

# ON THE GENERA OF $X_0(N)$

JÁNOS A. CSIRIK, JOSEPH L. WETHERELL, AND MICHAEL E. ZIEVE

ABSTRACT. Let  $g_0(N)$  be the genus of the modular curve  $X_0(N)$ . We record several properties of the sequence  $\{g_0(N)\}$ . Even though the average size of  $g_0(N)$  is  $(1.25/\pi^2)N$ , a random positive integer has probability zero of being a value of  $g_0(N)$ . Also, if  $N$  is a random positive integer then  $g_0(N)$  is odd with probability one.

## 1. INTRODUCTION

For each positive integer  $N$ , the modular curve  $X_0(N)$  parametrizes elliptic curves together with a cyclic subgroup of order  $N$  (for more details, see [11] and [14]). The genus  $g_0(N)$  of  $X_0(N)$  tends to infinity as the level  $N$  increases. We will examine the sequence  $\{g_0(N)\}$  more closely. Among other things, we will show that the average size of  $g_0(N)$  is  $1.25N/\pi^2$ ; however, the values of  $g_0(N)$  form a density-zero subset of the integers. These two properties imply that there is much collapsing under the map  $N \mapsto g_0(N)$ : for instance, there are integers whose preimage under this map is arbitrarily large.

The results of this note are:

- (1) Upper and lower bounds, including the asymptotic results  
 $0 < \liminf g_0(N)/N < \limsup g_0(N)/(N \log \log N) < \infty$ .
- (2) Average behavior:  $\lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} (1/B) \sum_{N \leq B} g_0(N)/N = 1.25/\pi^2$ .
- (3) Natural density:  $\{g_0(N)\}$  is a density zero subset of the integers.
- (4) Non-uniformity of  $g_0(N)$  modulo a fixed prime  $p$ : for instance,  $g_0(N)$  is odd with probability 1, and (for a fixed odd prime  $p$ ) the probability that  $g_0(N) \equiv 1 \pmod{p}$  is much less than  $1/p$ .

This note arose from a question about curves over finite fields. Typically one estimates the number of points on such a curve by means

---

*Date:* August 26, 2000.

The first author thanks A. M. Odlyzko for explaining how to use Dirichlet series to calculate the cumulative average of  $\mu/N$  (Section 5), and also thanks H. Zhu for bringing this topic to his attention. The third author thanks A. Granville, C. Pomerance, and J. Vanderkam for helpful correspondence. The second and third authors were supported in part by NSF Mathematical Sciences Postdoctoral Research Fellowships. The authors used the computer package GP/PARI for various computations related to this note.

of the Weil (upper) bound. However, in various situations this bound can be improved, which leads to the converse question of producing curves with many points (of a given genus, over a given field) in order to see how far the Weil bound can be improved. It is known that, if the prime  $p$  does not divide  $N$ , then  $X_0(N)$  has many rational points over the finite field  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$ . Covers of these curves have been used to show that there are curves with many points (over  $\mathbb{F}_{p^2}$ ) in every genus [1]. It is natural to ask whether covers are needed to prove the latter result, or whether the genera of  $X_0(N)$  already achieve all sufficiently large integer values. The present note grew from our proof that infinitely many positive integers do not occur in the sequence  $\{g_0(N)\}$ .

The authors suspect that some of the results of this note have been discovered previously, but apparently they have not been published.<sup>1</sup>

## 2. THE GENUS OF $X_0(N)$

For a positive integer  $N$ , let  $g_0(N)$  denote the genus of  $X_0(N)$ . By [14, Prop. 1.43], we have

$$g_0(N) = 1 + \frac{\mu}{12} - \frac{\nu_2}{4} - \frac{\nu_3}{3} - \frac{\nu_\infty}{2}$$

