References and Notes

1. D. B. Kopans, E. Halpern, C. A. Hulka, *Cancer* **74**, 1196 (1994).
2. A. B. Miller, C. J. Baines, T. To, C. Wall, *Can. Med. Assoc. J.* **147**, 1459 (1992).
3. D. B. Kopans and S. A. Feig, *Am. J. Roengenol.* **161**, 755 (1993).
4. P. C. Stomper, D. J. D'Souza, P. A. DiNitto, M. A. Arredondo, *Am. J. Radiol.* **167**, 1261 (1996).
5. D. B. Kopans *et al.*, *Radiology* **200**, 357 (1996).
6. K. Kerlikowske *et al.*, *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **270**, 2444 (1993).
7. S. H. Sox, *Ann. Intern. Med.* **122**, 530 (1995).
8. S. Shapiro, W. Venet, P. Strax, L. Venet, *Periodic Screening for Breast Cancer: The Health Insurance Plan Project and Its Sequelae, 1963–1968* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 1988).
9. L. Taber *et al.*, *Int. J. Cancer* **68**, 693 (1996).
10. Statement as provided to the press by the Consensus Development Conference Panel, 23 January 1997.
11. S. Shapiro, *Cancer* **74**, 231 (1994).
12. E. Hendrick, presentation to the NIH Consensus Development Conference Panel, 22 January 1997.
13. P. C. Prorok, B. F. Hankey, B. N. Bundy, *J. Chron. Dis.* **34**, 159 (1981).

■

Presidential Chairs in Chile

We fully agree with Ivan N. Saavedra (Letters, 7 Feb., p. 738) that there is a need to foster competence of Chilean science in the international arena. However, his criticism of the recently created program of Presidential Chairs in Science is unfair. The competition for these Chairs is open to all senior scientists, and the Chairs have been assigned by an International Scientific Committee that has had among its members three Nobel laureates in science. The International Scientific Committee has decided with full independence to whom to assign the Presidential Chairs.

By good fortune, one can evaluate the procedures of the committee that has assigned these Chairs. The article cited by Saavedra ("Science in Latin America," 10 Feb., 1995, p. 819) highlighted two scientific fields in Chile—astronomy and biophysics. Biophysics was considered "one of the brightest areas of Chilean science." The International Scientific Committee has done nothing but stimulate strong research teams in these two areas. Six Chairs have been granted to biophysics and related fields, and four Chairs in Physics are in the hands of astronomers.

Last year, the Howard Hughes Medical Research Institute opened an international competition for Latin America and Canada in the Biomedical Sciences. Four fellowships have been awarded to Chilean scientists. Two were given to scientists holding Presidential Chairs, and the other two went to more junior scientists. In addition, in the last competition of the Chilean National Fund for Scientific and Technological Development, the research project of a scientist holding a Presidential Chair in Science obtained the highest score.

Pedro Labarca
Ramon Latorre
Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, University of Chile, and
Centro de Estudios Cientificos de Santiago, Santiago 9, Chile

I cannot disagree more with Saavedra's suggestion that the Chilean National Commission for Scientific and Technological Research is the only national agency that should distribute funds for science in Chile. On the contrary, the example of the United States suggests that having multiple funding agencies is an advantage. From the receiving end, what could be better than having more than one agency to apply to for funds? With diversity there is competition, and competition ensures that funding agencies with the best track record fare better when the nation's budget is discussed.

Saavedra goes so far as to say the Presidential Chair program is "fail[ing] to reach its objective." No serious scientific institution would return a verdict on a program that is less than 2 years old.

Alan Neely
Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX 79409–2013, USA
E-mail: phyan@ttuhsc.edu

■

Butterfly Identification

The bird-wing butterfly pictured in Random Samples of 28 February (p. 1271) is not *Ornithoptera croesus* Wallace, but an exquisitely rare bilateral gynandromorph (female on the right side, male on the left) of one of the subspecies of *Trogonoptera brookiana* (Wallace). *Croesus* flies in the Moluccas, over a thousand miles east of the habitat of *brookiana* in Malaya and Sundaland.

At least no one can argue that the removal of this butterfly from its birthplace to the Osaka Museum of Natural History in Japan, by way of Kaoru Sumiyoshi's collection, will affect the survival of the species—gynandromorphs of this type are usually incapable of reproduction.

John A. Hyatt
Eastman Chemical Company, Kingsport, TN 37662, USA
E-mail: jhyatt@eastman.com

Bullish about the Bear?

A Population Reference Bureau report summarized in Random Samples (14 Feb., p. 933) says that the Russian population will fall because the birthrate is low and projected to decrease and suggests that the population of elderly threatens "to crush pension systems." The presented graph shows that from 1995 to 2030 there will be an increase in the proportion of elderly in the Russian population. However, the graph also shows a projected decrease in the number of children, which more than balances the increasing number of elderly. The proportion of elderly to total population will indeed increase from 20% to 32% between 1995 and 2030, but this will be offset by a decrease in children under 15 from 21% to 11.5%. Russian working ages are defined by the report as 15 to 54 for women and 15 to 59 for men. The proportion of working-age to total Russian population will remain about the same: 58% in 1995 and 57% in 2030. As the Russian economy improves over the next 30 years, a baby boom may develop. Until then, there is reason to be bullish about the Russian bear.

There will also be a relative decrease in the U.S. child population. Between 1995 and 2050, the proportion of working-age to total adult (working-age plus elderly) populations will decrease by 11%, but the proportion of working-age to total population will decrease by only 6% (*1*). Both child and elderly population levels affect the economy and the federal budget. Both should be considered in the current debates over Social Security and Medicare.

Bernard Brown
182 New Mark Esplanade, Rockville, MD 20850, USA

References

1. *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1996* (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Washington, DC, ed. 116, 1996), pp. 15; *ibid.*, p. 17.

Letters to the Editor

Letters may be submitted by e-mail (at science_letters@aaas.org), fax (202-789-4669), or regular mail (*Science*, 1200 New York Avenue, NW, Washington, DC 20005, USA). Letters are not routinely acknowledged. Full addresses, signatures, and daytime phone numbers should be included. Letters should be brief (300 words or less) and may be edited for reasons of clarity or space. They may appear in print and/or on the World Wide Web. Letter writers are not consulted before publication.