Physics (Long Is. City, N. Y.) 1, 63 (1964).

[2]S. L. Adler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 1051 (1965); W. I. Weisberger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 14, 1047 (1965).

[3]For a disucssion, see S. L. Adler and R. F. Dashen, *Current Algebras* (Benjamin, New York, 1968).

[4]For a review, H. Harari, in *Spectroscopic and Group Theoretical Methods in Physics* (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1968), p. 363, and reference to previous work therein.

[5]Suggested by R. F. Dashen and M. Gell-Mann [Phys. Rev. Lett. 17, 340 (1966)] in connection with the local algebra. F. Buccella *et al.* [Nuovo Cimento 69A, 133 (1970), and 9A, 120 (1972)] suggest a phenomenological scheme for charges.

[6]The extension to SU(3)⊗SU(3) is straightforward. See Ref. 4.

[7]H. J. Melosh, unpublished. We thank M. Gell-Mann and H. J. Melosh for several informative discussions.

[8]$V^{-1}Q^iV=Q^i$ because isospin is conserved.

[9]P. Söding *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 39B, 1 (1972).

[10]We use $f_\pi=135$ MeV from the π decay amplitude.

[11]Intrinsic to the use of PCAC is an ~10% error. All widths are calculated in narrow-resonance approximation, assuming PCAC for the Feynman amplitude and using phase space for massive π's.

[12]We define $g_{AB}=\langle A|Q_5|B\rangle$, where A and B are physical states. g^* is defined in Ref. 4.

[13]From the model of M. Gell-Mann *et al.* [Phys. Rev. Lett. 8, 261 (1962)] and experimental widths, we obtain $g_{\rho\pi\omega}=(14.4\pm1.0)$/GeV using $\gamma_\rho^2/4\pi=0.6$. Equation (11) gives a value of 15.6/GeV. In addition to the purely experimental errors, there is an unknown error inherent in the model.

[14]Our results for $L=1$ to $L=0$ transitions agree with those of Buccella *et al.*, Ref. 5, but we disagree in general.

[15]See the recent work of R. Ott, thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1972 (unpublished), and earlier references therein.

[16]See the references and discussion of the SU(6)$_W$ predictions and their breaking by E. W. Colglazier and J. L. Rosner, Nucl. Phys. B27, 349 (1971).

[17]F. J. Gilman and H. Harari, Phys. Rev. Lett. 18, 1150 (1967), and Phys. Rev. 165, 1803 (1968).

[18]See, for example, R. Klanner, in *Experimental Meson Spectroscopy—1972*, AIP Conference Proceedings No. 8, edited by A. H. Rosenfeld and K. W. Lai (American Institute of Physics, New York, 1972), p. 164.

[19]This modifies slightly the analysis contained in Ref. 17, where $\delta\not\to\eta\pi$.

[20]H. H. Bingham *et al.*, Phys. Lett. 41B, 635 (1972), and references to other experiments therein.

[21]Large mixing is needed in SU(6)$_W$. See D. Faiman and D. E. Plane, CERN Report No. CERN-Th-1549, 1972 (unpublished).

[22]See also the recent analysis of R. Ayed *et al.*, unpublished.

[23]A particular choice of parameters in broken SU(6)$_W$ gives results which agree with ours. See Ref. 16 and W. P. Petersen and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. D 6, 820 (1972). We thank J. L. Rosner for discussions and pointing out an error in an earlier manuscript.

ERRATUM

MASS FORMULA FOR KERR BLACK HOLES. Larry Smarr [Phys. Rev. Lett. 30, 71 (1973)].

Dr. Robert V. Penney has pointed out an algebraic error in the transformation of parameters from A, L, Q to η, β, ϵ (page 72) in the quantities E_r and $E_{\rm em}$. These two lines should be changed to

$$E_r=\tfrac{1}{2}\eta[(1-\beta_0^2)^{-1/2}-1],$$

$$E_{\rm em}=\tfrac{1}{2}\eta[(1+\epsilon^2)(1-\beta^2)^{-1/2}-(1-\beta_0^2)^{-1/2}],$$

where

$$\beta_0=\beta(A, L, Q=0).$$

Further, the line giving the second-order expansion of $E_{\rm em}$ should read

$$E_{\rm em}\cong\tfrac{1}{2}Q^2\eta^{-1}.$$

The conclusion of the paper remains unaltered.