

## /CORRESPONDENCE

### Headline Outrage

To the editor:

I was extremely disappointed to read the headline "How biotech will cope with Hillbilly healthcare" (*Bio/Technology* 11:434, April) and the first paragraph of the Commentary on Wall Street section in the latest issue of *Bio/Technology*. Indeed, I was so incensed at the outrageous implications of the headline and first paragraph that I could not bring myself to read the remainder of the article. Therefore, *Bio/Technology* failed to present effectively an opinion that, while I might not agree with, I could read and appreciate an alternative viewpoint. One may disagree with the appointment of Hillary Clinton to lead the Health Care Reform Plan

IMAGE  
UNAVAILABLE  
FOR COPYRIGHT  
REASONS

for a variety of reasons. However there is no reason to use name calling in order to make one's case. Name calling compounded with a distinct flavor of sexism is simply anti-intellectual and ineffective. It is not worthy of a scientific journal. The efforts of the Clinton administration represent the majority opinion in this country that something must be done to control health care costs. It would be prudent of *Bio/Technology* to take this opinion seriously and to assume a leadership role in this area rather than to trivialize what is considered by most thoughtful people to be a very serious problem.

Margaret D. Rosa  
32 Grove St.  
Winchester, MA 01890

### Elephants in the Living Room

To the editor:

While the headline "How biotech will cope with Hillbilly health care" (*Bio/Technology* 11:434-435, April) was tritely clever, you killed the messenger in your article. At least the Clinton administration has acknowledged that there is a health care problem to address; the Bush administration never even noticed the presence of this elephant in the living room, not to mention that of its pachyderm cousin, the national debt.

William F. Schraeder  
48-00 Saunders Street  
Rego Park, New York 11374

### Pasteur's Place

To the editor:

I enjoyed Robert Bud's article "100 Years of Biotechnology" (*Bio/Technology* 11:S14-S15, March 1993). It made me think back a bit further back than 100 years to Louis Pasteur, who established the origins of fermentation at a time when microbes were but the germs of an idea. Pasteur certainly deserves a mention in any history of biotechnology.

Alfred Hemming  
100 Irvington St.  
Montclair, New Jersey 07042

### Agbio Not the Problem

To the editor:

I am writing in response to an article that appeared in your anniversary issue entitled "Agbio and Third World Development" (*Bio/Technology* 11:S13, March). This article and others like it which appear in your journal from time to time are surprising, given the forum in which they appear. It seems clear to me that saying that biotechnology, and in particular agricultural biotechnology "threatens to compound the problems of the poor and hungry" is like saying that computer science is responsible for upending the economy by taking away tedious, repetitive, meaningless work. Is the real solution getting rid of the machines and returning to paper and pencil?

Peter Marketos  
#6 Aaareweg  
CH-3806  
Bönigen, Switzerland

### Anniversary Greetings

To the editor:

Congratulations on your anniversary! The March issue was terrific and I enjoyed perusing your cover full of covers from past issues. It really gave me a sense of how much has happened in this field in the space of ten short years. Here's hoping you have ten more good ones!

David L. Poole  
300 E. Sola St.  
Santa Barbara, California 93101

### Errata

The figures that appeared on pp. 454-455 of "Forestry in the 21st Century" by Pramod Gupta et al. in the April issue were out of sequence. The figure labeled 1 was actually Figure 2; the figure labeled 2 was actually Figure 4; the figure labeled 3 was actually Figure 1; and the figure labeled 4 was actually Figure 3. We apologize for the inconvenience.