ican Society for Cell Biology (ASCB) which condemned the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA's) microgravity protein crystallization program. Although the article also presented the views of several proponents of this program, what was not addressed is the fact that approximately 90% of NASA-funded protein crystallization research is conducted on the ground. Neither the article nor the ASCB report acknowledged an important new theory of crystallization proposed by Rosenberger and Vekilov, as well as Wilson and Larry DeLucas's new methods for improved crystallization developed at Mississippi State University and at the University of Alabama in Birmingham. All of this work is peer-reviewed, NASA-funded, ground-based research and has not required space flight to be scientifically relevant, although space flight is essential and will greatly extend the results. As recently as May of this year, Representative Mark Stanford (R–SC) stated, in support of the annual "kill the space station" amendment to the NASA Authorization Act (H.R. 1654) sponsored by Representative Tim Roemer (D–IN), "Indeed, the American Society for Cell Biology declared that crystallography experiments in microgravity have made no serious contribution to analysis of protein structures or the development of new pharmaceuticals."

The participation of many academic and industrial protein crystallographers in NASA's protein crystallization program is important and should have been mentioned. This would have placed the ASCB statement in the proper context.

Michael R. Fiske*
System Studies & Simulation, Inc., 3315 Bob Wallace Avenue, Suite 207, Huntsville, AL 35805, USA

*Chair, Microgravity and Space Processes Technical Committee, American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The article "Congress votes down delay in access law" by Jocelyn Kaiser (News of the Week, 23 July, p. 511) should have indicated that Louis Renjel of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce was not commenting directly on the draft Office of Managment and Budget document discussed in the article.

In the report by C. A. Klausmeier (11 June, p. 1826), the URL in the legend for figure 3 (p. 1828) was incorrectly printed. The letters "stripes.qt" should not have been included at the end of the URL in lines 20 and 21. The full sentence beginning on line 15 of the caption should have read, "An animation of this output is available on *Science* online at www.sciencemag.org/feature/data/990551.shl."

In the Random Samples item "Sex and anger" (21 May, p. 1263), "student Lisa Goos of York University..." should have read, "students Lisa Goos and Irwin Silverman of York University...."

In the Retrospective "Glenn Seaborg (1912–1999)" by Daniel E. Koshland Jr. (*Science*'s Compass, 16 Apr., p. 447), E. M. McMillan's name was misspelled twice. And at the end of the piece, "^{106}Sg" should have been "$_{106}$Sg."

In Leonard Hayflick's letter "Aging and the genome" (*Science*'s Compass, 26 Mar., p. 2019), the word "gene" was spelled incorrectly in line 5 of the third paragraph; the word "of" was spelled incorrectly in line nine of the last paragraph; and the e-mail address for the author should have been "len@gene.com."

The first author of the first item in reference 9 (p. 882) of the report "Precambrian sponges with cellular structures" by Chia-Wei Li *et al.* (6 Feb. 1998, p. 879) should have been "P. O. Wainright," not "P. O. Hinkle."