
In this issue

Stimulated by the 2012 Māori Council's national water and geothermal resources claim with the Waitangi Tribunal, GNS senior scientist Paul White discusses water management and property rights and their associated economic implications in New Zealand.

In his article Paul draws parallels with the 2012 water claim and that of Māori claims associated with the fisheries quota management to the Waitangi Tribunal in the 1990s. He suggests that, following that claim, the role of Māori in water resources management will probably be considered over several decades before achieving an outcome. This would be particularly true if privatisation of property rights to water is proposed as a mechanism for water resource management in New Zealand. His prediction reflects the fact that implementation of the fisheries management system extended from 1983 to 2004. He believes the key unknown factor that will need to be grappled with will be the definition of property rights as it relates to water use. Any revision of existing rights would have significant economic and financial implications for users and the community. It will require serious consideration by government.

In *For pluralism in scientific method*, Otago University's John Ashton draws our attention to two approaches to science. The first he calls 'classical' science, and the second, after Kuhn (1962), 'normal' science, which includes operational and applied research, industrial research, and any kind of puzzle-solving research carried out on a big industrial model. He defines classical science to mean the quest to discover explanations of the way the universe we live in works.

While admitting that it is not perfect, John argues that the distinction is real and useful and that both approaches have particular strengths for particular aims. He argues that many debates over methodology in science and in statistical analysis can be resolved by reference to this distinction.

He concludes that, 'In the long haul, the two types of science must interact – technological progress depending on the growth of good explanations, and new theories depend-

ing on the growth of technology. Cross-fertilisation rather than competition between the various approaches to science is required – employing no single approach to the exclusion of others, nor giving in to the anarchic notion that in science anything goes'.

There are two important short contributions in this issue of the *Review*. The first is from Council member Nicola Gaston, who reports on the Australian Academy of Science's inaugural meeting of the Early/Mid-Career Researcher Forum which was held in Canberra in September 2012. The forum's aim was to connect Australia's most eminent scientists with tomorrow's future scientific leaders, and Nicola believes that this was achieved particularly through the willingness of the chair to facilitate the innovative use of twitter, and through maintaining focus on delivering practical outcomes.

The second is Lara Shepherd's introduction to the Wellington early- and mid-career researchers group (WEMCR) which was launched recently. WEMCR includes members from all research disciplines including the humanities and the social sciences.

Researchers interested in being part of the group are invited to make contact via <https://www.facebook.com/groups/427892793944151/> or Twitter @wtn_emcr. Alternatively Lara can be contacted at lara.shepherd@tepapa.govt.nz.

Finally in the issue we carry news of the NZAS Awards for 2012, the Association's President's Report for 2011/12, Subcommittee Reports and the Financial Report for the year ending 31 July 2012.

Reference

Kuhn, T. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. University of Chicago Press.

Allen Petrey
Editor