

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.

The American Association for the Advancement of Science was founded in 1848 and incorporated in 1874. Its objectives are to further the work of scientists, to facilitate cooperation among them, to foster scientific freedom and responsibility, to improve the effectiveness of science in the promotion of human welfare, to advance education in science, and to increase public understanding and appreciation of the importance and promise of the methods of science in human progress.

Membership/Circulation

Director: Michael Spinella
Deputy Director: Marlene Zendell
Member Services: Rebecca Dickerson, *Manager*; Mary Curry, *Supervisor*; Pat Butler, Helen Williams, Laurie Baker, *Representatives*
Marketing: Dee Valencia, *Manager*; Jane Pennington, *Europe Manager*; Hilary Baar, *Associate*; Angela Mumeka, *Coordinator*
Business and Finance: Jacquelyn Roberts, *Manager*; Robert Smariga, *Assistant Manager*
Administrative Assistant: Nina Araujo de Kobes
Science Member Services
Marion, Ohio: 800-347-6969;
Washington, DC: 202-326-6417
Other AAAS Programs: 202-326-6400

Advertising and Finance

Associate Publisher: Beth Rosner
Advertising Sales Manager: Susan A. Meredith
Recruitment Advertising Manager: Janis Crowley
Advertising Business Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold
Finance: Randy Yi, *Senior Analyst*; Shawn Williams, *Analyst*
Marketing: John Meyers, *Manager*; Allison Pritchard, *Associate*
Traffic Manager: Tina Turano
Recruitment: Terri Seiter, *Assistant Manager*; Dan Moran, *Traffic Manager*; Debbie Cummings, Celeste Wakefield, Angela Wheeler, *Sales*
Reprints Manager: Corrine Harris
Permissions Manager: Arlene Ennis
Sales Associate: Carol Maddox

PRODUCT 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:** Elizabeth Mosko, 312-665-1150, FAX 312-665-2129 • **West Coast/W. Canada:** Neil Boylan, 415-673-9265, FAX 415-673-9267 • **UK, Scandinavia, France, Italy, Belgium, 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:** Mashu Yoshikawa, (3) 3235-5961, FAX (3) 3235-5852

RECRUITMENT ADVERTISING SALES: US: 202-326-6555, FAX 202-682-0816 • **Europe:** AnneMarie Vis, (44) 0223-302067, FAX (44) 0223-302068 • **Australia/New Zealand:** Keith Sandell, (61) 02-922-2977, FAX (61) 02-922-1100

Send materials to *Science* Advertising, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Information for Contributors appears on pages 37–39 of the 7 January 1994 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005.

Internet addresses: science_editors@aaas.org (for general editorial queries); science_letters@aaas.org (for letters to the editor); science_reviews@aaas.org (for returning manuscript reviews)

LETTERS

Inappropriate Analogy

I read with shock and distaste the opening of the Research News article about the Keck telescope that begins, "In the pages of *Mademoiselle* and *Cosmo*, there's an eternal debate about whether bigger really is better" (15 Apr., p. 346). A sophomoric sexual reference attributed to women's magazines is hardly an appropriate lead-in to a *Science* article, especially when more amusing and less offensive "bigger is better" analogies exist. Respect for your female and male readers should preclude the publication of such a comment. This type of writing degrades the journal.

Diana Lane

*Department of Rangeland Ecosystem Science,
Colorado State University,
Fort Collins, CO 80523, USA*

Response: The News department regrets the tone of the offending sentences in the article. Those sentences were inappropriate, and the News department takes responsibility for them. In the future we will redouble our efforts to be sure it doesn't happen again.

—**John Benditt**, *Features Editor*

Black Rhino Conservation

Our recent Policy Forum (4 Mar., p. 1241) about the efficacy of different black rhino conservation strategies may have had an unfortunate result, the premature termination of our research project in Namibia. We had little choice but to leave the country when our research permits were not renewed. This occurred after publication of our Policy Forum, which did not unequivocally support "official" policy.

Our study was designed to evaluate biological consequences of dehorning rhinos as a conservation measure. It was officially approved by Namibia's Ministry of Wildlife, Conservation, and Tourism (MWCT). After 3 years, our findings regarding dehorning were mixed, news apparently not well received by MWCT officials in light of their decision to continue to dehorn rhinos and to support legalized horn trade.

Namibia, as an independent country, should of course be free to manage their resources any way that they so please. The choice to accept or discard information is

ultimately theirs alone. But they have much to lose. There will now be no way to validate declarations about the success or failure of different programs, including dehorning. Without research by independent scientists, it will be difficult to know whether assertions of management successes are credible. The MWCT is no longer free from conflicts of interest. As they pointed out to us, some of our results could be used by detractors of the dehorning tactic and possibly hundreds of thousands of international dollars would be lost.

Clearly, the unenviable dilemma is whether to make no waves and continue one's work or, at some risk, to attempt to notify local officials, drawing attention to results that do not wholeheartedly embrace a host country's official policy. It would be impossible for any field study of rhino conservation, no matter how long, to remove unequivocally *all* possible competing explanations. Because many countries are now trying to assess management strategies for rhinos and to implement sanctions against those using rhino horn, we felt a responsibility to release scientific results quickly so as to enable informed decision-making.

Joel Berger

*Program in Ecology, Evolution and
Conservation Biology,
University of Nevada,
Reno, Nevada 89512, USA*

Carol Cunningham

*Department of Environmental and
Resource Sciences,
University of Nevada, Reno*

Outcomes Research

We read Christopher Anderson's review of outcomes research with a curious sense of déjà vu (News & Comment, 25 Feb., p. 1080). The alleged inadequacies of nonrandomized studies of human health have provoked spirited exchanges in *Science* and elsewhere (1). These debates have centered on traditional epidemiologic studies of disease causation in which, for ethical reasons, randomization is prohibited and nonrandomized studies must be used.

For assessing new therapies, however, randomization is often ethically acceptable and has traditionally been the method of choice. Randomization greatly enhances one's ability to make unbiased comparisons