low-sulfur fuel toward the smaller low-level sources. The best short-run strategy for reducing community exposure to episodic or localized occurrences of high SO_2 levels seems to be still an open question.

If our conclusions were misapplied by a utility or by anyone else, we are sorry. Facts can be misused. To their chagrin, scientists have had ample opportunity to learn this in the last few years.

T. R. MONGAN
Sydney Area Transportation Study,
7 West Street, North Sydney,
New South Wales, Australia

J. GOLDEN
7716 Iroquois Court,
Falls Church, Virginia 22043

Alas

Hamlet spoke of a single skull. McMahon was referring to a single scull (see 23 July, p. 350, table 1).

ANNE SYMINGTON
745 Cella Road,
St. Louis, Missouri 63124

Climate Change

The report by Rasool and Schneider (9 July, p. 138) presents quantitative relationships between atmospheric carbon dioxide and aerosol concentrations which may be useful. However, two of their conclusions with respect to the effects of aerosols may be misleading.

Their statement that "the surface temperature falls precipitously with increasing opacity" is a consequence of the use of a logarithmic scale in presentation of the results. A replot of their figure 2b, using linear scales, indicates that the decline in surface temperature is linear with optical thickness and hence with aerosol concentration, at least to the accuracy with which I was able to read their curves.

In the projection of possible future events, they appear to neglect the effect of naturally produced aerosols. The authors of the SCEP report (*1*), which Rasool and Schneider cite as their first reference, concluded that, at present, the man-made tropospheric particulate component averaged over the globe amounts to about one part in five by weight and by number. Thus, the projected increase in the next 50