recognize the contributions science has made, and continues to make, in understanding the process of ecological restoration (*2*).

Roger C. Anderson
Department of Biology, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61790–4120
Edith B. Allen
Department of Botany and Plant Sciences, University of California, Riverside, CA 92521–0124
M. Rebecca Anderson
Department of Health Sciences, Illinois State University, Normal, IL 61790–5220
James S. Fralish
Department of Forestry, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, IL 62901
R. Michael Miller
Environmental Research Division, Argonne National Laboratory, 9700 South Cass Avenue, Argonne, IL 60439
William A. Niering
Department of Botany, Connecticut College, New London, CT 06320

References and Notes

1. V. Kline, in *John T. Curtis: Fifty Years of Wisconsin Plant Ecology*, J. S. Fralish, R. P. McIntosh, O. L. Loucks, Eds. (Wisconsin Academy of Sciences, Arts, and Letters, Madison, WI, 1993), pp. 51–56; E. Howell and F. Stearns, in *ibid.*, pp. 57–66.
2. In this regard, the Society for Ecological Restoration has recently launched a journal, *Restoration Ecology* (Blackwell Scientific). The first issue was published in March 1993.

■

The Chlorine Controversy

Ivan Amato's News & Comment article "The crusade against chlorine" (9 July, p. 152) captures the muddled thinking of nonexperts who abuse science to achieve a social agenda. The article and some of the individuals quoted therein interchange environmental issues and health effects as though they were the same. There may be good reasons for reducing the impact on the environment of some chlorinated compounds. This is discussed in an in-depth review (*1*) by an expert panel of which I was a member. Nevertheless, the contribution of chlorinated compounds to human health effects is another issue. For example, the benefits of DDT in malaria prevention far outweigh any theoretical human cancer hazard, as do the benefits of drinking-water chlorination. In fact, there is no chlorinated compound that has been proved to be a significant human cancer hazard (*2*). To the contrary, the drug toremifene, which contains chlorine, does not induce cancer

in rats, whereas its nonchlorinated analogue tamoxifen is strongly hepatocarcinogenic (3). The application of scientific principles in assessing benefits and risks of chemical use in modern society is long overdue (4).

Gary M. Williams
American Health Foundation,
1 Dana Road, Valhalla, NY 10595

References

1. Report of Expert Panel on Chlorinated Organic Compounds, in preparation for the Chlorine Institute, Washington, DC.
2. *IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of the Carcinogenic Risk to Humans, Overall Evaluations of Carcinogenicity: An Updating of IARC Monographs Vol. 1 to 42* (International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyons, France, 1987) (supplement 7); G. M. Williams and G. M. Weisburger, in *Casarett and Doull's Toxicology: The Basic Science of Poisons*, M. O. Amdur, J. Doull, C. D. Klaassen, Eds. (Pergamon, New York, ed. 4, 1991), pp. 127–200.
3. G. M. Williams, M. J. Iatropoulos, M. V. Djordjevic, O. P. Kaltenberg, *Carcinogenesis* **14**, 315 (1993); G. C. Hard *et al.*, *Cancer Res.*, in press.
4. R. F. Willes, E. R. Nestmann, P. A. Miller, J. C. Orr, I. C. Munro, *Regulat. Toxicol. Pharmacol.*, in press.

I read that Greenpeace and other environmental organizations propose the banning of all compounds that contain the element chlorine. In the same spirit, I believe all compounds containing the element oxygen should also be banned, because such well-known components of smog as ozone, carbon monoxide, and nitrogen oxides all contain oxygen. I am starting a new grass-roots organization to support this worthy cause. It will be called No Oxygen (NO), and our slogan will be "Just Say NO."

T. S. Benedict Yen
Department of Pathology,
School of Medicine,
University of California,
San Francisco, CA 94143–0506

Corrections and Clarifications

In "Cornell leads battle of the B factories" (News, 27 Aug., p. 1111) by Faye Flam, two erroneous statements were attributed to Burton Richter, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center. Synchrotron radiation is a concern in B factory design not because it can throw the beam off course but because it heats the vacuum chamber walls. And the use of superconductors in radio-frequency cavities is, contrary to the article, not an untried innovation. Both errors were *Science*'s, not Richter's.

The title of the Perspective by Christopher Miller in the issue of 24 September (p. 1692) was printed incorrectly. It should have read, "Potassium selectivity in proteins: Oxygen cage or π in the face?" In the figure caption on the same page, "-electron" was printed incorrectly instead of "π-electron."