















































Is Forensics really Science?
EDITORIAL
Foreensic Science: Oxymoron? In detective novels and television series, criminals often get caught because they leave finger- ind those of many other countries. But rait does imitate life; fingerprint analysis is widely used in U.S. courts and those of many other countries. But lat year a finary thing happened to fingerprint evidence on the way to a coviction. Applying the standard set for the admixed biblie of scientific evidence by the U.S. Supreme Court in the 1993 Daubert case, Judge Louis Pollak ruled that an expert could not testify that the prints at a crime scene matched those of a support. Short reverberat- ed through the criminal justice community, util Judge Pollak induced a sight of relief from district attorneys everywhere by saying that at least in this case, ach testimony could be used after all. The Supreme Court's Daubert standard has generated some ambiguity for the legal community, but the Court did list several criteria for qualifying expert testimony: poer review, error nek, ade- quate testing, regular standards and techniques, and general acceptance. Judge Pollak' initial find- ing was that the evidence finduced all but one. Some distinguided legal scholars think that he was
a figure of speech that combines two normally contradictory terms
It's not that fingerprint analysis is unreliable. The problem, rather, is that its reliability is unverified either by statistical models of fingerprint variation or by consistent data on error rates. Nor does pre-interests accurry and plante - would be randered by a finde scenific water to want it r analyzing crimes. The mystery here is why the practitioners don't seen to want it Donald Kennedy Editor-in-Chief
www.sciencemag.org SCIENCE VOL 302 5 DECEMBER 2003





















