where  $\nu_2$  and  $\nu_3$  are the numbers of solutions in  $\mathbb{Z}/N\mathbb{Z}$  of the equations  $x^2 + 1 = 0$  and  $x^2 + x + 1 = 0$ , respectively;  $\nu_\infty = \sum_d \varphi(\gcd(d, N/d))$ ; and  $\mu = N \sum_a 1/a$ . Here  $\varphi$  denotes Euler's totient function,  $d$  ranges over the positive divisors of  $N$ , and  $a$  ranges over the squarefree positive divisors of  $N$ . Likewise, let  $p$  range over the prime divisors of  $N$ , and write  $N = \prod_p p^{r_p}$ . Then  $\mu = \prod_p (p+1)p^{r_p-1}$ . Also  $\nu_2$  is 0 if  $4 \nmid N$  or if some  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$ , and otherwise  $\nu_2 = 2^s$  where  $s$  is the number of  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{4}$ ; similarly,  $\nu_3$  is 0 if  $9 \nmid N$  or if some  $p \equiv 2 \pmod{3}$ , and otherwise  $\nu_3 = 2^t$  where  $t$  is the number of  $p \equiv 1 \pmod{3}$ . Finally,  $\nu_\infty = \prod_p \theta(p, r_p)$ , where we define  $\theta(p, 2R+1) = 2p^R$  and  $\theta(p, 2R) = (p+1)p^{R-1}$ .

## 3. BOUNDS ON $g_0(N)$

We now give general upper and lower bounds on  $g_0(N)$ . For the lower bound we show that

$$g_0(N) \geq (N - 5\sqrt{N} - 8)/12,$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Indeed, we recently saw an unpublished manuscript of S. Wong which contains some of the results of this note.

with equality if and only if  $N = p^2$  where  $p$  is a prime congruent to 1 (mod 12). For the upper bound we show the asymptotic result

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{g_0(N)}{N \log \log N} = \frac{e^\gamma}{2\pi^2}$$

and the explicit bound

$$g_0(N) < N \frac{e^\gamma}{2\pi^2} (\log \log N + 2/\log \log N) \quad \text{for } N > 2,$$

where  $\gamma = 0.5772\dots$  is Euler's constant.

We start by proving the lower bound  $g_0(N) \geq (N - 5\sqrt{N} - 8)/12$ . If  $N$  is a prime power (or  $N = 1$ ), it is easy to prove this bound and to show that equality occurs precisely when  $N$  is the square of a prime congruent to 1 (mod 12). It is also easy to check the lower bound for  $N$  less than 2000, so we may assume in the sequel that  $N \geq 2000$ .

Suppose that  $N$  has exactly two distinct prime factors  $p$  and  $q$ . Then  $\mu - N > N/p + N/q > 2\sqrt{N}$ . Since  $\nu_\infty \leq \mu/\sqrt{N}$  and  $\nu_2, \nu_3 \leq 4$ , we have  $g_0(N) \geq 1 + \mu/12 - 4/4 - 4/3 - \mu/(2\sqrt{N})$ . Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} 12g_0(N) &\geq \mu(1 - 6/\sqrt{N}) - 16 \\ &> (N + 2\sqrt{N})(1 - 6/\sqrt{N}) - 16 \\ &> N - 5\sqrt{N} - 8. \end{aligned}$$

Finally, consider the case where  $N$  has at least 3 distinct prime factors. In this case we observe that  $\mu - N > 3N^{2/3}$  and  $\nu_2, \nu_3 \leq \nu_\infty$ . It follows that  $g_0(N) \geq 1 + \mu/12 - (1/4 + 1/3 + 1/2)\nu_\infty$ ; hence,

$$\begin{aligned} 12g_0(N) &\geq 12 + \mu - 13\mu/\sqrt{N} \\ &> (N - 5\sqrt{N} - 8) + (\mu - N)(1 - 13/\sqrt{N}) - 8\sqrt{N} + 20 \\ &> (N - 5\sqrt{N} - 8) + 3N^{4/6} - 39N^{1/6} - 8N^{3/6} + 20. \end{aligned}$$

The largest real root of  $3x^4 - 8x^3 - 39x + 20$  is  $3.5495\dots < 2000^{1/6}$ . The lower bound on  $g_0(N)$  follows.

