competitiveness, and so forth. These two sets of circumstances seem at odds, but they are not. Put simply, many smart young people see science as a ridiculous career choice. For them, better alternatives abound.

Koshland rightly dismisses "birth control" as a solution. But there is a simpler, kinder, and more accurate method: Eliminate wholesale training grants. If all Ph.D. students faced exactly the same financial aid choices as medical or law students, the "C" students, and even the "A" students, would take a much harder look at their future prospects. Eventually, those prospects would improve as fewer graduates emerged from the pipeline. The market (dare I use the term in this context?) would reach a natural equilibrium, based on self-selection.

Koshland has argued forcefully in other editorials for a more "free market" vision of the management of science and technology and less government meddling. I submit that there is no more compelling case for a free market than in the production of scientists themselves.

Charles Hsu
Vice President,
Advent International Corporation,
1875 South Grant Street,
Suite 310E,
San Mateo, CA 94402, USA

Corrections and Clarifications

The caption for the figure in the article by Marcia Barinaga "Possible new test found for Alzheimer's disease" (Research News, 11 Nov., p. 973) was in error. The upper eye was not that of a normal subject, as stated, but was the eye of the Alzheimer's patient before administration of the eye-dilating drug.

In the Policy Forum by Brian Frost-Smith "European Union: Fresh tracks for academic exchanges" (4 Nov., p. 743), in the first paragraph on line 14 of page 744, the term "European Community Unit" should have been "European Currency Unit."

In Philip H. Abelson's editorial "Supplies of oil and natural gas" (21 Oct., p. 347), reference is made in the second sentence of the third paragraph to 4.6 "Tm^3" of natural gas. The unit "Tm^3" represents "trillion cubic meters," not "terameters."

In the report "Direct determination of grain boundary atomic structure in $SrTiO_3$" by M. M. McGibbon *et al.* (7 Oct., p. 102), on line 10 of the third column on page 103, the term "three-dimensional" should have been "3d." In reference 17 of the same report (p. 104), "*IEEE*" should have been "*IEE*."

In note 6 (p. 54), of the Policy Forum "The paradox of critical mass for women in science" by H. Etzkowitz *et al.* (7 Oct., p. 51), the author of *Fair Science: Women in the Scientific Community* should have read, "J. Cole."