plasma. It is worth recalling that a theory based on the weak-turbulence approximation[16] has also shown a tendency for Alfvénic turbulence towards the asymmetry discussed here.

Thanks are due to J. Leorat for useful discussions on the subject of this paper.

[1]R. H. Kraichnan, Phys. Rev. 109, 1407 (1958).
[2]R. H. Kraichnan, Phys. Fluids 8, 1385 (1965).
[3]A. Pouquet, U. Frish, and J. Leorat, J. Fluid Mech. 77, 321 (1976).
[4]D. Fyfe and D. Montgomery, J. Plasma Phys. 16, 181 (1976).
[5]P. J. Coleman, Jr., Astrophys. J. 153, 371 (1968).
[6]J. W. Belcher and L. Davis, Jr., J. Geophys. Res. 76, 3534 (1971).
[7]L. F. Burlaga and J. M. Turner, J. Geophys. Res. 81, 73 (1979).
[8]J. W. Sari and G. C. Valley, J. Geophys. Res. 81, 5489 (1976).
[9]M. Dobrowolny, A. Mangeney, and P. L. Veltri, Astron. Astrophys. 83, 26 (1980).
[10]H. K. Moffat, *Magnetic Field Generation in Electrically Conducting Fluids* (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, England, 1979).
[11]W. M. Elsasser, Phys. Rev. 79, 183 (1950).
[12]J. V. Hollweg, Solar Phys. 56, 305 (1978).
[13]M. Dobrowolny, Phys. Fluids 15, 2263 (1972).
[14]M. D. Montgomery, S. P. Gary, W. C. Feldman, and D. W. Forslund, J. Geophys. Res. 81, 2743 (1976).
[15]R. H. Kraichnan, J. Fluid Mech. 47, 513 (1971).
[16]M. A. Livshits and V. N. Tsytovich, Nucl. Fusion 10, 241 (1970).

ERRATA

ANGULAR DISTRIBUTIONS FOR THE REACTION $^{18}O(\pi^+, \pi^-)^{18}Ne$ AND PION DOUBLE-CHARGE-EXCHANGE FORM FACTORS. Kamal K. Seth, S. Iversen, H. Nann, M. Kaletka, J. Hird, and H. A. Thiessen [Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1574 (1979)].

It has been found that a counter inefficiency correction was inadvertently applied twice in determining the cross sections shown in Fig. 2. The correct measured cross sections with their statistical errors are as follows:

$\theta_{c.m.}$ (deg)	σ (μb/sr) 0^+	2^+
13.2	360(65)	98(30)
18.3	69(15)	155(20)
23.4	87(20)	248(35)
30.5	261(45)	330(50)
45.7	202(40)	87(25)

The additional error in absolute normalization is estimated to be $\leq \pm 15\%$. The summed cross sections for the excitation region 5–20 MeV (referred to in paragraph 4 of page 1575) accordingly decrease monotonically from 5.8 μb/sr at 13° to 2.5 μb/sr at 45°.

The above changes have no effect on any other results or conclusions of the paper.

WHAT CAN WE LEARN ABOUT NUCLEAR ELECTRIC DIPOLE MOMENTS FROM PARITY NONCONSERVATION IN ATOMIC TRANSITIONS? Geoffrey N. Epstein [Phys. Rev. Lett. 44, 905 (1980)].

There was an error in the evaluation of $\langle \beta_0 | V^{PT} \times | e_0 \rangle$. Remarkably this specific matrix element is zero even for relativistic wave functions. This has the effect that for both hydrogen and deuterium we must look for higher-order corrections which come from vacuum polarization, the electron anomalous magnetic moment, two-photon exchange processes, etc. The complete and careful evaluation of these pieces is now essential and will be discussed fully elsewhere. However, it is evident now that with the order α^2 correction being zero we must end up with an order α^3 correction. Therefore at worst we will lose two orders of magnitude of sensitivity to the proton and deuteron electric dipole moments (e.d.m.) in the ^1H and ^2H experiments discussed. This means that the deuteron e.d.m. limit will be improved by seven, not nine, orders of magnitude. The proton e.d.m. limit will be improved by five, not seven, orders of magnitude over that obtained