We now prove the limsup result. We have already noted that  $\nu_2, \nu_3$ , and  $\nu_\infty$  are each bounded by  $\mu/\sqrt{N}$ ; thus, it suffices to show that

$$\limsup_{N \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\mu}{N \log \log N} = \frac{6}{\pi^2} e^\gamma.$$

For any  $x \geq 2$  let  $N_x = \prod_{p \leq x} p$ . Among all  $N$  with  $N_x \leq N < N_{x+1}$  (for fixed  $x$ ), the case  $N = N_x$  maximizes  $\mu/N$  and minimizes  $\log \log N$ . Thus, we need only consider values  $N = N_x$ . For these  $N$ , Mertens showed in 1874 that  $\mu/N$  is asymptotic to  $(\log x)e^\gamma 6/\pi^2$  [6, p. 429]; the limsup result follows, since  $\log \log N_x$  is asymptotic to  $\log x$  [6, p. 341].

The upper bound on  $g_0(N)$  is easily verified for  $N < 210$ , so we now assume  $N \geq 210$ . Note that  $g_0(N) \leq \mu/12$ , so our upper bound follows from the inequality  $\mu/N < (\log \log N + 2/\log \log N)e^\gamma/(2\pi^2)$ . As above, it suffices to prove this inequality when  $N = N_x$  (since  $N \geq 210 = N_7$ ). But in this case the inequality follows easily from results in [12].

#### 4. DATA FOR SMALL $N$

We now determine the first few positive integers  $n$  which do not occur as  $g_0(N)$  for any  $N$ . The lower bound of the previous section implies that, if  $n = g_0(N)$ , then  $N < 12n + 18\sqrt{n} + 40$ . So, to determine whether  $n$  occurs as  $g_0(N)$ , we just check all levels  $N$  up to this bound. Doing this by computer, we find the first few missed values (i.e., positive integers  $n$  not of the form  $g_0(N)$ ): 150, 180, 210, 286, 304, 312, ... Note that all of these are even; in fact, the first several thousand missed values are even. It is easy to describe all positive integers  $N$  for which  $g_0(N)$  is even. They are given in the following list, where  $p$  denotes a prime and  $r$  denotes a positive integer:

- (1)  $N = 1, 2, 3, 4, 8$  or  $16$ ;
- (2)  $N = p^r$  where  $p \equiv 5 \pmod{8}$ ;
- (3)  $N = p^r$  where  $p \equiv 7 \pmod{8}$  and  $r$  odd;
- (4)  $N = p^r$  where  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{8}$  and  $r$  even;
- (5)  $N = 2p^r$  where  $p \equiv \pm 3 \pmod{8}$ ;
- (6)  $N = 4p^r$  where  $p \equiv 3 \pmod{4}$  and  $r$  odd.

It follows that, if  $N$  is a randomly chosen positive integer, then  $g_0(N)$  is odd with probability 1. This shows that a randomly chosen even positive integer has probability zero of occurring as a value of  $g_0(N)$ .

Looking further in the list of integers not of the form  $g_0(N)$ , we do eventually find some odd values, the first one occurring at the 3885th position. There are four such up to  $10^5$  (out of 9035 total missed values), namely 49267, 74135, 94091, 96463. In Section 6 we will show that the paucity of odd missed values is not a general phenomenon, but instead an accident caused by the fact that ‘small’ numbers do not have enough prime factors. In particular, we will see that there are infinitely many positive odd integers not of the form  $g_0(N)$ , and in fact the set of integers of the form  $g_0(N)$  has density zero in the set of all nonnegative integers.

#### 5. AVERAGE SIZE OF $g_0(N)$

We have shown that  $g_0(N)$  is sometimes as small as  $N/12$ , and sometimes as large as  $cN \log \log N$ . We now determine the usual behavior.

More precisely, we show that

$$\frac{1}{B} \sum_{N=1}^B g_0(N) = \frac{5}{8\pi^2} B + o(B).$$

By Abel's lemma [13, p. 65], this result is equivalent to the following:

$$(1) \quad \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{B} \sum_{N=1}^B \frac{g_0(N)}{N} = \frac{5}{4\pi^2} = 0.12665\dots$$

In Section 3, we showed that  $g_0(N)/N = (1/12) \sum_{a|N} (1/a) + o(1)$ , and we can ignore the error term since it contributes nothing to the limit. Here we use the convention that  $p$  is always prime, and  $a$  is always a squarefree positive integer. The following computation proves (1):

