Review, "Breeding technologies to increase crop production in a changing world," p. 818), such as Africa's major staples (described in G. Ejeta's Perspective, "African green revolution needn't be a mirage," p. 831), should be extended to include locally important crops. Such crops generally are well adapted to local conditions, form the basis of local food systems, show remarkable resilience to environmental change, and frequently possess unique characteristics that are in demand on the global marketplace (*1*). Although the breeding infrastructure for such species is often severely underdeveloped and underfunded, breeding can be facilitated by linkages to closely related major crops (*2*). Strategies that aim to increase or sustain crop diversity in agricultural production systems have many benefits, including the maintenance of cultural practices and traditional knowledge, balanced nutrition, increased resilience to climate extremes, and exploitation of a broader array of environments for food production.

**HANNES DEMPEWOLF,[1]* PAUL BORDONI,[2] LOREN H. RIESEBERG,[1] JOHANNES M. M. ENGELS[2]**

[1]The Biodiversity Research Centre and Department of Botany, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC V6T 1Z4, Canada. [2]Bioversity International, 00057 Maccarese, Rome, Italy.

*To whom correspondence should be addressed. E-mail: handem@biodiversity.ubc.ca

**References**

1. R. L. Naylor *et al., Food Pol.* **29**, 15 (2004).
2. R. J. Nelson *et al., Crop Sci.* **44**, 1901 (2004).

## Food Security: GM Crops Threaten Biodiversity

THE SPECIAL SECTION ON FOOD SECURITY (12 February, p. 797) appeared to strongly and uncritically support the application and development of genetically modified (GM) technologies and the reliance on agrochemicals. There was little appreciation of the conflicts that are likely to arise. Increased access to expensive nonrenewable inputs, along with increased public acceptance and trust of GM crops, could threaten biodiversity (*1*, *2*) and overall sustainability of agriculture. The articles should have acknowledged the success of non-GM alternatives, such as observed increases in yields resulting from low-input ecological practices on rainfed farms (*3*).

In their Review for the section ("Food security: The challenge of feeding 9 billion people," p. 812), H. C. J. Godfray *et al*. wrote, "we must avoid the temptation to further sac-

### CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

**Perspectives:** "A test for geoengineering?" by A. Robock *et al*. (29 January, p. 530). In the third paragraph, the sentence "Some authors have argued that the effects of polar testing could be confined to the Arctic (*4*)" should read, "Some authors, in simulations designed to control Arctic climate, have confined radiative forcing to the Arctic (*4*)." In the fourth paragraph, the phrase "Even if insertion does indeed have to end up as planetwide" should read "Even if insertion does indeed have to end up affecting a large part of the planet…."

**Association Affairs:** "Reflections on: Our planet and its life, origins, and futures" by J. J. McCarthy (18 December 2009, p. 1646). In the second sentence of the Fig. 10 caption, the allowed emissions should have been referred to as gray, not blue.

**Reports:** "Imaging the interaction of the heliosphere with the interstellar medium from Saturn with Cassini" by S. M. Krimigis *et al*. (13 November 2009, p. 971). Because of a conversion error, on p. 973, first column, line 15, the expression ($B^2/2\mu_0$ = 0.25 pPa), and in Fig. 4 the label at lower right $P_B \sim 0.25$ pPa are both inconsistent with the value commonly assumed for the interstellar magnetic field (ISMF) of 0.25 nT (brought to the authors' attention by J. F. Cooper). The value of 0.25 nT for the ISMF corresponds to a pressure of 0.025 pPa. For the hot plasma pressure that was estimated (0.31 pPa) from the measurements to be balanced by the external ISMF, the external field would need to be ~0.9 nT.