

LETTERS

Alcohol and Pregnancy

Gina Kolata, in her article "Fetal alcohol advisory debated" (Research News, 6 Nov., p. 642) discusses our study on the effects of moderate drinking during pregnancy and includes the statement, "Kline stands by her conclusions but does note that the results of a more recent, unpublished, study by her group [do] not confirm [the] initial results." I am writing to affirm that I in no way wish to retract or amend our published results (1). Kolata's report suggests that two studies have been carried out; in fact, there is a single study comprised of a heterogeneous population. There are many good reasons why our confidence in our early inferences remains. Perhaps the most persuasive, and one which Kolata does not report, is our observation that the effect of alcohol drinking on spontaneous abortion is confined to chromosomally normal conceptions. The specificity of the effect for a portion of all spontaneously aborted conceptions makes it unlikely that our results arise from bias in recall or other sources of confounding.

JENNIE KLINE

Gertrude H. Sergievsky Center,
Columbia University, and
New York State Psychiatric Institute,
630 West 168 Street,
New York 10032

References

1. J. Kline, P. Shrout, Z. Stein, M. Susser, D. Warburton, *Lancet* **1980-II**, 176 (1980); J. Kline, Z. Stein, M. Susser, D. Warburton, in *Human Embryonic and Fetal Death*, I. H. Porter and E. B. Hook, Eds. (Academic Press, New York, 1980), pp. 225-240.

Nuclear Waste Disposal

We warmly support the proposal of C. D. Hollister, D. R. Anderson, and G. R. Heath (18 Sept., p. 1321) that the feasibility of subseabed disposal of high-level nuclear wastes be thoroughly discussed, explored, and assessed. We believe, as they do, that this is a most promising avenue by which to avoid placing on future generations the hazards of this generation's nuclear wastes.

However, one danger of disposal in deep-sea sediments is not adequately confronted by Hollister *et al.* Experimental and observational evidence against active natural advection of pore waters driven through the entire sedimentary column by an underlying oceanic

crustal convection system is not one of the site selection criteria they propose for a U.S. seabed waste disposal program. If high-level nuclear wastes were to be deposited in an actively advecting natural system, any leakage might be rapidly transported to the biosphere. Consequently, Canada, the United Kingdom, and the Netherlands all include in their site evaluation programs experiments designed to detect such advection in sediments. While Hollister *et al.* do consider this problem obliquely, they place a low priority on experimental verification of presence or absence of advection (for example, their reference 21).

There is now considerable chemical evidence, beyond the geothermal evidence noted by Hollister *et al.*, that active upward advection, on the order of 1 to 10 centimeters per year, of pore water through marine sediments occurs over wide areas of the pelagic ocean. At present such advection can be confidently ruled out *only* where deep chemical diffusion gradients can be demonstrated. In a typical deep diffusion gradient, extending to an underlying basalt basement, dissolved magnesium diminishes continuously with depth, usually vanishing at the basalt contact, while dissolved calcium increases continuously with depth by an amount comparable to the magnesium deficit (1). Such a diffusion gradient contrasts markedly with advection-produced pore water chemistry, since advection, at 10 centimeters per year, would transport ions at least two orders of magnitude faster than diffusion. Upward advection would produce a shallow, distinctly nonlinear chemical gradient confined to the sediment boundary layer near the sea floor.

McDuff (1) has shown that deep gradients are especially apt to be missing where total sediment thickness is less than 300 meters. From the Deep Sea Drilling Project data reviewed by Lawrence and Gieskes (2) we can estimate that deep gradients are absent over perhaps 20 to 40 percent of the ocean floor. The criterion of Hollister *et al.* that the sediments should be oxidized may well tend to favor sediment columns subject to advection. Sayles and Manheim (3) have observed that absence of chemical gradients is especially characteristic of slowly deposited pelagic clays.

The regional absence of nonlinear temperature gradients in sediments, as determined by standard oceanographic methods, is not necessarily a sufficient criterion to exclude vertical pore water advection. Measurements over most of the past three decades in all the world's

oceans (4), including some which extend to a depth of hundreds of meters (5), do not generally show systematically nonlinear gradients. Only with the recent development of instrumentation to obtain precise and detailed temperatures with depth in the uppermost sediments have nonlinear thermal gradients been measured to permit the inference of significant vertical advection (6). However, such nonlinearity has now been found even in relatively impermeable clays (7).

Although the laboratory permeability values referred to by Hollister *et al.* do seem to rule out such advection in the sediments they have studied, we are concerned that either the laboratory measurements do not reflect the in situ permeability (8), or that the net hydrostatic pressure "head" driving upward advection through the sediment column may often be much greater than expected (9). It seems possible that a fine sediment deposited very slowly in the presence of a steady upward advective flow might develop an exceptionally permeable fabric that would not be apparent in laboratory measurements made on molded core samples. In any case, the presence of deep continuous chemical diffusion gradients would ensure that such advection is negligible.

We therefore urge an additional criterion for site selection: there should be clear evidence, both from chemical gradients and from the thermal gradient, that there is no significant advection of the sediment pore waters at any proposed disposal site.

