

conservationists voiced concern that political pressure in the United States, and not scientific merit, could inadvertently send the whole elephant conservation program down the drain.

The reason conservationists such as Jeffrey McNeely, formerly IUCN's chief conservation officer and now its Director General, favor allowing continued import of elephant trophies is that carefully managed hunting is at the heart of a program in Zimbabwe that one faction of the conservation movement thinks is a model for how endangered species ought to be conserved. Called the Campfire program, it allows hunters to come in and take a certain number of elephants per year, if they pay the people who live near the national parks. The beauty of the program, advocates say, is that it has caused local residents to look on the elephants as a resource that should be protected from poachers. And since 90% of the hunters who use the program are American, if the Fish and Wildlife agency were to ban importing elephant trophies, Campfire would likely collapse.

"Campfire is what conservationists have been striving for over the past decade," says Simon Metcalf, a wildlife biologist at Cornell University. "It protects wildlife while returning something tangible to the local population. And above all, it does so in a sustainable manner."

But not everyone in the conservation community agrees. David K. Wills, vice president for investigations at the Humane Society of the United States describes as "pure fiction" the claim that the elephant population in southern Africa is doing well enough for any hunting to continue. "The census that we conducted shows that elephant numbers are not as high in southern Africa as many claim, and poaching is as rampant as it ever was. Yes, people living near the parks are benefitting, but the animals are not being protected."

Wills and his confreres at organizations such as the African Wildlife Federation have persuaded officials in the White House to support their point of view and back a ban on elephant trophies. But the White House position doesn't mean the Fish and Wildlife agency will put a stop to the hunting, because its decision rests partly on a scientific debate having to do with the state of African elephant populations.

Everybody in the debate agrees that east African elephant populations (in Kenya, Tanzania, and surrounding countries) are dangerously low. But many conservationists, supported by animal population census studies by the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) through the 1980s, say elephants are thriving in Zimbabwe, South Africa, Namibia, Botswana, Zambia, and Swaziland. In Zimbabwe,

for example, WWF estimates that there are at between 60,000 and 75,000 elephants, up sharply from the lowpoint, 1900, when 5,000 elephants were counted.

Based on the WWF census data, each of the local district councils that are responsible for protecting wildlife sets a yearly elephant harvest level. For example, in 1988 through 1990, the elephant population in the Nyaminyami District of Zimbabwe averaged between 1500 and 2000 animals; the quota in each year was set at 12. Since the fee for an elephant trophy is \$5000, \$60,000 annually went into local coffers. Over the past 3 years, the council voted to use the money to build a daycare center, grinding mill, and water treatment facility, and to

provide a \$200 dividend yearly to each family in the district.

But Wills disagrees sharply with the WWF data that form the basis of the Campfire program. After a recent 5-week trip through southern Africa, he said, "the number of elephants in Zimbabwe is not the 75,000 that WWF claims, but is more like 40,000. In addition, poaching is as widespread as ever. I personally saw 25 to 30 fresh kills with tusks chopped off."

Is Wills right? Or is the Campfire program a boon to the southern African elephant? In the next week it will be up to officials of the Fish and Wildlife Service to decide. *Science* will report on the result of that decision-making process. ■ JOSEPH ALPER

Health Official Falls, Lands in NIMH

Under attack by 26 black congressmen, Representative John Dingell (D-MI), and Senator Edward Kennedy (D-MA) for remarks comparing the behavior of inner-city youth to that of male primates, psychiatrist Frederick K. Goodwin has resigned as head of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). But Goodwin's superiors were willing to bend only so far to congressional wrath: Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan, asserting his "complete confidence in Dr. Goodwin's scientific integrity and commitment to equality," promptly appointed him director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH).

Goodwin had already planned to move to NIMH later this year. But events took a new turn on 11 February during a public meeting of the NIMH Advisory Council on Mental Health. While describing a proposed "violence initiative" at ADAMHA, Goodwin said, in part: "If you look, for example, at male monkeys, especially in the wild, roughly half of them survive to adulthood. The other half die by violence. That is the natural way of it for males, to knock each other off." Furthermore, "the same hyperaggressive monkeys who kill each other are also hypersexual, so they...reproduce more to offset the fact that half of them are dying." Goodwin then went on to suggest that "the loss of social structure... particularly within the high impact inner-city areas, has removed some of the civilizing evolutionary things that we have built up... maybe it isn't just the careless use of the word when people call certain areas of certain cities jungles..." Goodwin added that "I say this with the realization that it might be easily misunderstood."

It was, generating much publicity. After

meeting with Sullivan, Goodwin formally apologized on 21 February for his "insensitivity." He continued apologizing the following week, but key members of Congress weren't satisfied. On 25 February, members of the Congressional Black Caucus wrote Sullivan questioning Goodwin's fitness to serve as ADAMHA director in view of his apparent inference that "inner city black youth are essentially animals." They asked for a meeting with Sullivan to discuss the matter, including "the extent to which the federal government funds research of the type to which Dr. Goodwin made reference." Kennedy and Dingell, the chairmen of ADAMHA's oversight committees, also weighed in on 26 February with a letter decrying Goodwin's "extremist and appalling view" of urban problems. Goodwin resigned the following day, saying he was "appalled to see the way in which complex and important scientific issues can become so distorted when they enter the political arena..."

Senator Orrin D. Hatch (R-UT), reportedly a key figure in persuading Sullivan to keep Goodwin around, agreed, and said in a 28 February statement: "I'm happy that Fred is getting back to NIMH." But some observers are still wondering if Goodwin's political effectiveness has been grievously wounded. Alan Kraut, head of the American Psychological Society, says, "I'd be shocked if this were the end of it." Sure enough, on 28 February Charles D. Spielberger, president of the 114,000-member American Psychological Association, wrote Sullivan to say it opposes Goodwin's appointment as NIMH director. Goodwin nonetheless says he is optimistic, though he acknowledged to *Science*, "I have got a lot of repair work to do." ■ CONSTANCE HOLDEN