through the ILP have differed in no way from the interactions I had when I served for 13 months as a liaison scientist with the U.S. Office of Naval Research–Tokyo in 1984–1985. How can Congress praise that program as a model of international scientific interaction, yet condemn the interaction when I do the same thing as an MIT faculty member through the ILP?

THOMAS W. EAGAR
Department of Materials Science and Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139

NASA and Intellectual Quality

I was appalled to read in the 18 August issue of *Science* (Research News, p. 699) a statement, attributed to unnamed members of the astronomical community, that the intellectual quality at NASA centers is "mediocre at best." If these unnamed astronomers have the courage to identify themselves, I will personally invite them to visit the NASA-Ames Research Center to explain their point of view in face-to-face discussions with our outstanding scientific staff. We would point out in these discussions that many scientists here at Ames—and elsewhere within NASA—have passed up opportunities to join or remain on university faculties in favor of less well-paying civil service positions in which our efforts are largely devoted to developing new scientific opportunities for the entire astronomical community.

MICHAEL WERNER
Space Infrared Telescope Facility Project, NASA-Ames Research Center, Moffett Field, CA 94035

Animal Experimentation: Context of a Quote

My attention has been called to a letter by Brandon P. Reines (11 Aug., p. 583) citing a statement of mine that seems to align me with the antivivisection movement.

I did publish an article in 1979 (*1*), giving a history of the development of our knowledge of hepatitis and pointing out how much was learned by clinical observation alone. Reines plucked out these words: "progress by the study of man is by no means unusual, in fact, it is more nearly the rule." Of course I stand by that, but its use in the context of his letter is a distortion of my belief and my practice. As I said in another section of the same article, clinical observations may provide leads and these may need to be pursued by disciplines other than pure clinical observation. Most of the research I have engaged in over the past half century has involved use of experimental animals (mice, rats and rabbits).

PAUL B. BEESON
21013 Northeast 122nd Street, Redmond, WA 98053

REFERENCE

1. P. B. Beeson, *Am. J. Med.* **67**, 366 (1979).

Erratum: In the legend of figure 3 (p. 1437) in the Research Article "Synthetic amphiphilic peptide models for protein ion channels" by J. D. Lear *et al.* (27 May 1988, p. 1177), the holding potential for the $(LSLLLSL)_3$ peptide should have read, "−150 mV" instead of "−120 mV." In the same legend, the duration intervals of the plots in C, E, and F should have been given as 20 msec, 0.5 msec, and 20 msec, respectively.

Erratum: In the legend of figure 4 in the Research Article "Identification of the cystic fibrosis gene: Cloning and characterization of complementary DNA" by J. R. Riordan *et al.* (8 Sept., p. 1066), the oligonucleotide sequence "5′-GTTTTCCTGGATTATGCCTGGGCAC-3′" [error is italicized] should have read "5′-GTTTTCCTGGATTATGCCTGGCAC-3′"; one extra G residue was inserted in error. The same error appeared in note 35 (p. 1079) of the Research Article "Identification of the cystic fibrosis gene: Genetic analysis" by B. Kerem *et al.* (8 Sept., p. 1073). In addition, the first amino acid residue displayed in figure 2 of the paper by Kerem *et al.* should have been K (for lysine) instead of L; the N and the CF(ΔF) sequences were also mislabeled. The correct sequence should have read, "KENIIFGV" for N and "KENIIGV" for CF(ΔF).