works to a publisher and retain the right to profit from further uses of them. Freelancer-written articles published in the *JNCI* as a government publication went into the public domain—in effect, the people owned the copyright—a situation understood and accepted by freelancers who write for government publications. The copyright for freelancer-written articles published in the *JNCI* as OUP publications should remain with the writer. OUP, however, has begun to demand that freelancers sign over their copyrights for the sole, perpetual benefit of this privately owned British company.

Copyright law in this country derives from Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which authorizes Congress to provide for protection of creative works in order to encourage "authors and inventors." There is no mention of encouraging publishers. The *JNCI*'s outside contributors should not have to give up the copyrights granted them by U.S. law simply to accommodate a British publishing company.

Claire Safran
President
American Society of Journalists and Authors,
1501 Broadway, Suite 302,
New York, NY 10036, USA

■

On the Antibiotic Frontier

In their article "Exploitation of mammalian host cell functions by bacterial pathogens" (2 May, p. 718), B. Brett Finlay and Pascale Cossart state (p. 718), "No new class of antibiotic has been discovered in the past three decades, and derivatives of current antibiotics soon encounter resistance." During the past 15 years, a group of small cationic antibiotic peptides has been shown to be produced by several animal species, including the cecropins of insects, the magainins of amphibian skin, and the defensins of mammalian neutrophils (*1*). The simple chemical structures of many of these antibiotics enabled the use of solid-phase peptide synthesis technology to rapidly create thousands of structural analogs and derivatives, some of which are currently in clinical trails (*2*).

David Wade
Karolinska Institutet,
Huddinge Hospital F82,
S-141 86 Huddinge, Sweden
E-mail: David.Wade.@impi.ki.se

References

1. R. E. W. Hancock, *Lancet* **349**, 418 (1997).
2. H. G. Bowman *et al.*, *FEBS Lett.* **259**, 103 (1989).

We agree with Wade's statement regarding the antibacterial activity of small cationic peptides and their promise as therapeutic agents. In our article, our statement referred to antibiotics that are currently in clinical use—no new chemical class of antibiotic has been introduced into clinical practice since 1981. At present, only one cationic peptide has passed phase III trials and shows equivalence to a quinolone against a localized infection, although there are several others under consideration.

Unfortunately, there are few other new types of antibiotics close to clinical use, although there are many compounds that are under development (*1*). These include a small number of protein synthesis and cell wall inhibitors. Lipid A inhibitors are in early stages, and other drugs under development are derivatives of existing antibiotics (such as vancomycin). The lack of new types of antibiotics emphasizes the need to understand the mechanisms of bacterial pathogenicity, which can then be applied to developing new therapeutics.

B. Brett Finlay
Biotechnology Laboratory,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, B.C., Canada, V6T-1Z3
E-mail: bfinlay@unixg.ubc.ca
Pascale Cossart
Unité des Interactions Bactéries-Cellules,
Institut Pasteur,
75724 Paris Cedex 15, France
E-mail: pcossart@pasteur.fr

References

1. R. E. W. Hancock, *Clin. Inf. Dis.* **24** (suppl. 1), S148 (1997).

■

Environmental Economics and Ecological Economics

The Random Samples item about a new Ph.D. program in ecological economics at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute ("Eco-Pioneering at RPI", 16 May, p. 1037) could leave readers with the mistaken impression that "conventionally trained economists" shun all environmental issues. Ph.D.-level courses in environmental economics thrive at dozens of institutions [check the listings of graduate programs courtesy of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists (AERE) at gopher://UKCC.uky.edu/0text AERE-G!191/GRADS.TXT].

Since the field evolved from the older disciplines of land economics and agricultural economics, the natural home for these Ph.D. programs at many institutions is a department of agricultural and resource economics. At an institution such as the University of California at Los Angeles, however, with no "ag econ" department, we

offer a Ph.D. field in environmental and resource economics within the "conventional" Department of Economics. The Random Sample item states that "in addition to standard courses, the new program has at its core three new ones: environmental economics . . . natural-resource economics . . . and ecological economics." The descriptions of the first two courses are entirely standard, and they are taught widely. The third course tends to be interdisciplinary, and is a poorer fit for most economics programs because the subject matter is less amenable to rigorous modeling and empirical verification. It is no more and no less an orphaned subject than any other interdisciplinary endeavor.

Economists are trained to focus on matters of fact (how people and firms make choices, and therefore how these choices might be influenced by available policy measures). What they "fiercely resist" is the temptation to make value judgments regarding the choices that people ought to make. Economic analysis, ideally, is dispassionate. Economists do not consider it their prerogative to make policy, only to carefully and throughly inform the policy process. Some aspects of ecological economics do not fit this mold.

There is a prevalent misconception that an economist is no more than a cost accountant—the corporate bean counter who tells management that it is too expensive to take measures to protect the environment, a professional naysayer, and "environmental enemy number 1." The 800 or more members of AERE would likely disagree.

Trudy Ann Cameron
Department of Economics,
University of California,
Los Angeles, CA 90095–1477, USA
e-mail: tcameron@econ.ucla.edu

■

Expanding Wetlands Globally

The article "Putting a price tag on nature's bounty" by Wade Roush (Research News, 16 May, p. 1029) has an interesting implication. It would be simple to convert the two ecosystems of least value per hectare (cropland and grasslands) into that of the most valuable (wetlands). Doing this would more than triple their "global annual value" (*1*) to $110.4 trillion.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture has small programs to encourage this conversion (Wetland Restoration, Enhancement, or Creation and Wildlife Upland Habitat Management). Given the results of my brief analysis, it would be wise to expand those programs on a global scale.

*Michael E. Valdez**
4625 Scott Street,
Davenport, IA 52806, USA
E-mail: michael.valdez@qcs.org

*Retired, Florida Institute of Technology

References

1. R. Costanza *et al.*, *Nature* **387**, 253 (1997).

Corrections and Clarifications

The letter "Treating AIDS dementia" by S. A. Lipton (13 June, p. 1629) contained two errors introduced during editing. The first sentence should have stated, "I read with interest the elegant report by Ashley Haase's group (W. Cavert *et al.*, Reports, 9 May, p. 960) and the accompanying news, by Jon Cohen (9 May, p. 898) concerning the vulnerability of stubborn human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) reservoirs to new treatments." And, 11 lines from the bottom of the second column, NMDA should have been described as standing for *N*-methyl-D-aspartate.

In figure 2 (p. 1528) of the report "Arecibo radar mapping of the lunar poles: A search for ice deposits" by N. J. S. Stacy *et al.* (6 June, p. 1527), the shaded scale bar below part A should have read (from left to right), "−50, −40, −30, −20, −10," and "0." The shaded scale bar below part B should have read, "0, 0.3, 0.6, 0.9," and ">1.2."

National Academy of Sciences President Bruce Alberts was quoted incorrectly in a sidebar to a Special News Report by Andrew Lawler on the National Research Council (9 May, p. 904). Alberts said a National Research Council study on the Army's Natick Research, Development and Engineering Center is "not something I would refuse to do." Because of an error in transcribing a taped interview, he was quoted as saying the study is "not something I would choose to do." *Science* regrets the error.

The News & Comment article "New clues for two toxicological mysteries" by Jocelyn Kaiser (11 Apr., p. 201) incorrectly identified Patricia McClellan-Green. She is a toxicologist at Duke University.

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.