

## Skepticism Fades Over Pre-Clovis Man

When did humans first enter the Americas, before 12,000 years ago or after? "It's an old debate," says David Meltzer of Southern Methodist University, "but I think we've just witnessed a significant change."

Meltzer, who has had the reputation among paleontologists as nonaligned in this "old" debate, is excited by new information from a Chilean dig. "Tom Dillehay's evidence on Monte Verde really looks impressive now," he says, adding that if substantiated, Monte Verde would be the first generally accepted evidence of human occupation in the Americas older than the magic 12,000-year figure.

Since 1976 Dillehay, an archeologist at the University of Kentucky, has been going around trying to persuade skeptical colleagues of the reality of his apparently remarkable finding: a human encampment which no less than 17 separate radiocarbon datings, done on various types of material, including bone, wood, and charcoal, all say are around 13,000 years old. The site "yielded not only stone tools and the bones of extinct animals but also well-preserved wooden artifacts, dwelling foundations of both earth and wood, and the remains of useful plants," reported Dillehay. "We even unearthed a human footprint and a hunk of mastodon flesh."

Until last month most leading archeologists continued to place Dillehay's Monte Verde under the heading of "questionable." Dillehay turned this around by what is reported to have been a remarkable presentation at a meeting organized by the University of Maine's Center for the Study of the First Americans. "What convinced me was seeing all the evidence together," says Meltzer. "Previously we'd only seen bits and pieces of the evidence."

So far Dillehay has published very little of the mass of evidence he's accumulated from the creek-side excavation. "There hasn't been much publicly available evidence to go on," says Meltzer. "Just looking at the bits and pieces, there was good reason to continue to be skeptical. But Tom's Maine presentation changed that."

Even Vance Haynes was enthusiastic. Said the severest critic of all pre-12,000-year claims: "I was impressed. Each time his evidence has been getting better and better." The University of Arizona archeologist added: "There is no other archeological site of this type with this quality of material. It is almost too good to be true." Most sites are just the bare bones—literally—of the past. Not Monte Verde.

Situated on the swampy bank of a small creek, Monte Verde's most arresting feature is a series of rectangular arrangements of logs that Dillehay quickly concluded formed the foundations of dwellings. Just a couple of years ago Canadian archeologist Richard Morlan suggested that perhaps the pattern of logs was the result of natural tree fall. "I am not yet convinced that this is an archeological site, but I expect to be proved wrong on this one," he speculated at the time. He has. "I've got egg on my face now," concedes Morlan, who works at the National Museum of Man, Ottawa. "Dillehay showed us that the logs were secured with wooden pegs from a different species of tree," he explains. "And there is even evidence of reeds tied around the logs. That's convincing to me."

Not to Tom Lynch, though. Addressing Dillehay's radiocarbon results, he told *Science*: "There's no question that the dates themselves are good. My problem is with what has been dated. Maybe it is old material mixed with younger artifacts." The Cornell archeologist remains virtually the last hold-out against Monte Verde as a good pre-Clovis site.

Haynes proposes that perhaps the way to nail the issue for good would be to have a team of outsiders visit the site to evaluate it. "The skeptics would then have an opportunity to prove their point, or not," says Haynes. So far Dillehay has not been enthusiastic about this unorthodox idea.

■ ROGER LEWIN

## Invisible Evidence?

Monte Verde undoubtedly was the acclaimed star of the recent Maine meeting, but, not surprisingly, there were many other candidates jostling for equal recognition. "These other claims weren't impressive," says Meltzer. "People who weren't convinced before the Maine meeting remained unconvinced."

The heretofore magic figure of 12,000 years ago hangs on the explosion of archeological evidence of Clovis and Folsom people shortly after that date. There is general agreement that people entered the Americas from Siberia across the Bering land bridge, made crossable during periods of severe glaciation.

If Monte Verde is substantiated, then clearly some migrations occurred before Clovis and Folsom times. But, says Morlan, "where are the pre-Clovis sites in North America?" The main contender here is James Adavasio's site of Meadowcroft, near Pittsburgh, said to be some 19,000 old. "Meadowcroft is the one good candidate," says Morlan.

The problem, according to Morlan: either pre-Clovis migration was minimal, or perhaps unfavorable geological conditions failed to preserve sites, thus making a greater presence archeologically invisible. Another explanation, says Meltzer, is that he and his colleagues may simply be blind to a different kind of archeological evidence from pre-Clovis times. However, he guesses it's absent, not invisible.

■ R.L.

## New Type of Receptor Found

Maintenance of normal blood pressure depends on many things, one of which is the blood pressure-lowering agent called atrial natriuretic peptide. The cellular receptor through which the peptide exerts its effects would have been of interest then, even if that receptor had been "ordinary."

But it is definitely not ordinary. "It's really interesting," says Marc Caron of Duke University School of Medicine, who has been studying receptors for some 15 years. "It's different. It belongs to a new receptor class."

The intriguing discovery arose from a series of experiments culminating in the cloning of the receptor gene by David Lowe, Ming-Shi Chang, and David Goeddel of Genentech, Inc., in South San Francisco, who did the work in collaboration with receptor specialists Sujay Singh and David Garbers of the Howard Hughes

Medical Institute at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine in Nashville. The researchers got help in their quest from a surprising source—the sperm of the sea urchin *Arbacia punctulata*.

Biochemical evidence from several laboratories had indicated that the receptor for atrial natriuretic peptide works by stimulating the production of cyclic GMP, a "second messenger" that tells cells that a signal has been received and that they must take appropriate action. This work had also suggested that the guanylate cyclase, the enzyme that makes the cyclic GMP when the receptor is activated, is either part of the receptor protein or very tightly bound to it.

Meanwhile, the Garbers group had found that a guanylate cyclase in the membrane of the sea urchin sperm is the receptor for a chemical that the sea urchin eggs release to