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} (1/B) \sum_{N=1}^B \sum_{a|N} 1/a &= \lim_{B \rightarrow \infty} (1/B) \sum_{a \leq B} (B/a)(1/a) \\ &= \sum_{a < \infty} 1/a^2 = \zeta(2)/\zeta(4) = 15/\pi^2. \end{aligned}$$

A. M. Odlyzko showed us the following alternative proof of (1): for any complex  $s$  with  $\operatorname{Re}(s) > 1$ , the series  $F(s) := \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} (\mu/N) N^{-s}$  converges, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} F(s) &= \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} N^{-s} \prod_{p|N} (1 + 1/p) = \prod_p (1 + (1 + 1/p)(p^{-s} + p^{-2s} + \dots)) \\ &= \zeta(s) \prod_p (1 + 1/p^{s+1}) = \zeta(s)\zeta(s+1)/\zeta(2s+2). \end{aligned}$$

It follows that  $F(s)$  has a simple pole at  $s = 1$  with residue  $\zeta(2)/\zeta(4)$ , and that  $F(s)$  is regular on  $\operatorname{Re}(s) = 1$  except at  $s = 1$ . Now (1) follows at once from Ikehara's Tauberian theorem [7, p. 311].

## 6. DENSITY OF $\{g_0(N)\}$

In this section we consider the (natural) density of the set  $\{g_0(N)\}$  as a subset of the non-negative integers. We have already seen that  $g_0(N)$  is almost never even, so this density (if it exists) is at most  $1/2$ . In fact, we will show that the set  $\{g_0(N)\}$  has density zero—in other words, we will show that  $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} (\#S(x))/x = 0$ , where

$$S(x) = \{n \in \mathbb{Z} : n \leq x \text{ and } n = g_0(N) \text{ for some } N\}.$$

Let  $N$  be a positive integer and suppose that  $N$  is divisible by at least  $s > 2$  distinct odd primes. The formulas in Section 2 imply that

$2^{s-1}$  divides  $\nu_3$  and  $2^s$  divides each of  $\mu$ ,  $\nu_2$ , and  $\nu_\infty$ . It follows that  $g_0(N) \equiv 1 \pmod{2^{s-2}}$ .

We now show that  $\#S(x) \leq x/2^d + o_d(x)$  for each positive integer  $d$ ; this implies that  $\#S(x) = o(x)$ , as desired. Fix a positive integer  $d$ . Clearly the number of  $n \in S(x)$  with  $n \equiv 1 \pmod{2^d}$  is less than  $x/2^d + 1$ . It remains to show that the number of  $n \in S(x)$  with  $n \not\equiv 1 \pmod{2^d}$  is  $o(x)$ . Each such  $n$  has the form  $g_0(N)$  where  $N$  has at most  $d + 1$  distinct odd prime divisors and  $N < 12x + 18\sqrt{x} + 40$ . And the number of such  $N$  (hence also the number of such  $n$ ) is well-known to be  $o(x)$  [6, p. 356].

*Remark.* We have shown that  $\#S(x) = o(x)$ . It would be interesting to obtain a more precise estimate for  $\#S(x)$ . We make some preliminary observations in this vein. First, the number of even integers in  $S(x)$  is asymptotic to  $9x/\log x$ . (This follows from the classification of  $N$  for which  $g_0(N)$  is even, together with the fact that, for any fixed nonzero integers  $a, b$ , there are only  $o(x/\log x)$  primes  $p < x$  for which  $|ap + b|$  is prime [4, Cor. 2.4.1].) We can prove the following upper and lower bounds on  $\#S(x)$  for  $x \geq 3$ :

$$\frac{x}{\log x} e^{a(\log \log \log x)^2} \ll \#S(x) \ll \frac{x}{(\log x)^b (\log \log x)^c}.$$

