

Ice Age Art Analysis

In his Research News article "Ice Age art idea toppled" (17 Mar., p. 1435), Roger Lewin states that I am "an independent scholar in New York," when in fact I am a full-time Associate in Paleolithic Archaeology at the Peabody Museum, Harvard University, and have been a corporation appointee and associated faculty member on staff for more than two decades.

Lewin states that I have claimed that sets of marks made in the Upper Paleolithic represent, for instance, "a lunar calendar or a kill tally." Hunting tallies may have existed; but I have not found them, nor have I claimed them.

Lewin cites Randall White to the effect that the wear and breakage that occurs to a point during use changes an engraved cross section, with the presumption that changes in tools cannot therefore be determined from cross-sectional differences and cannot be used to determine notational accumulations. In my response to Francesco d'Errico (1), I indicate that it is precisely this process that helps verify the notational hypothesis. The light engraving of notational sets of tiny unit marks does not show evidence of a change in the cross section of the marks, particularly in the last stroke of a set. The next set, however, begins and continues with dramatically different cross sections. Such data represent a small portion of the complex evidence used in notational analysis.

I also state in my reply (1) to d'Errico that more than a dozen years ago I examined by microscope precisely the same Azilian pebbles he has examined. I determined at that time that they were not notational and the markings on them did not correspond in any way to the notations of the Upper Paleolithic.

Lewin quotes White as stating that fresh bone is easy to incise but old bone and ivory are difficult. On the contrary, tests with 1-year-old bone and with Aurignacian ivory and bone at least 25,000 years old have shown that the engraving of a set of short and light, tiny notational marks, often to the scale of the marking on a centimeter rule, is not difficult and seldom causes change to a point. Tests conducted in England more than a dozen years ago (2) determined that bone from freshly killed animals is difficult to incise because of the fat in fresh bone but that slightly cooked or weathered bone, such as would be found in a homesite scrap heap, is easy to incise.

Notational analysis is one of the most

complex and specialized inquiries in the study of Upper Paleolithic image and symbol. A single microscopic study (and of pebbles rather than of the bone normally used for notation) or the presentation of isolated examples of noncontextual data and alternative hypotheses cannot methodologically or theoretically prove or disprove the presence of notation, or "topple" any hypothesis whatsoever.

ALEXANDER MARSHACK
Peabody Museum, Harvard University,
Cambridge, MA 02138

REFERENCES

1. A. Marshack, *Curr. Anthropol.*, in press.
2. C. J. Hawkes and E. Powers, *Proc. Univ. Br. Speleol. Soc.* 12, 137 (1970).

Agricultural Research Initiative

Mark Crawford (News & Comment, 14 Apr., p. 140) highlights the important National Initiative for Agricultural Research developed by the Board of Agriculture of the National Research Council (NRC) under the leadership of Ted Hullar. However, the article does not describe the present precarious state of the current Competitive Research Grant Program (CRGO) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture. In its twelfth year, CRGO has been underfunded since its inception. For instance, in fiscal year 1985, Congress appropriated \$46 million for CRGO, but by FY 1989 this had dropped to \$39.7 million. In its plant science program, \$15.5 million was appropriated in FY 1985, but by 1989 this had dropped to \$8 million, from which \$1 million was earmarked for research proposals dealing with soybeans and alcohol fuels. The human nutrition program has fared even worse: in 1978, \$5 million was appropriated for this program, and in recent years this has been reduced to approximately \$3 million. In FY 1989, funding for this program was further reduced to \$1 million, making it essentially nonviable. The biotechnology program, brought into CRGO in 1985 with much fanfare at a level of \$20 million, is funded in FY 1989 at a \$19.06-million level. When one considers the administrative and small business research innovation taxes of 5.25% deducted from the total appropriation and the various indirect costs each organization imposes on each successful grant, investigators are in actual fact left with only minimal funds to carry out their research. Moreover, of the less than 20% of the submitted proposals that are successfully awarded grants, all are underfunded for an average length of 2.2 years. The average per year award size is \$48,000 for CRGO, as

compared with \$70,000 for the National Science Foundation and \$164,000 for the National Institutes of Health.

The Office of Management and Budget (OMB) has recommended to Congress for FY 1990 a budget for CRGO of \$63.54 million with a restoration of funds in the different categories to the level of a few years ago. This proposed budget would go a long way toward improving the funding capability of the CRGO program. However, because of the severe budget stringencies facing the Bush Administration for FY 1990, one cannot be very optimistic about the prospects for CRGO's budget.

