different assumption that paved the way to quantum physics. But is there a fundamental relationship between Kleiber's and Planck's law? No. Kleiber's law is a pattern, not an explanatory model like Planck's law. Further, both apply to different domains, and although Planck's law accounts for unequal distribution of energy among different wavelengths, it follows from Kleiber's law that the total amount of energy used by populations of species of different body sizes, or power density, is about the same (i.e., $N \times P \propto M^0$), an empirical pattern dubbed the energy equivalence rule (*7*, *8*). Thus, contrary to hot objects for which power density is concentrated at intermediate wavelengths, for assemblages of living entities, the pattern to be explained is that of equipartition of energy, a widespread ecological regularity for which there is no satisfactory explanation as yet.

PABLO A. MARQUET[1] AND MARÍA C. DEPASSIER[2]
[1]Center for Advanced Studies in Ecology and Biodiversity and Department of Ecology, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 114-D, Santiago, Chile. E-mail: pmarquet@genes.bio.puc.cl. [2]Facultad de Física, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Casilla 306, Santiago 22, Chile. E-mail: mcdepass@fis.puc.cl

References
1. M. Kleiber, *Hilgardia* **6**, 315 (1932) (see www.anaesthetist.com/physiol/basics/scaling/Kleiber.htm).
2. G. B. West, W. H. Woodruff, J. H. Brown, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **99**, 2473 (2002).
3. J. Whitfield, *Nature* **413**, 342 (2001).
4. E. R. Weibel, *Nature* **417**, 131 (2002).
5. J. Damuth, *Nature* **290**, 699 (1981).
6. B. J. Enquist, J. H. Brown, G. B. West, *Nature* **395**, 163 (1998).
7. J. Damuth, *Biol. J. Linn. Soc.* **31**, 193 (1987).
8. S. Nee, A. F. Read, J. J. D. Greenwood, P. H. Harvey, *Nature* **351**, 312 (1991).

Division of Planetary Science Statements

THE SCIENCE SCOPE ITEM "PLUTO OR BUST?" (26 July, p. 495) requires some clarification. The item implies that contradictory statements regarding a NASA mission to Pluto were made by the American Astronomical Society (AAS). In fact, these statements were issued by the Division of Planetary Science (DPS) of the AAS. Divisions of the AAS are able to make statements of their own as long as the statements are clearly identified as coming from the Division, not the Society as a whole.

The press releases announcing both statements of the DPS clearly indicate that they were made by the Division. This information was not mentioned in the Science Scope item.

The two DPS statements are in fact complementary. The first statement broadly endorses the newly released National Academy Decadal Survey of Planetary Science, which places the Kuiper Belt–Pluto mission as the highest priority medium cost mission for the coming decade. The second, more detailed statement endorses the Kuiper Belt–Pluto mission and urges Congress to act this year to augment the mission budget to achieve a launch in 2006. Launch in 2006 is necessary if gravity assistance is to be used to reach Pluto.

CATHERINE A. PILACHOWSKI*
American Astronomical Society, 2000 Florida Avenue, NW, Suite 400, Washington, DC 20009, USA.
*President, AAS.

Letters to the Editor

Letters (~300 words) discuss material published in *Science* in the previous 6 months or issues of general interest. They can be submitted by e-mail (science_letters@aaas.org), the Web (www.letter2science.org), or regular mail (1200 New York Ave., NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA). Letters are not acknowledged upon receipt, nor are authors generally consulted before publication. Whether published in full or in part, letters are subject to editing for clarity and space.