(7) also suffered from most of these design faults, and it considered only two pollutants, neglecting the influence of their correlates. These two studies (4, 7) are thus a shaky basis on which to attempt to interpret the ambiguous daily studies.

Finally, the scientific skepticism about this issue runs much deeper than just pro forma industrial opposition. A recent invited critical review of the particulate matter standards expressed doubt about the validity of both the short- and long-term mortality studies (8), and other academics have expressed similar opinions (9, 10). EPA would be well advised to demonstrate the actual public health benefits already accrued from its existing air quality regulations before mandating the hefty additional investments that meeting the new regulations will require.

Frederick W. Lipfert
Environmental Consultant,
23 Carll Court,
Northport, NY 11768, USA

References

1. J. M. Samet, S. L. Zeger, J. E. Kelsall, J. Xu, "Air pollution, weather, and mortality in Philadelphia, 1973–88, Report to the Heath Effects Institute on Phase 1B: Particle Epidemiology Evaluation Project" (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, Baltimore, MD, 1996).
2. R. T. Burnett, S. Cakmak, J. R. Brook, D. Krewoki, *Environ. Health Perspect.* **105**, 614 (1997).
3. F. W. Lipfert and R. E. Wyzga, *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* **47**, 517 (1997).
4. D. W. Dockery *et al.*, *N. Engl. J. Med.* **329**, 1753 (1993).
5. E. L. Frazier, C. A. Okoro, C. Smith, D. V. McQueen, *Morbid. Mortal. Wkly. Rep.* **45** (no.556), 1 (1996).
6. F. W. Lipfert, in *Particulate Matter: Health and Regulatory Issues* (Air and Waste Management Association, Publ. VIP 49, Proceedings of the International Specialty Conference, Pittsburgh, PA, April 1995), pp. 78–102.
7. C. A. Pope, III, M. J. Thun, M. M. Namboodiri, D. W. Dockery, J. S. Evans, *Am. J. Resp. Crit. Care Med.* **151**, 669 (1995).
8. S. Vedal, *J. Air Waste Manag. Assoc.* **47**, 551 (1997).
9. R. F. Phalen, testimony before subcommittees on health and environment and on oversight and investigations, Committee on Commerce, U.S. House of Representatives, 8 May 1997.
10. A. A. Moghissi, *Environ. Intl.* **23**, 147 (1997).

■

Genetic Evolution of Morphology

Two commentaries in the 4 July issue, by their contrast, inadvertently point to a missing element in most discussions of the evolution of animal form. In his Perspective "Which came first, the hypha or the yeast?" (p. 52), P. T. Magee draws the lesson from a report by B. R. Braun and A. D. Johnson (4 July, p. 105) that the existence of a simple genetic switch between the budding yeast and the thread-like hypha morphologies of *Candida albicans* suggests that "there is no 'default' form for this organism." This seems reasonable: C. *albicans* is thought of as polymorphic, with numerous forms being consistent with a single genetic constitution. The choice between alternative forms in such cases may depend on epigenetic or environmental factors, although, in principle, heritable genetic change could bias such choices, leading to distinct morphological varieties.

This view may be compared with one presented in the Special News Report by Elizabeth Pennisi and Wade Roush "Developing a new view of evolution" (4 July, p. 34), in which they discuss, among other things, recently published evidence that a gene called *manx* distinguishes a species of tunicates whose larvae lack tails from a related species whose larvae develop them (B. J. Swalla and W. R. Jeffery, Reports, 15 Nov., 1996 p. 1205). We are told in the News article that the result "raises the possibility that a single genetic change could be responsible for the innovation that led to a tail in primitive vertebrates."

The attribution of ineffable creative power to individual genes is not an isolated instance, but can be traced back at least to the erroneous "unit character" model of Mendelism propounded by some early ge-

neticists (*1*) and lives on in some precincts of developmental and evolutionary biology (Letters, C. Nielsen, 5 Sept., p. 1422). Investigators of the regulation of morphogenesis of protists and bacteria seem relatively resistant to this form of mystification, as exemplified by the recent work on C. *albicans* [see also (*2*)].

Genetic absolutism does not take into account that the correspondence of a given genotype to a nearly unique morphological phenotype seen in modern animals may itself be a product of evolution: in the absence of more recently evolved redundancies and other back-up mechanisms, the earliest animals may have been as polymorphic, or more so, as C. *albicans*. If true, this would imply that once the metazoa emerged, the genetic evolution of morphology would have been implemented not so much by the origination of novelty as by the selective stabilization of particular forms from those within the ancestral animals' morphological repertoire (*3*).

Stuart A. Newman
Department of Cell Biology and Anatomy, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY 10595, USA
E-mail: newman@nymc.edu

References

1. L. C. Dunn, *A Short History of Genetics* (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965).
2. J. T. Bonner, *Life Cycles: Reflections of an Evolutionary Biologist* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1993).
3. S. A. Newman, *J. Evol. Biol.* **7**, 467 (1994).

■

Resonance Raman Results: Retraction

We wish to alert readers that the resonance Raman spectra reported in two papers (Reports, D. Qiu *et al.*, 6 May 1994, p. 817; M. Kumar *et al.*, 27 Oct. 1995, p. 628) (*1*, *2*) have been found to be unreliable and to consist of artifacts. However, the non-Raman data in both reports are reliable. We are confident that all the samples were properly prepared and contained the reaction intermediates under investigation. However, we have been unable to reproduce the Raman spectra with fresh samples, and judge the published spectra to be artifacts resulting from electronic processing of the data.

This retraction affects our main conclusions in both papers about the metal(s) to which CO and methyl bind in CODH, because these conclusions rested heavily on the reported isotope sensitivity of signals that we now consider spurious. We are working to produce positive new evidence regarding this topic.

Thomas G. Spiro
Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA

References

1. D. Qiu, M. Kumar, S. W. Ragsdale, T. G. Spiro, *Science* **264**, 817 (1994).
2. M. Kumar, D. Qiu, T. G. Spiro, S. W. Ragsdale, *ibid.* **270**, 628 (1995).

Corrections and Clarifications

In the Table of Contents for the issue of 12 September, on page 1579. Technical Comment author H. Tiedemann's name was spelled incorrectly.

In This Week in Science for the issue of 5 September (p. 1413), it is stated incorrectly under the title "Big craters on little bodies" that Vesta is an "Earth-crossing" asteroid. Vesta's orbit is completely within the main asteroid belt. Only its meteoroid progeny are found in Earth-crossing orbits.

In the next-to-last paragraph of the letter "Telomerase activity of reverse transcriptase" by Miria Ricchetti and Henri Buc (15 Aug., p. 887), the last sentence should have begun, "On specific template sequences, it is therefore sufficient to modify the cationic environment (from magnesium chloride to manganese chloride in the reaction buffer). . . ." Magnesium chloride and manganese chloride were inadvertently reversed during the editing process. *Science* regrets the error.

In figure 2 (p. 495) of the article "Human domination of Earth's ecosystems" by P. M. Vitousek *et al.* (25 July, p. 494), the y axis should have read, "Percentage," not "Percentage change."

The e-mail address of K. Tanaka, corresponding author of the report "Epilepsy and exacerbation of brain injury in mice lacking the glutamate transporter GLT-1" (13 June, p. 1699), was incorrect. It should have been, "tanaka@ncnaxp.ncnp.go.jp".

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.