For these reasons, the Board of Agriculture-NRC Initiative is a critical step in the right direction, and all scientists interested in basic agriculture research should follow it as it begins its tortuous path through the bureaucratic maze in Washington.


PAUL K. STUMPF
Department of Biochemistry and Biophysics,
University of California, Davis, CA 95616

Retraction

I wish to report that our finding (1) of epitaxial growth of mass-selected C⁺ ion-beam-deposited diamond films on single crystal silicon is incorrect. As we shall describe in more detail in a forthcoming paper (2), we were led astray by an extraordinary (to us) set of circumstances noted below. It should also be noted that our original data (1) agreed almost perfectly with the epitaxial diamond assignment.

The villain in our x-ray measurement was a harmonic of the main Cu-K_α wavelength off the monochromating graphite crystal. This λ/2 component is diffracted in second order at the graphite first order setting (λ/2 = 2 d₀₀₁/2 sin θ₀₀₁). Of course, one electronically discriminates against this well-known component, but in this case it was particularly troublesome in that, at a very low residual intensity, it could nonetheless be diffracted by the (333) and (660) planes of silicon to angles that are 0.6° and 1.2°, respectively, from the expected diamond reflections. The λ/2 peaks will also be broad reflections, as they have no sharp (K_α) spectral structures. Finally, the λ/2 contaminants can accidentally come *not* at λ(K_α)/2, as predicted, but rather at a slightly longer wavelength due to peculiarities of alignment and mosaic distribution of the graphite monochromator.

We have verified this unhappy constellation of effects and have proved that all of our diamond reflections in (1) are, in fact, λ/2 contaminants insufficiently removed and



WILL AMERICANS BE SCIENTIFICALLY LITERATE BEFORE COMET HALLEY RETURNS IN 2061?

Project 2061—a long-term effort launched by the AAAS—is designed to help make the answer “Yes—long before!”

The first phase of this massive nationwide effort to reform U.S. science education has produced six reports that recommend in detail what all citizens should know about science, mathematics, and technology.

They consist of an integrated report, *Science for All Americans* (AAAS order no. 89-01S), by the National Council on Science and Technology Education, and reports by five independent panels: *Biological and Health Sciences* (#89-02S), *Mathematics* (#89-03S), *Physical and Information Sciences and Engineering* (#89-04S), *Social and Behavioral Sciences* (#89-05S), and *Technology* (#89-06S).

Send orders giving titles and AAAS order numbers—and a check, money order, or purchase order (made out to AAAS)—to AAAS Books, Dept. 2061, P.O. Box 753, Waldorf, MD 20604.

Prices: *Science for All Americans*: \$14.50 (AAAS members, \$11.50), 10–49 copies \$9.25 each, 50 or more \$8 each; each panel report: \$7.50 (AAAS members, \$6), 10–49 copies \$3.50 each, 50 or more \$3 each; all six reports (order no. 89-12X): \$35 (AAAS members, \$28), 10–49 sets \$18, 50 or more \$15.50. (For shipments to California, add 6% sales tax.)



PROJECT 2061

American Association for the Advancement of Science

fortuitously shifted to almost exactly the expected diamond diffraction angles.

Our present result—namely the absence of any (appreciably) crystalline diamond diffraction features—has also been verified in a preliminary synchrotron study of ours at the National Synchrotron Light Source at Brookhaven. It thus remains for us to determine the detailed structure of these interesting films whose short-range bonding is clearly sp^3 and whose Raman spectrum shows evidence mainly of a broad peak at $\sim 1550 \text{ cm}^{-1}$ (3).

S. C. MOSS

Department of Physics, University of Houston,
Houston, TX 77204-5504

REFERENCES AND NOTES

1. J. L. Robertson *et al.*, *Science* **243**, 1047 (1989).
2. J. L. Robertson *et al.*, in *Proceedings, MRS Symposium on "Optical Materials: Processing and Science,"* C. Ortiz and D. B. Paker, Eds. (Materials Research Society, Pittsburgh, PA, in press).
3. F. Adar, Y. Lifshitz, J. W. Rabalais, unpublished data.
4. Thank M. Geis for suggesting to us that some of our results could be observed on pure silicon.

