

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION
FOR THE
ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Board of Directors

PAUL E. KLOPSTEG, *President*
CHAUNCEY D. LEAKE, *President Elect*
WALLACE R. BRODE, *Retiring President*
H. BENTLEY GLASS
GEORGE R. HARRISON
MARGARET MEAD
THOMAS PARK
DON K. PRICE
MINA REES
WILLIAM W. RUBEY
ALAN T. WATERMAN
PAUL A. SCHERER, *Treasurer*
DAEL WOLFLE, *Executive Officer*

DAEL WOLFLE, *Executive Officer*
GRAHAM DUSHANE, *Editor*
JOSEPH TURNER, *Assistant Editor*
ROBERT V. ORMES, *Assistant Editor*

Editorial Board

DONALD J. HUGHES H. BURR STEINBACH
KONRAD B. KRAUSKOPF WILLIAM L. STRAUS, JR.
EDWIN M. LERNER EDWARD L. TATUM

Editorial Staff

SARAH S. DEES, LUCILLE GUINARD, NANCY S. HAMILTON, WILLIAM HASKELL, OLIVER W. HEATWOLE, YUKIE KOZAI, JUDITH B. LEVIN, ELLEN E. MURPHY, BETHSABE PEDERSEN, MADELINE SCHNEIDER, NANCY L. TEIMOURIAN, MARIA A. WOLSAK.

EARL J. SCHERAGO, *Advertising Representative*

SCIENCE, which is now combined with THE SCIENTIFIC MONTHLY, is published each Friday by the American Association for the Advancement of Science at Business Press, Lancaster, Pa. The joint journal is published in the SCIENCE format. Entered at the Lancaster, Pa., Post Office as second class matter under the Act of 3 March 1879. SCIENCE is indexed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodical Literature*.

Editorial and personnel-placement correspondence should be addressed to SCIENCE, 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington 5, D.C. Manuscripts should be typed with double spacing and submitted in duplicate. The AAAS assumes no responsibility for the safety of manuscripts or for the opinions expressed by contributors. For detailed suggestions on the preparation of manuscripts, book reviews, and illustrations, see *Science* 125, 16 (4 Jan. 1957).

Display-advertising correspondence should be addressed to SCIENCE, Room 740, 11 West 42 St., New York 36, N.Y.

Change of address notification should be sent to 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington 5, D.C. 4 weeks in advance. If possible, furnish an address stencil label from a recent issue. Be sure to give both old and new addresses, including zone numbers, if any.

Annual subscriptions: \$8.50; foreign postage, \$1.50; Canadian postage, 75¢. Single copies, 35¢. Cable address: Advancesci, Washington.



Unidentified Seismic Events

Last summer a group of experts from East and West assembled at Geneva to determine what would have to be done to set up a system for detecting explosions of nuclear weapons. Two kinds of explosions offered special difficulties: those set off underground and those set off in space. For the detection of underground detonations, to which we shall confine our attention, the question to be answered is: are there detectable differences between artificial and naturally occurring earthquakes?

As it now turns out (see p. 259), the data available last summer—obtained from a single nuclear explosion and several TNT explosions—have proved to be inadequate. Ordinary earthquakes send out compression waves in some directions and waves of rarefaction in others. Consequently, some seismographs will pick up, as the first detectable motion, waves of one or the other types. An earthquake initiated by an underground explosion, on the other hand, sends out, as the first motion, compression waves only. All seismographs within range pick up the first motion as a compression wave. It is this characteristic difference that permits the identification of a shock as of artificial origin.

The results of the three test explosions carried out in late October, 1958, showed that the earlier tests had led to an overestimation of the energy of the waves generated by explosions. Hence, at more distant stations the possibility that the first identifying compression wave will be swamped by background tremors ("noise") is greater than was thought last summer. Thus the number of unidentified seismic events that might or might not be of human causation is severalfold more than had been estimated.

These new estimates do not mean that a control system is out of the question, but only that the system proposed last summer—a network of 180 seismic stations and a system of on-site inspection of suspicious events—may need modification. One important first step would be to augment the data. Perhaps the best way to do this would be, as Senator Pastore has recently suggested, to carry out additional tests under international sponsorship, a procedure which would give the participating nations confidence in the results.

Such an undertaking would not exhaust the possibilities. The seismic stations could be more closely spaced; inspections could be made of a larger number of unidentified seismic events; better instruments could be developed.

After the scientific questions are answered, the political questions will remain. When the probability of detection can be more closely estimated, the political negotiators will still have to decide whether that probability is sufficiently high to deter a potential violator. Absolute assurance that all explosions of small devices can be detected cannot, at least at present, be given. What can be given is an estimate that a certain percentage of all shots will be detected by a system of defined characteristics. Where that percentage may be safely set is a political decision of great difficulty and great importance. But it is a decision that can be reached if both sides sincerely want to reach it.—G.DuS.