

American Association for the Advancement of Science
Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Publisher: Richard S. Nicholson

Editor: Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.

News Editor: Ellis Rubinstein

Managing Editor: Patricia A. Morgan

Deputy Editors: Philip H. Abelson (*Engineering and Applied Sciences*); John I. Brauman (*Physical Sciences*)

EDITORIAL STAFF

Senior Editor: Eleanore Butz

Associate Editors: Keith W. Brocklehurst, Martha Coleman, R. Brooks Hanson, Barbara Jasny, Katrina L. Kelner, Edith Meyers, Linda J. Miller, Phillip D. Szuroni, David F. Voss

Letters Editor: Christine Gilbert

Book Reviews: Katherine Livingston, *editor*; Susan Milius

This Week in Science: Ruth Levy Guyer

Contributing Editor: Lawrence I. Grossman

Chief Production Editor: Ellen E. Murphy

Editing Department: Lois Schmitt, *head*; Mary McDaniel, Patricia L. Moe, Barbara P. Ordway

Copy Desk: Joi S. Granger, Jane Hurd, MaryBeth Shartle, Beverly Shields

Production Manager: James Landry

Assistant Production Manager: Kathleen C. Fishback

Art Director: Yolanda M. Rook

Graphics and Production: Holly Bishop, Julie Cherry, Catherine S. Siskos

Covers Editor: Grayce Finger

Systems Analyst: William Carter

NEWS STAFF

Correspondent-at-Large: Barbara J. Culliton

Deputy News Editors: Roger Lewin, Colin Norman

News and Comment/Research News: Mark H. Crawford, Constance Holden, Richard A. Kerr, Elliot Marshall, Jean L. Marx, Joseph Palca, Robert Pool, Leslie Roberts, Marjorie Sun, M. Mitchell Waldrop

European Correspondent: David Dickson

West Coast Correspondent: Marcia Barinaga

BUSINESS STAFF

Circulation Director: John G. Colson

Fulfillment Manager: Ann Ragland

Business Staff Manager: Deborah Rivera-Wienhold

Classified Advertising Supervisor: Karen Morgenstern

ADVERTISING REPRESENTATIVES

Director: Earl J. Scherago

Traffic Manager: Donna Rivera

Traffic Manager (Recruitment): Gwen Canter

Advertising Sales Manager: Richard L. Charles

Marketing Manager: Herbert L. Burklund

Employment Sales Manager: Edward C. Keller

Sales: New York, NY 10036; J. Kevin Henebry, 1515 Broadway (212-730-1050); Scotch Plains, NJ 07076; C. Richard Callis, 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873); Chicago, IL 60914; Jack Ryan, 525 W. Higgins Rd. (312-885-8675); San Jose, CA 95112; Bob Brindley, 310 S. 16th St. (408-998-4690); Dorset, VT 05251; Fred W. Dieffenbach, Kent Hill Rd. (802-867-5581); Damascus, MD 20872; Rick Sommer, 11318 Kings Valley Dr. (301-972-9270); U.K., Europe: Nick Jones, +44(0647)52918; Telex 42513; FAX (0647) 52053.

Information for contributors appears on page XI of the 31 March 1989 issue. Editorial correspondence, including requests for permission to reprint and reprint orders, should be sent to 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20005. Telephone: 202-326-6500. **Advertising correspondence** should be sent to Tenth Floor, 1515 Broadway, New York, NY 10036. Telephone 212-730-1050 or WU Telex 968082 SCHERAGO, or FAX 212-382-3725.

Effects of Electric and Magnetic Fields

Since the late 1960s there have been controversy and litigation about health effects of electric and magnetic fields produced by power transmission lines. Recent studies have heightened this concern and have led to a request by a subcommittee of Congress that the Office of Technology Assessment (OTA) review the problem. In turn, OTA contracted for a study by a group at Carnegie-Mellon University. Their recently published report* provides a comprehensive review and analysis of the pertinent literature together with policy recommendations. A key finding is that if there are effects on human health from exposure to fields created by electricity, they arise mainly from use in the home. Household appliances and wiring produce electric and magnetic fields that in magnitude are comparable to those near the right of way of a transmission line.

Until recently, conventional wisdom held that fields associated with power systems posed no threat to human health. There is no substantial transfer of energy from power fields to biological systems. Moreover, naturally occurring fields *in vivo* are at least 100 times as intense as those induced by 60-hertz power fields. In addition, there has been an absence of any large-scale obvious public health effects associated with electrification.

However, a growing number of positive findings have demonstrated that under special circumstances weak low-frequency electromagnetic fields can produce changes at the cellular level. Among the responses found in laboratory studies of animal cells and tissues are modulation of ion flows, interference with DNA synthesis and RNA transcription, and interaction with the biomedical kinetics of cancer cells. In a few instances effects have been demonstrated at the level of the whole animal. Experiments involving calcium-ion efflux from chick brain tissue *in vitro* produced interesting but puzzling effects. At 60 hertz, enhanced efflux occurred at three intermediate values of field strength, but not at higher or lower values. In addition, when field strength was held constant, enhanced efflux occurred at a series of specific frequencies but not in between them. The values of these frequencies were influenced by the strength and orientation of static magnetic fields.

To evaluate electromagnetic effects on humans, one must rely on epidemiological studies. These are notoriously difficult to conduct with certainty due to confounding factors. For example, in cancer studies one must control for smoking, diet, food preparation, and other variables. Perhaps the two most quoted epidemiological studies were conducted in and around Denver. Both reported a doubling of the frequency of childhood leukemia in homes where fields were higher than average. One of the two studies showed that high appliance use leading to magnetic fields greater than 2.5 milligauss was associated with increased risk in the offspring for all cancers. Also childhood electric blanket and isolette exposures were associated with increased cancer risks.

Studies other than those at mile-high Denver have yielded mixed results regarding the question of association between cancer and low-frequency electromagnetic fields. The OTA report states, "Overall the evidence now available is too weak to allow firm conclusions either way."

If there are human health effects, what are the cogent variables? For example, it is not certain whether the changing electric fields or magnetic fields are the causative agents. Are effects related to the integral of field strength over time, or are infrequent exposures to very high fields crucial? If regulators wished to set standards now, they would not have a solid knowledge base to guide them. They could mandate the expenditure of tens of billions of dollars to little effect.

The situation calls for much more effort in research than has hitherto taken place. The previous level of support in the United States has been of the order of a few million dollars a year. The new work should include more animal studies and substantial epidemiological studies, coupled with accurate measures of fields. In the meantime, one option suggested by the OTA study is to "adopt a 'prudent avoidance' strategy. That is, systematically look for strategies which can keep people out of 60 Hz fields . . . but only adopt those which look to be 'prudent' investments given their cost and our current level of scientific understanding about possible risks."—PHILIP H. ABELSON

*I. Nair, M. G. Morgan, H. K. Florig, "Biological effects of power frequency electric and magnetic fields" (Office of Technology Assessment, Washington, DC, May 1989).