ported by a great many well-documented cases in the fossil record, if what is meant is the stability of morphospecies over long periods of time. Rarely, however, are the data of the record sufficient for interpretation of microevolutionary changes within these lineages or determination of such consequences as physiological, reproductive, or mechanical changes and similar modifications which may affect functional, populational, and ecological aspects of the morphospecies of concern. It was an exhortation to reasonable caution in these directions that was the thrust of my remarks. I do not, in fact, think that a great gulf exists between me and my colleagues on this matter, nor have I been, as might be inferred from Lewin's article, a diehard proponent of evolutionary gradualism or sufficiency of explanation by synthetic theory.

EVERETT C. OLSON
Department of Biology,
University of California,
Los Angeles 90024

Thank you for Lewin's "Evolutionary theory under fire," a fine article that vividly describes the self-correcting manner by which scientific knowledge progresses. The choice of title, while obviously designed to draw attention to the proceedings of an important symposium, is unfortunate because it suggests that evolution is being challenged instead of pointing to the reevaluation of the mechanisms by which organic evolution proceeds. As a result, this article is undoubtedly destined to enter the out-of-context arsenal that has become a mainstay of recent creationist literature.

We are sure the creationists will be delighted to have an opportunity to cite *Science* in apparent support of their cause.

JOSEPH E. ARMSTRONG
BOYCE A. DRUMMOND
Department of Biological Sciences,
Illinois State University,
Normal 61761

Lasers in Space

In Nicholas Wade's briefing (News and Comment, 9 Jan., p. 148) about my recent study (with Kosta Tsipis) of laser weapons (*1*), I was identified as an "MIT physicist." Although I was at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology when the study began, since September 1979, I have been at Carnegie-Mellon University.

Although Wade's review accurately summarizes selected points of our report, his comment that a carbon dioxide laser is the Pentagon's leading candidate for a space-based laser weapon deserves clarification. We did not make such a statement. In fact, we did not discuss Department of Defense plans at all; instead, we discussed general constraints applicable to all laser weapons, and we postulated and criticized several weapons and scenarios of our own invention.

MICHAEL B. CALLAHAM
Departments of Electrical Engineering and Engineering and Public Policy,
Carnegie-Mellon University,
Schenley Park,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

References

1. M. Callaham and K. Tsipis, *High Energy Laser Weapons—a Technical Assessment* (Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, 1980).

Perhaps I am prejudiced because I was employed at Avco Everett Research Laboratory in Massachusetts where a breakthrough to truly high-power lasers was made, but I must take exception to Wade's caustic "A cooler look at laser weapons."

While it is true that atmospheric propagation problems may hinder the use of laser weapons on the battlefield or at sea, their use in space is another matter entirely. Laser or particle beam weapons may be effective defenses against ballistic missiles and may provide a defense against the hydrogen bomb terror that we have faced since such missiles became operational.

There are severe technical difficulties in fielding a network of operational laser-armed antiballistic missile satellites, to be sure. But if current trends are followed, such weapons systems may be undergoing orbital tests before the decade is out. Certainly they will be tested by the Soviet Union, which has shown a continuing interest in developing space-based weaponry, such as their antisatellite systems, and in bringing such weaponry into use. . . .

BEN BOVA
Omni Publications International Ltd.,
909 Third Avenue,
New York 10022

Erratum: In the article by C. E. Land (12 Sept. 1980, p. 1197), the labels for the curves P(negative estimate) and Power in the left-hand panel of Fig. 1 (p. 1199) should be reversed; the data sources for table 1 (p. 1200) should have been given as (*19, 25*).

Erratum: Photomicrographs of normal and sickled erythrocytes that were published in the 30 January issue (Research News, p. 469) should have been credited to the laboratory of Patricia Farnsworth, Department of Physiology, New Jersey Medical School, Newark. The photos were taken by graduate student Patricia A. Burke.