neering but did not disclose the information to the public. According to the article, FDA officials were "apparently hoping to keep the recombinant link quiet until they could determine whether it in fact did play a role in the outbreak [of eosinophilia myalgia]." Furthermore, an FDA scientist quoted in the article gave the "impact on the industry" as a reason for delaying release of the information.

The idea of FDA scientists suppressing vital health information out of a concern for the impact on the biotechnology industry does little to inspire confidence in the FDA as a regulator of this new technology. At a minimum, it raises the question of whether other potential links exist between genetic engineering and human disease that FDA is hoping to keep quiet. Beyond that, it highlights the FDA's conflicting roles as both promoter and regulator of biotechnology.

It is well known that the FDA has been an energetic advocate for the biotechnology industry. The FDA's representatives have appeared in many forums extolling biotechnology's benefits and glossing over its risks. Considering its enthusiasm for the technology, FDA's apparent desire to protect the industry from the black eye of a potential connection to a major disease outbreak is no surprise. But, in fact, such efforts do the industry no favor. The public will not accept this technology unless it is confident that government regulators are committed to prevent its risks. That confidence is undermined where the FDA appears to be protecting the biotechology industry rather than the public health.

MARGARET MELLON
Director, National Biotechnology Policy Center, National Wildlife Federation, 1400 Sixteenth Street, NW, Washington, DC 20036–2266

International Congress of Entomology

Socrates was condemned for "popularizing science that might lead to skepticism or disbelief." Science continues to be the victim of censorship by nonscientific institutions. Religious authorities suppressed progress in astronomy, attacked evolutionary theory, and have even promoted legislation against the teaching of evolution. Hitler and Stalin imposed political dogma on geneticists and anthropologists. In the United States, physicists have been persecuted for political reasons, and today creationists mix religion and science with abandon. Scientists cannot escape or ignore institutional intrusion on the scientific functions of the world community.

Scientists must defend the freedom to express ideas, not just about genetics, anthropology, or physics, but any idea honestly presented for debate. We need not dwell on the repression of the past, but we must demand that scientific meetings be held in an atmosphere of intellectual freedom. We must not allow ourselves or our scientific societies to be used to legitimatize repressive governments.

The government of the People's Republic of China, through the Entomological Society of China, is seeking endorsement of the International Congress of Entomology that is scheduled for Beijing in 1992. That same government drove astrophysicist Fang Lizhi into refuge in the U.S. embassy, killed or imprisoned student protestors, severely limited foreign travel by university graduates and sent the freshman class of Beijing University away for a year of indoctrination.

We believe that, as scientists, we all have a special obligation to protect freedom of expression, in the same way that attorneys have a special obligation to protect the rule of law. The obligation is not partisan, it is a fundamental professional ethic. Open discussion is an integral part of the scientific process. Entomological societies must withhold approval of meeting in Beijing, and other disciplines should avoid meetings there until it becomes clear that new ideas can be expressed without fear of reprisal.

JOHN R. ANDERSON*
JOHN T. DOYEN*
MARJORIE A. HOY*
CARLTON KOEHLER*
RUDOLPH L. PIPA*
LLOYD A. ANDRES†
MICHAEL I. HAVERTY‡
JAMES B. HOY§
NANCY F. KNOP‖
PAUL R. EHRLICH¶
MATTHEW GREENSTONE**
FREDERICK W. PLAPP, JR.††
YE SHUPING‡‡

* Department of Entomological Sciences, University of California, Berkeley, CA; †1324 Arch Street, Berkeley, CA 94708; ‡Post Office Box 245, Berkeley, CA 94701; §1004 Grizzly Peak Boulevard, Berkeley, CA 94708; ‖1273 Monterey Avenue, Berkeley, CA 94707; ¶Department of Biological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305; **Box 7629 Research Park, Columbia, MO 65205; ††Department of Entomology, Texas A & M University, College Station, TX 77843; ‡‡Division of Biological Sciences, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045.

Erratum: In the report "Structural transitions upon ligand binding in a cooperative dimeric hemoglobin" by William E. Royer *et al.* (3 Aug., p. 518), the fourth sentence of the last paragraph on page 518 was incorrectly printed. It should have read, "In the CO structure, the phenyl group is extruded from the heme pocket and is instead in the subunit interface in close contact with $Thr^{72'}$."

Erratum: In the report "Birth of projection neurons in adult avian brain may be related to perceptual or motor learning" by Arturo Alvarez-Buylla *et al.* (21 Sept., p. 1444), parts B and C in figure 1 were transposed. The legend is correct.