelyn Roberts
Administrative Assistant: Nina Araujo de Kobes
Science Member Services
Marion, Ohio: 800-347-6969;
Washington, DC: 202-326-6417

Advertising and Finance

Associate Publisher: Beth Rosner
Advertising Sales Manager: Susan A. Meredith
Recruitment Advertising Manager: Janis Crowley
Advertising Business Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold
Financial Manager: Leslie Gelder
Marketing Manager: Laurie Hallowell
Traffic Manager: Tina Turano
Recruitment: Michele Pearl, *Operations Manager*; Dan Moran, *Traffic Manager*; Debbie Cummings, Millie Muñoz-Cumming, Angela Wheeler, *Sales*
Marketing Associate: Allison Pritchard
Reprints Manager: Corrine Harris
Permissions Manager: Arlene Ennis
Sales Associate: Carol Maddox

ADVERTISING SALES: East Coast/E. Canada:
Richard Teeling, 201-904-9774, FAX 201-904-9701 •
Southeast: Mark Anderson, 305-856-8567, FAX 305-856-1056 • **Midwest:** Donald Holbrook, 708-516-8882, FAX 708-516-8883 • **West Coast/W. Canada:**
Neil Boylan, 415-673-9265, FAX 415-673-9267 • **UK, Scandinavia, France, Italy, Belgium, the Netherlands:** Andrew Davies, (44) 457-838-519, FAX (44) 457-838-898 • **Germany/Switzerland/Austria:**
Tracey Peers, (44) 270-760-108, FAX (44) 270-759-597 • **Japan:** Mashy Yoshikawa, (3) 3235-5961, FAX (3) 3235-5852
Recruitment: 202-326-6555, FAX 202-682-0816
European Recruitment: AnneMarie Vis, (44) 0223-302067, FAX (44) 0223-302068
Send materials to *Science* Advertising, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Information for Contributors appears on pages 40–42 of the 1 January 1993 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. **Science Telephone:** 202-326-6500, TDD 202-408-7770. **Other AAAS Programs:** 202-326-6400.

LETTERS

DNA Evidence

The legal system has been somewhat paralyzed by the appearance of a raging controversy over the statistical aspect of forensic DNA typing (1). The letter of D. L. Hartl and R. C. Lewontin (23 Apr., p. 473) continues the debate by creating the impression that a frequency estimate that might be off by a factor of 10 or 100 in the 1:1,000,000 range would have a meaningful impact in a given case. DNA evidence is rarely the major component of the prosecution's evidence.

Hartl and Lewontin find support in an "informal" telephone survey by Charles Taylor. The survey was actually conducted for another case (2) that did not involve the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The DNA evidence was admitted in spite of the "informal" survey. The survey did not play a role in the decision in the case mentioned by Hartl and Lewontin (3). In subsequent cases, trial judges have not admitted the survey as evidence (4). The survey has proved to be such an insignificant source of information that defense attorneys have long since stopped using it.

Hartl and Lewontin claim support for their current position with the assertion that four superior courts "have ruled that convictions based on faulty statistics be set aside." Their reference 3 describes those cases as *Barney/Howard* and *Breadmore* and *Lanigan*. None of these convictions has been "set aside." Both Barney and Howard will continue to spend a substantial part of their natural lives in prison. Their convictions were affirmed because there was more than enough evidence in addition to the DNA estimates to support their guilt. As for Breadmore and Lanigan, the appellate review of their trial court admissibility hearings took place *before* the trials. Because they had not been convicted, their convictions could not have been "set aside," as Hartl and Lewontin assert. The cases were remanded for additional admissibility hearings. Lanigan's hearing was held, and the DNA evidence was again ruled admissible on 5 January 1993.

Hartl and Lewontin's misuse of legal history to bolster their scientific opinions will only guarantee more contentiousness and controversy.

Rockne P. Harmon
District Attorney's Office,
Alameda County, Oakland Branch,
661 Washington,
Oakland, CA 94607

References

1. *People v. Barney/Howard* (1992) 8 Ca. App. 4th 798.
2. *People v. Menephee*, Los Angeles Co., No. LA 003 852, 8 July 1991.
3. *People v. Halik*, Los Angeles Co., No. VA 00843, 26 September 1991.
4. *State v. Johnson* (Hennepin Co., Minn., SIP No. 89072014), 22 July 1991.

Dioxin's Effects

I would like to amend a comment cited in Richard Stone's Research News article about dioxin (2 Apr., p. 31). When I said that the data "don't support the idea of a general threshold for dioxin's effects," I meant that in the context of Ah-receptor-mediated responses to dioxins, that is, induction of CYP1A1A cannot be shown to have a threshold. However, I and many other European toxicologists do not share Linda Birnbaum's view that the adverse effects of dioxins (for example, tumor induction) might not have a threshold.

The fact that I share Birnbaum's reluctance to speculate on future decisions by the regulators depends more on the uncertainty of the importance of new data coming up, indicating possible effects on, for example, the immune system at lower doses than hitherto demonstrated.

Ulf G. Ahlborg
Institute of Environmental Medicine,
Karolinska Institutet,
Box 60208,
S-104 01 Stockholm, Sweden

Alvin and Deep Ocean Research

The article, "Deep-sea debate pits Alvin against Jason" by John Travis (News & Comment, 12 Mar., p. 1534) obfuscates an ongoing dialog about the future of deep submergence science by suggesting that the use of manned or unmanned vehicles in the abyss is an either/or situation. In more than 25 years of service to the oceanographic sciences, the manned submersible Alvin has provided investigators with a capability to carry out controlled, manipulative, and interactive tasks in the deep ocean. Alvin has been, and still is, critical to advances in biological, chemical, and geological oceanography. A recent call for letters of interest