

LETTERS

SETI Program

In his letter objecting to an observational Search for Extraterrestrial Intelligence (SETI) program, Frank J. Tipler (14 Jan., p. 110) creates (and demolishes) a "strawman" that represents neither the statements contained in "Extraterrestrial intelligence: An international petition" (Letters, 29 Oct., p. 426) nor the realities of the proposed NASA SETI microwave observing program. Since I signed the petition and have helped to define the observing program, I would like to set the record straight.

The petition authored by Carl Sagan stated: "Using current radioastronomical technology, it is possible for us to receive signals from civilizations no more advanced than we are over a distance of at least many thousands of light years." This is merely saying there is a pragmatic limitation on the minimum detectable signal flux that we believe it is possible to search for in a systematic way, in the near future, with existing radio telescopes and SETI-specific back-end hardware. In particular, the minimum detectable flux for narrow-band signals originating in the direction of the nearest 773 solar-type stars will be somewhere between 1 and 20×10^{-27} watts per square meter, depending upon the telescope, the integration time, and the frequency and site-dependent interference actually encountered. At a distance of 1000 light years, this requires a transmitter with an equivalent isotropic radiated power of 1 to 20×10^{12} watts. Since the most powerful terrestrial transmitter is the planetary radar at the Arecibo Observatory, rated at 10^{13} watts, the petition correctly concludes that no major extrapolation of our own technology is required to permit a successful detection.

Success is not guaranteed in SETI. Indeed, the signers of the petition state that "We represent a wide variety of opinion on the abundance of extraterrestrials, [and] on the ease of establishing contact. . . . [b]ut we are unanimous in our conviction that the only significant test of the existence of extraterrestrial intelligence is an experimental one." This is precisely the approach that makes SETI a valid scientific discipline. The signers of the petition support the initiation of a systematic radio search because "[t]he results—whether positive or negative—would have profound implications for our view of our universe and ourselves." But Tipler says that a negative result will never be convincing to

SETI supporters. Nonsense! A systematic radio search would produce compelling positive or negative results. The number and scope of hypotheses that will have to be discarded because they contradict the experimental results will depend on the scale of the observational program actually conducted. This is perfectly proper science, and no one should be surprised that profound and sweeping conclusions require significant experimental efforts. Hypotheses that can be discarded will be discarded at every stage in the process. SETI is now, and has been for decades, a scientific endeavor.

JILL C. TARTER

*Space Sciences Laboratory,
University of California,
Berkeley 94720*

Natural Gas Resources

The letter of Craig Bond Hatfield (7 Jan., p. 10) certainly would not lead the reader to suspect that there is presently a real "glut" of natural gas in the United States. His statement that there has been a large decrease in the nation's proved reserves of natural gas during the past 10 years is misleading. During the first part of this time interval, no gas at all would have been discovered had it not been that it is difficult to bring in much oil without finding gas along with the oil. This resulted from the price of some 40 to 50 cents per 1000 cubic feet imposed by a federal regulatory agency. When this agency proposed to raise the price to \$1.40 (still about one-fourth the price of the same number of Btu's from petroleum), consumer groups went to court to try and block the increase. After passage of the Natural Gas Act of 1978, which made it profitable to drill for gas, there was an immediate surge of "new" gas brought in, so there are literally thousands of wells that are capped for lack of a market. Other wells are producing intermittently, as the pipeline companies seek to juggle their "take or pay" commitments. During 1981, some of the gas from deep wells (below 15,000 feet) was contracted at prices as high as \$9 per 1000 cubic feet, since it was unregulated. The "glut" has now reduced such prices dramatically.

In summary, there is now more natural gas than the market can consume, and the evidence is convincing that this supply of gas will continue to increase for many years. Furthermore, there is little doubt that the partial deregulation of the gas price by the 1978 act and the full

deregulation of oil prices in this country are responsible for our present welcome abundance of both these critical commodities. In addition, "geopressed methane" is present under lands in the United States in quantities sufficient to meet our needs for natural gas for some 150 years. Although new technology will be required, this nation should have little difficulty bringing this vast resource to market.

JAMES CASON

*Department of Chemistry, University of
California, Berkeley 94720*

Math Archive

As one who has profitably explored the Humanities Research Center (HRC) of the University of Texas at Austin, I was surprised by the unsympathetic tone of your News and Comment article "Math archive in disarray" (25 Feb., p. 940). My research in modern literature has required travel to the HRC in Austin and follow-up correspondence.

The curators and staff impressed me with efficiency, friendliness, and profound scholarship. The HRC has made Austin a crossroads for serious investigators of history, literature, fine printing, theatre, film, photography, and painting. It is a miracle of organization that the HRC comprises a mountain of historical treasures and not a bottomless pit.

After phoning HRC director Decherd Turner, *Science* reporter Gina Kolata portrayed his position unfairly. When he said that the math archives are "a peripheral item," I am sure Turner meant peripheral to the *humanities*, the focus and weighty charge of the HRC. Mathematicians may be miffed at Turner, but he is busy at a Gargantuan banquet of the arts and may not want to bite off more than he and his staff can chew (that is, mathematics). The verbatim inclusion of the terms "honey" and "dear" from a telephone interview, which might suggest flippancy, condescension, or sexism to readers unfamiliar with Turner's amicable Southern diction, is also unfair to this gentleman and scholar.

