The reading and the lecture are both about the Tunguska explosion. The author of the reading believes that the most probable cause of this event was the methane gas explosion. The lecturer casts doubt on the claims made in the article. He thinks that possibly the asteroid streak was responsible for that event.

First of all, the author claims that there is no evidence of asteroid rocks in the examinations. She believes that the fact that asteroid streaking was seen across the sky is not proved. This point is challenged by the lecturer. He says that there are witnesses that claim that after the explosion a strong wind started to blow which is evidence of asteroid streaking. Furthermore, he points out the asteroid was exploded before crushing the earth so the asteroid rocks and materials were not detectable because they were destroyed.

Secondly, the author states that there is no crater in that site as an impact of the asteroid. She argues the wide regions which are free of forests are due to the effect of methane explosion. The lecturer rebuts this. He suggests that destroyed trees that last their branches and bark are unique patterns for asteroid struck. He elaborates on this by mentioning that laboratory tests have also proved this claim.

Finally, the author mentions that the high level of methane gases that build up underground started to release, causing such a big explosion. She believes that the light that saw by some people near the area of the explosion was due to the methane gas. The lecturer, in contrast, states that if the gas is responsible for the explosion the fire would be seen by the witnesses. She puts forth the idea that that area did not have to potential to produce enough amount of methane gas that caused that big explosion.