(For positive  $f(x), g(x)$ , the notation  $f(x) \ll g(x)$  is equivalent to  $f(x) \leq O(g(x))$ .) Here  $a$  is any constant less than  $a_0$ , where the constants  $a_0 = 0.8168146\dots$  and  $b = 0.2587966\dots$  and  $c = 0.2064969\dots$  are defined as follows. Let  $B$  be the unique root of  $1/B + \log B = 1 + \log 2$  in the interval  $(0, 1)$ , let  $A$  be the unique root of  $\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} A^n ((n+1) \log(n+1) - n \log n - 1) = 1$  in the interval  $(0, 1)$ , and put  $a_0 = -1/(2 \log A)$  and  $b = B \log 2$  and  $c = (B \log 2)/(2 - 2B)$ . The lower bound is proved by considering numbers  $N$  which are products of a fixed number  $k$  of distinct primes, the least of which is 11; for such  $N$  we have  $g_0(N) = 1 - 2^{k-1} + (1/12) \prod_{p|N} (p+1)$ , and the lower bound follows from [8]. The upper bound is proved by optimizing the choice of  $d$  in our density-zero proof, after one has modified that proof by replacing the  $o(x)$  bound from [6, p. 356] by the more precise bound from [5]. Similar bounds have been proved for the number  $\#V(x)$  of distinct values of Euler's  $\varphi$ -function not exceeding  $x$ . In this setting, our upper bound is essentially an optimization of the paper [10]. In [8], upper and lower bounds are proved for  $\#V(x)$ , both of which have the same shape as the above lower bound (but the upper bound is for any  $b > b_0$ ). The precise order of magnitude of  $\#V(x)$  is determined in the excellent paper [2], which (together with [3]) also contains several other interesting results whose analogues would be interesting to study in our situation.

However, the multiplicativity of  $\varphi(n)$  plays a crucial role in all proofs giving better upper bounds for  $\#V(x)$  than our upper bound for  $\#S(x)$  above. Since  $g_0(N)$  (and  $g_0(N) - 1$ ) is not multiplicative, it seems that these methods do not apply to  $\#S(x)$ . We do not know which of our upper and lower bounds is closer to the truth.

## 7. DISTRIBUTION OF $g_0(N)$ MODULO PRIMES

We now study the distribution of  $g_0(N)$  modulo a fixed prime  $\ell$  as  $N$  varies. We will see that some residue classes occur more often than others. Let  $\ell$  be a fixed prime. We may restrict to levels  $N$  having a prime factor  $p$  congruent to  $-1$  modulo  $12\ell$ , since the set of such  $N$ 's has density 1 in the set of positive integers (as shown by Dirichlet, cf. [13, p. 73]). Our assumption on  $N$  forces  $\nu_2 = \nu_3 = 0$  and  $12\ell \mid \mu$ , so

$$g_0(N) \equiv 1 - \nu_\infty/2 \pmod{\ell}.$$

First consider the case  $\ell = 2$ : for our restricted class of  $N$ 's, we have  $g_0(N) \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$  unless  $N$  is either  $p^{2r}$  or  $4p^{2r}$ , so certainly  $g_0(N)$  is odd with probability 1 (as was observed in Section 4).

We have seen that the sequence of residues mod 2 of  $g_0(N)$  is biased. We now show a similar result modulo other primes  $\ell$ . We compute the density of positive integers  $N$  for which  $g_0(N) \equiv 1 \pmod{\ell}$ . As above, we may assume  $N$  has a prime factor  $p$  with  $12\ell \mid (p+1)$ ; then  $\ell \mid (g_0(N) - 1)$  is equivalent to  $\ell \mid \nu_\infty$ , and this occurs precisely when either  $\ell^3 \mid N$  or some prime congruent to  $-1 \pmod{\ell}$  divides  $N$  with (positive) even multiplicity. By a standard argument (similar to [9, Thm. 2.18]), the probability that  $N$  does not satisfy either of these conditions is

$$(1 - 1/\ell^3) \prod_{\substack{s \equiv -1 \pmod{\ell} \\ s \text{ prime}}} (1 - 1/s^2 + 1/s^3 - 1/s^4 + 1/s^5 - \dots),$$

which equals  $(1 - 1/\ell^3) \prod (1 - 1/(s^2 + s))$ . The following table gives upper bounds for the probability  $P(\ell)$  that  $g_0(N) \equiv 1 \pmod{\ell}$ :

$\ell$	3	5	7	11	13	17	19	23
$P(\ell) <$	$1/4$	$1/78$	$1/105$	$1/653$	$1/1542$	$1/1793$	$1/978$	$1/5821$

