The reading and the lecture are both about the cause of the catastrophe in Russia that happened in 1908. The author of the passage believes that it was methane gas that caused the explosion contrary to the belief that it could have been an astroid strike. The lecturer casts doubt on the claims made in the article. He thinks that none of the arguments presented in the reading is plausible.

First of all, the author claims that there has been many expedition to the site of explosion, and there was no evidence showing any sign of astroid strike there. This point is challenged by the lecturer. He says that there has been some report that people saw bright sky there, and soon after that, a powerful wind damaged everything within its vicinity.

Secondly, the writer states that astroids leave craters to the site where they impact, but there is no evidence indicating such an impcat in the explosion site. The lecturer rebuts this. He suggests that the astroid exploded in the mid air and shattered to pieces. He elaborates on this by mentioning that the debris was either so minute to be noticiable or was hidden away over time.

Finally, the author mentions that Russia has many ecological locations near the site that released methane that later led to the explosion. The lecturer, on the other hand, states that the amount of combined methane released by all these locations never has been enough to produce such an explosion. He puts forth the idea that even if it was true, it would have created fire in that area; but there was no report by the people who were near that site.