Space Facility

We are reluctant to allow Eliot Marshall's 21 April article "National Academy panel rejects the case for a mini-space station" (News & Comment, p. 282) to stand as a record of what the study committee said.

First, the Commercially Developed Space Facility (CDSF) has rarely been considered a "mini-space station." In the recent National Research Council (NRC) White Paper on Space Policy, the National Academies go on record as believing "a station is essential to establish the feasibility of human exploration beyond the Earth's orbit." Clearly, a man-tended CDSF would not meet this criterion. It is misleading to continuously refer to the CDSF as a mini-station; certainly none of its supporters made that claim before the study committee.

The Academy report is faulted several times for "not examining the big station with the same rigor" with which it examined the CDSF. Indeed, the Academies were charged by the Office of Management and Budget and the National Security Council with an examination of the space station program in the summer of 1987, and a report was issued later that year. The present committee's charge was to assess the need for a CDSF *prior* to the station!

While the article observes the CDSF had support from "budget cutters in Congress," a quick reading of the introduction of the report would have revealed that the study originated at the request of both houses of

Congress, rather than NASA, in an effort to secure an objective assessment of whether anticipated national needs for microgravity processing would exceed likely facilities in the period preceding the station.

The article states that NASA converted CDSF high-level endorsements to "a standard procurement request." The procurement process that NASA undertook last spring was far from standard, for example, no preliminary early phase studies were conducted or sought. Other erroneous details include reference to a private Spacelab (which should have read Spacehab), and two references to 11 March as the release date for the report (which should have read 10 April).

ROBERT H. KORKEGI

Aeronautics and Space Engineering Board
Commission on Engineering and
Technical Systems,
National Research Council,
Washington, DC 20418

Response: Former Senator William Proxmire (D-WI), who backed CDSF when he was chairman of the appropriations subcommittee for space, certainly saw it as a "mini" alternative to NASA's space station, which he called the "space palace." However, unlike the big station, CDSF would not permit astronauts to stay aboard indefinitely, but only for 3-week visits. Advocates said that CDSF could be used as a developmental outpost until the \$16-billion big station arrived, especially if the big station were delayed beyond the 1996 due date. The Academy report assumes that the big station will be in place by 1998 and finds no useful role for CDSF before then.

—ELIOT MARSHALL

Erratum: On page 1556 of Robert Pool's Research News article "New equipment roundup dazzles scientists" (24 Mar., p. 1554), the photographs of the automated purification system and the low-level light detector were inadvertently interchanged.

Erratum: In the Research Article "Hydrogen tunneling in enzyme reactions" by Y. Cha *et al.* (10 Mar., p. 1325), the first equation in reference 28 on page 1329 was incorrectly printed. It should have read

$$k_t/k_T = \ln\{1 - f\} \left[\frac{({}^3\text{H}/{}^{14}\text{C})_f}{({}^3\text{H}/{}^{14}\text{C})_r} \right] \quad (L = \text{H,D})$$

Erratum: In the caption of figure 2 on page 59 of the Research Article "Purification and characterization of mouse hematopoietic stem cells" by G. J. Spangrude *et al.* (1 July 1988, p. 58), the last sentence should have begun, "By linear regression analysis, one splenic colony was formed per ten hematopoietic stem cells transferred [frequency = 0.095 ± 0.08 (SD)]." . . . In the same article, the fourth sentence of the last paragraph on page 60 should have read, "In contrast, transfer of as many as 900 Thy-1^{lo} Lin⁻ Sca-1⁻ cells did not save the mice."

Erratum: In William Booth's short article on women in science, "Oh, I thought you were a man" (News & Comment, 27 Jan., p. 475), Sallie Watkins' affiliation was incorrectly given as the University of Southern California. Her correct affiliation is the University of Southern Colorado.

Science

Retraction

S. C. MOSS

Science **244** (4908), 1029-1030.
DOI: 10.1126/science.244.4908.1029-b

ARTICLE TOOLS

<http://science.sciencemag.org/content/244/4908/1029.3.citation>

PERMISSIONS

<http://www.sciencemag.org/help/reprints-and-permissions>

Use of this article is subject to the [Terms of Service](#)

Science (print ISSN 0036-8075; online ISSN 1095-9203) is published by the American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1200 New York Avenue NW, Washington, DC 20005. 2017 © The Authors, some rights reserved; exclusive licensee American Association for the Advancement of Science. No claim to original U.S. Government Works. The title *Science* is a registered trademark of AAAS.