countries and specifically that such industries owe back "royalties" to source nations from drugs already on the market. It has been implied, for example, that Eli Lilly and Co. have an outstanding indebtedness to the original providers of the *Vinca* plant from which the company derived the profitable anticancer drugs vinblastine and vincristine (News & Comment, 19 June, p. 1624). Such implication has been persuasively refuted by Irving S. Johnson (Letters, 14 Aug., p. 860) and Carl Djerassi (Letters, 9 Oct., p. 203).

In our view the debate is improperly focused. The question is not whether the pharmaceutical industry is retroactively indebted for its successful development of natural products, but whether, as a matter of self-interest, it should henceforth help bear some measure of the cost of the custodianship of nature. As exemplified by the discovery of "miracle" drugs such as ivermectin, cyclosporin, and taxol, organisms are continuing to yield compounds of unforeseen structure and activity, such as could not, on the basis of existing knowledge, have been "invented" by design. Yet organisms are being lost to extinction faster than they can be studied chemically. If biodiversity is to be preserved for future chemical prospecting, the tide of extinction will need to be stemmed. The pharmaceutical industry, as a major beneficiary of the prospecting effort, should participate in the financing of conservation. Following the lead of Merck & Co., which in exchange for prospecting rights in Costa Rica is helping support the broadly conceived Costa Rican conservation program (Research News, 22 May, p. 1142), pharmaceutical companies should enter into regional agreements worldwide aimed at integrating chemical exploration with biotic preservation. Governments should provide tax incentives to encourage the industries' involvement in such ventures.

President-elect Clinton, in his 1992 Earth Day speech at Drexel University, proposed what will one hopes provide the basis for an initiative of his Administration. "We should explore establishing the international equivalent of The Nature Conservancy," he said, "a fund contributed to by developed nations and pharmaceutical companies to purchase easements in the rainforests for medical research. These easements and the profits from new drugs could make not developing the forests more profitable than tearing them down."

Thomas Eisner
Ignacio Chapela
Cornell Institute for Research in Chemical Ecology, W347 Mudd Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853

Addendum

It has come to our attention that we inadvertently omitted an important condition from our description of the crystallization of HIV-1 reverse transcriptase in our Research Article "Crystal structure at 3.5 Å resolution of HIV-1 reverse transcriptase complexed with an inhibitor" (26 June, p. 1783) (*1*). Reverse transcriptase crystals were grown at 4°C. We apologize for any confusion our omission may have caused.

Thomas A. Steitz
Lori A. Kohlstaedt
Jimin Wang
Jonathan M. Friedman
Phoebe A. Rice
Howard Hughes Medical Institute, and Department of Molecular Biophysics and Biochemistry, and Chemistry, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06511

References

1. L. A. Kohlstaedt, J. Wang, J. M. Friedman, P. A. Rice, T. A. Steitz, *Science* **256**, 1783 (1992).

■

Alliteration Accidental?

With regard to the Meeting Briefs "Chemists cluster in Chicago to confer on cagey compounds" by Anne Simon Moffat (Research News, 16 Oct., p. 400): Chemists clustering in Chicago? Conferring on cagey compounds? Common citizens complain! Closemouthed chemistry colleagues can cogitate on circular clustering, but care not for cagey compounds. Chicago? Were congressing chemists considering cagey clustered carbon compounds created in the Chicago conflagration? C's confuse! Call the copywriter!

Thomas J. Volk
U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Products Laboratory, Center for Forest Mycology Research, One Gifford Pinchot Drive, Madison, WI 53705

Corrections and Clarifications

The explanation of the images in the Table of Contents for the issue of 27 November (p. 1415) keyed to the report by D. S. Faber *et al.* (p. 1494) should have read "Stochastic behavior of glycine receptors," not "glutamate receptors."

The image in the Table of Contents for the issue of 23 October (p. 523) illustrating the report by G. D. Schellenberg *et al.* (p. 668) and the Research News article by Jean Marx (p. 550) about early-onset familial Alzheimer's disease being linked to chromosome 14 was incorrect. The correct figure appears on page 668 of the same issue.