PAUL C. MANGELSDORF, JR.
Department of Physics,
Swarthmore College,
Swarthmore, Pennsylvania 19081

FREDERICK L. SAYLES
RICHARD P. VON HERZEN
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution,
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

JORIS M. GIESKES
Scripps Institution of Oceanography,
University of California at San Diego,
La Jolla 92093

RUSSELL E. MCDUFF
School of Oceanography, WB-10,
University of Washington,
Seattle 98195

ROGER N. ANDERSON
Lamont-Doherty Geological
Observatory, Columbia University,
Palisades, New York 10964

References and Notes

1. R. E. McDuff, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **45**, 1705 (1981).
2. J. R. Lawrence and J. M. Gieskes, *J. Geophys. Res.* **86**, 7924 (1981).
3. F. L. Sayles and F. T. Manheim, *Geochim. Cosmochim. Acta* **39**, 103 (1975).

4. M. G. Langseth and R. P. Von Herzen, in *The Sea*, A. E. Maxwell, Ed. (Wiley-Interscience, New York, 1971), vol. 4, part. 1, p. 299.
5. A. J. Erickson, R. P. Von Herzen, J. G. Sclater, R. W. Girdler, B. V. Marshall, R. Hyndman, *J. Geophys. Res.* **80**, 2515 (1975).
6. R. P. Von Herzen, J. Crowe, K. Green, *Eos* **60**, 382 (1979).
7. R. N. Anderson, M. A. Hobart, M. G. Langseth, *Science* **204**, 828 (1979).
8. J. Crowe and A. J. Silva, *J. Geophys. Res.*, in press.
9. R. N. Anderson and M. Zoback (*ibid.*, in press) have measured negative pore pressures in ocean crust of about 10 bars below hydrostatic. These have been modeled as resulting from hydrothermal circulation, which may produce positive pore pressures of comparable magnitude elsewhere.

We thank Mangelsdorf *et al.* for raising the problem of pore water convection. We also feel that site-specific studies should be done when (or if) candidate areas are actually selected, perhaps in the time frame of the late 1980's. Their additional site selection criterion has been added to our list.

Furthermore, we continue to caution against advocating the subseabed disposal concept until these and other scientific questions are put to rest. Our effort is very young, as compared to other waste isolation schemes, and very little money, comparatively, has been allocated to this program. Our chief concern is that the concept will not be allowed to stand, or fail, on its technical merits, or discrepancies, because of the tremendous inertia built into other waste disposal projects and because of the standard bureaucratic paradigm: nothing erodes the public's confidence in a waste disposal project faster than the study of viable alternatives.

We continue to stress that ours is not an alternative; rather it is one other geologic isolation concept that may or may not be the *n*th repository after a continental rock has been chosen as a first repository. We agree that a land-based option should be pursued to completion, and we do feel that there will be a need for more than one repository.

We view the issue of waste isolation in a regionally strategic perspective. We would like to see that this concept gets fair and open peer-reviewed critique. We also believe that other concepts should be similarly judged. Public confidence in the decision-making process cannot be achieved without such intercomparisons.

CHARLES D. HOLLISTER
Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution,
Woods Hole, Massachusetts 02543

Erratum: In the report "Abnormal glutamate metabolism in an adult-onset degenerative neurological disorder" by Andreas Plaitakis *et al.* (9 Apr., p. 193), the identification number of the grant from the National Institutes of Health Division of Research Resources [(15), p. 196] is misprinted. It should read RR-71.

The world's leading scientists get *Nature* every week and so should you...

Scientists who are leaders in their field and who get to reap the rewards of their achievements are among *Nature's* most eager readers.

And they are renewing their subscriptions to *Nature* in record numbers.

If, like them, you keep searching for ways to speed up your research, or if you're looking for advancement where you work, or are thinking of moving on to something more stimulating, how can you afford to be without your own personal subscription to *Nature*?

It's the most certain and consistent way to get the research results, news, opinion, and analysis you need, while they're still fresh and can be applied most usefully to your own work.

With your own *Nature*, you'll be well ahead of the monthly journals whose reports often lag a year or more behind ours. And there isn't a science weekly anywhere that covers research developments in as many parts of the world, as fully and authoritatively, as *Nature* does.

The good news is that we've cut *Nature's* personal subscription rate in half and, to top it off, if you subscribe for a full year, we'll send you, free, a copy of *Nature's* new, annual *Directory of Biologicals*. Planned for fall 1982, the *Directory* will be the first truly worldwide buyers' guide to biological products. It will be available only to yearly subscribers (or, for \$45, to buyers of the hardcover version, in bookstores).

A personal subscription to *Nature* has never been more attractive. We urge you to clip and mail the coupon today. For credit-card orders only, call toll-free now, 24 hrs/day, any day: (800) 624-7888 Ask for Operator 130. In California: (800) 852-7777. Ask for operator 130.

**Now: *Nature*
at 1/2 price – plus a
bonus book, free**



SC-12 To: *Nature* 15 East 26th Street,
New York, N.Y. 10010

- ☐ Please send me a year of *Nature* at 1/2 price, \$99.25, plus my free *Directory of Biologicals* (mailed in December 1982).
- ☐ I enclose my personal check.
- ☐ Please bill my credit card account.

Account No. _____

☐ Visa ☐ Master ☐ Amer. Ex. ☐ Exp. Date _____

Signature _____

Name _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Orders must include personal check or credit card data. Offer good in the U.S. and Canada and is subject to change without notice. Please send personal check for \$45.50 or credit card data to: *Nature*, 41 The Essex St., London WC2R 3LF.