of the benefits incurred by all, even those who claim to be the victims of the taking.

I agree with Shaw that the costs of environmental protection are best shared equitably among the public. One way to do this would be to provide incentives to property owners to not destroy their land. This could be done by (i) charging those among us who degrade natural systems with the use of a fee based on measurable indices of the value of the systems (*1*), or (ii) taxing everyone according to income and purchasing outright land that is in need of protection. In both cases, the costs would be passed along, through normal economic activity, to the public. To create a sustainable economy, we must limit human activities that damage our own natural support system.

Fraser Shilling
Committee on Conservation,
Society for Integrative and Comparative Biology,
and *Section of Molecular and Cellular Biology,*
University of California,
Davis, CA 95616, USA

References

1. R. Costanza *et al.*, *Nature* **387**, 253 (1997).
2. *Lucas* v. *South Carolina Coastal Council, Supreme Court Rep.* **112**, 2886 (1992).

■

A U3-Like Small Nucleolar RNA in Archaea: Retraction

In a report from this laboratory (19 May 1995, p. 1056) (*1*), a complementary DNA (cDNA) clone of an RNA with U3-like properties from the hyperthermophilic archaeon *Sulfolobus acidocaldarius* was described. In subsequent experiments, we were unable to identify the encoding sequence of the RNA within the genome of this organism. The cDNA appears to have originated from the *Taq* DNA polymerase used in the cDNA polymerase chain reaction. With appropriate primers, the internal portion of the sequence can be amplified with the use of *Taq* DNA polymerase without added template DNA; amplification with Vent DNA polymerase requires added template. The encoding sequence was not found in the genome of *Thermus aquaticus*, and its organismal origin remains unknown.

It was initially observed that the ability of the processing fraction to cleave the 5′ external transcribed spacer of ribosomal precursor RNA (pre rRNA) was reproducibly sensitive to micrococcal nuclease. This was interpreted in the report (*1*) to mean that the processing fraction contained an essential RNA component. With further purification and using the same assay, we now observe that the more pure fraction is not sensitive to micrococcal nuclease digestion, whereas the less pure fraction is sensitive. At present, we do not understand the full significance of this observation, but it suggests that an RNA may not be required for these endonucleolytic cleavages. Finally, the use of an in vitro assay to study both precursor and 5′-end maturation cleavages in a pre-16*S* rRNA substrate was reported (*1*). Recent work has shown that, under the conditions used (*1*), precursor cleavages occur efficiently, whereas only a small amount of 5′-end maturation cleavage occurs. We therefore retract and correct these aspects of the report (*1*).

Anthony G. Russell
Mario Moniz de Sa
Patrick P. Dennis
Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology,
University of British Columbia,
Vancouver, BC, Canada V6T-1Z3

References

1. S. Potter, P. Durovic, P. P. Dennis, *Science* **268**, 1056 (1995).

Corrections and Clarifications

Marcia Barinaga's 27 June Research News article, "New imaging methods provide a better view into the brain" (p. 1974) erroneously attributed the imaging of ocular dominance columns exclusively to Kamil Ugurbil's neuroimaging team at the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. That research project was conducted by Ravi Menon at the John P. Robarts Research Institute in London, Ontario, Canada, in collaboration with Ugurbil at the University of Minnesota.

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.