Mathematicians and historians of science would be superbly served were a national archive of mathematics endowed with a facility as accommodating as the HRC at Austin. I hope the eventual math archive will be blessed with a curator as dedicated to science as Decherd Turner is to art.

JOHN KIDD

*Literature Board, University of
California, Santa Cruz 95064*

**Buy
four,
get one
more.**




**Save two ways when
you switch to Brockway
culture tubes.**

Make your next order Brockway culture tubes and save twice.

Based on manufacturers' retail prices, our high quality, flint-glass culture tubes are already 20% less than borosilicates. And now through June 30, 1983, we can save you an additional 20% on the three most popular sizes: 10x75mm, 12x75mm, and 13x100mm. For every four cases you buy, the fifth one is free.

From tissue culturing to chemical determination, Brockway culture tubes give quality performance. In fact, millions of our tubes are used every year in American Monitor's KDA[®] Automatic Analyzers with excellent results. Unconditionally guaranteed because they work.

To try this intelligent, money-saving alternative to borosilicates, contact your laboratory equipment supplier or Brockway for the name of a distributor in your area.



**Free
Catalog**

For your copy of our catalog, contact Brockway, Tubular Products Division, Parkersburg, WV 26101; (304) 295-9311.

Brockway
Tubular Products Division

Quality labware at competitive prices.

Circle No. 63 on Readers' Service Card

Kudos to Gina Kolata for leaving the "honey" and the "dear" in her quotes from Decherd Turner of the University of Texas. Seeing just how those terms look in print is a more effective consciousness-raising device than a full article on sexism would have been.

PAUL G. CHAPIN

*Linguistics Program,
National Science Foundation,
Washington, D.C. 20550*

Mormon Church Policy

In discussing the appointment of David Gardner to the position of president of the University of California (News and Comment, 18 Mar., p. 1301), R. Jeffrey Smith mentions that the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints (Mormons) bars blacks from the priesthood; this is no longer the case.

ROGER G. CHAPMAN

*4535 Twilight Drive,
Kearns, Utah 84118*

Evolution Debate

I agree with Richard E. Grant (Letters, 11 Mar., p. 1170) that ancestor-descendant relationships cannot be objectively recognized in the fossil record (1). I suggest, however, that the debate over phyletic gradualism versus punctuated equilibrium be viewed as a debate over the distribution of rates of evolution; that is, over the tempo of evolution, not the mode of evolution as Grant suggests. Viewed in this light, there are at least three separate and distinct questions to be investigated: (i) whether the punctuational tempo is prevalent in the fossil record, as Gould and Eldredge suggest (2); (ii) whether punctuations are roughly equivalent to speciation events; and (iii) given that punctuations mark speciation events, whether speciation is the dominant mode of macroevolutionary change. Thus, the punctuational model of the tempo of evolution is distinct from, although perhaps related to, the previous models of differing modes of speciation cited by Grant ("saltation," "allopatric speciation"). Furthermore, the choice between gradualism and punctuated equilibrium need not "always . . . devolve to a matter of personal preference." Even if ancestor-descendant relationships cannot be objectively recognized, data obtained from the fossil record, such as origination and extinction rates of species, species dura-

tions, and aggregated changes in entire faunas (3) can be analyzed and may shed light on the question of the predominance of punctuationalism or gradualism. Likewise, study of the possible, and even most probable or common, mechanisms of evolution and speciation (for example, the genetics, molecular biology, and behavioral biology of extant organisms) may shed light on the question of the most common tempo of evolution.

ROBERT M. SCHOCH

*Department of Geology and Geophysics
and Peabody Museum of Natural
History, Yale University,
New Haven, Connecticut 06511*

References

1. R. M. Schoch, *Nature (London)* **299**, 490 (1982).
2. S. J. Gould and N. Eldredge, *Paleobiology* **3**, 115 (1977).
3. S. M. Stanley, *Macroevolution: Pattern and Process* (Freeman, San Francisco, 1979); S. J. Gould, *Science* **219**, 439 (1983).

Intellectually it seems to me to be quite unnecessary to point out that arguments about modes of evolution are "philosophically intractable," but the contention that they are "pseudoquestions" is a "personal preference." One of my most memorable undergraduate experiences occurred when a curator at the British Museum of Natural History stopped by the library desk where I was researching a particularly erudite issue in coelenterate phylogeny, a topic to which he had made several contributions. In my youthful naiveté, I expressed frustration that we would never know the answer. Firmly but gently he pointed out that the significance and usefulness of debate in evolutionary matters lies, not in "getting the answer," but in the continual reevaluation of old data, the questioning of old ideas and assumptions, and the incorporation of new data. I happen to disagree with the punctuation model but, in confirmation of the sage advice I received a quarter of a century ago, I have gained a great deal from considering the arguments that have been posed pro and con. One should not miss the opportunity to explore and appreciate the latest blooming in the desert of dogma.

PAUL F. A. MADERSON

*Department of Biology,
Brooklyn College of the City
University of New York,
Brooklyn, New York 11210*

Erratum: In the report "Cloud droplet deposition in subalpine balsam fir forests: Hydrological and chemical inputs" by G. M. Lovett *et al.* (24 Dec., p. 1303), two errors appeared in Table 2 on page 1304. The cloud deposition of SO₄²⁻, incorrectly reported as 275.8 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹, should have been 137.9 kg ha⁻¹ year⁻¹. The percentage of the sum contributed by clouds, reported as 81 for SO₄²⁻, should have been 68.