In these first few cases, we see that the probability is much less than  $1/\ell$ . More generally, for every  $\ell$  we have  $P(\ell) < 3/\ell^2$  (where the constant

‘3’ is not optimal):

$$\begin{aligned}
P(\ell) &= 1 - (1 - 1/\ell^3) \prod_{\substack{s \equiv -1 \pmod{\ell} \\ s \text{ prime}}} (1 - 1/(s^2 + s)) \\
&< 1 - (1 - 1/\ell^3) \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - 1/((n\ell)^2 - n\ell)) \\
&< 1 - (1 - 1/\ell^3) \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - 1.5/(n\ell)^2) \\
&< 1 - (1 - 1/\ell^3) (1 - \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (1.5/\ell^2)/n^2) \\
&= 1 - (1 - 1/\ell^3) (1 - \pi^2/(4\ell^2)) \\
&< 3\ell^{-2}.
\end{aligned}$$

Also note that other cosets mod  $\ell$  will have special behavior as well. If  $N$  is squarefree,  $\nu_{\infty}$  is a power of 2, so that  $g_0(N)$  is congruent modulo  $\ell$  to a number of the form  $1 - 2^k$ . Recall that  $N$  is squarefree with probability  $6/\pi^2 = 0.6079\dots$  [6, p. 269]. Thus, if 2 is not a primitive root mod  $\ell$ , then the residue classes (mod  $\ell$ ) of the integers  $1 - 2^k$  will occur more frequently than the other residue classes. For example, for  $\ell = 7$ , the classes 0, 4, 6 occur much more frequently than the classes 2, 3, 5.

Closing remark: readers wishing to see further details of various arguments in this note are invited to look at the comments in the  $\text{\TeX}$  source code.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] N. Elkies, E. Howe, A. Kresch, B. Poonen, J. Wetherell, and M. Zieve, *Curves of every genus with many points: on a question of Serre*, preprint, 1999.
- [2] K. Ford, *The distribution of totients*, Ramanujan J. **2** (1998), 67–151.
- [3] K. Ford, *The number of solutions of  $\varphi(x) = m$* , Ann. of Math. **150** (1999), 283–311.
- [4] H. Halberstam and H.-E. Richert, *Sieve Methods*, Academic Press, New York, 1974.
- [5] G. H. Hardy and S. Ramanujan, *The normal number of prime factors of a number  $n$* , Quart. J. Math. **48** (1917), 76–92.
- [6] G. H. Hardy and E. M. Wright, *An Introduction to the Theory of Numbers*, 5th ed., Oxford University Press, New York, 1979.
- [7] S. Lang, *Algebraic Number Theory*, 2nd ed., Springer-Verlag, New York, 1994.
- [8] H. Maier and C. Pomerance, *Distinct values of Euler’s  $\varphi$ -function*, Acta Arith. **49** (1988), 263–275.
- [9] W. Narkiewicz, *Number Theory*, World Scientific, Singapore, 1983.



- [10] S. S. Pillai, *On some functions connected with  $\varphi(n)$* , Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. **35** (1929), 832–836.
- [11] D. E. Rohrlich, *Modular curves, Hecke correspondences, and  $L$ -functions*, in Modular Forms and Fermat's Last Theorem, (G. Cornell et al., eds.), Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997, 41–100.
- [12] J. B. Rosser and L. Schoenfeld, *Approximate formulas for some functions of prime numbers*, Illinois J. Math. **6** (1962), 64–94.
- [13] J.-P. Serre, *A Course in Arithmetic*, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1973.
- [14] G. Shimura, *Introduction to the Arithmetic Theory of Automorphic Functions*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, 1971.

AT&T SHANNON LAB, P.O. BOX 971, 180 PARK AVE, FLORHAM PARK, NJ  
07932-0971

*E-mail address:* `janos@research.att.com`

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA,  
LOS ANGELES, CA 90089-1113

*E-mail address:* `jlwether@alum.mit.edu`

CENTER FOR COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH, 29 THANET RD., PRINCETON,  
NJ 08540-3699

*E-mail address:* `zieve@idaccr.org`