choose the intervention with the greater likelihood of achieving a meaningful reduction in blood pressure. The data now available appear to make that choice relatively simple—a dietary strategy using the DASH approach is more effective.

Moore and his colleagues express concern about the use of the results of DASH "to predict the effect of the DASH diet in persons with more severe hypertension." Yet, their own analysis of DASH demonstrated that the blood-pressure reductions were greater in subjects with higher systolic and diastolic pressures. Furthermore, in their original article (*4*), the DASH authors themselves appropriately projected the impact of consumption of the DASH combination diet on coronary artery disease and stroke events in our society. My projection of the effects of the DASH diet on the incidence of moderately severe hypertension, therefore, is consistent with the use by Moore and his co-authors of the DASH data to project an impact on cardiovascular end-points. My projection also documented the published sources of data used to arrive at that estimate.

In raising their third objection, Moore and colleagues ignore the fact that, while I mentioned specific nutrients, the overall emphasis of the article is totally supportive of whole foods rather than single nutrients for optimal blood pressure control. This is a conclusion I first articulated in a 1984 *Science* paper (*5*), which identified the very dietary patterns that DASH tested and confirmed as being beneficial to blood-pressure regulation and at least as effective as mono-drug therapy. We now all know that a diet rich in low-fat dairy foods, fruits, and vegetables provides a viable public health strategy to treat and possibly prevent chronic medical problems whose control continues to elude us.

David A. McCarron
Department of Medicine, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, OR 97201, USA. E-mail: mccarron@ohsu.edu

References

1. N. A. Graudal, A. M. Galløe, P. Garred, *J. Am. Med. Assoc.* **279**, 1383 (1998).
2. L. Griffith *et al.*, *Am. J. Hypertens.*, in press.
3. N. J. Birkett, *Am. J. Epidemiol.* **148**, 223 (1998).
4. L. J. Appel *et al.*, *N. Engl. J. Med.* **336**, 1117 (1997).
5. D. A. McCarron, C. D. Morris, H. J. Henry, J. L. Stanton, *Science* **224**, 1392 (1984).

The Burning of Yellowstone—Another Perspective

The article "Yellowstone rising again from ashes of devastating fires" by Richard Stone (Research News, 5 June, p. 1527) describes the struggle to rationalize the official burning of the forests of Yellowstone in 1988. Independent observers who know the status of the park today say that the rosy picture of renewal presented by the National Park Service and by ecologists quoted in this article is not accurate. The photograph shown of young trees sprouting among the blackened tree stumps does not typify 90% of the previously forested areas decimated by the all-consuming fires.

Ecologists who defend the controversial "let forest fires burn" policy that could well destroy the rest of our national parks if it is applied inappropriately do not fully take into account the vast cemetery of burned, rotting, and bug-infested tree stumps that is all that remains of 320,000 hectares of once-beautiful Yellowstone forests, the millions of small animals that were incinerated, and the thousands of tons of topsoil that have washed into stream beds because the stabilizing vegetation was destroyed. The ecologists quoted imply that those who latter struggled to stop the Yellowstone fires in 1988 were misguided, ecologically ignorant souls (this includes most of the general public, leaders of Congress, and the president of the United States at the time).

Yellowstone forest, after the fire

The "miraculous" forest renewal that is described also occurs after controlled burns during off-peak fire season; these burns clean up the forest and make it fire tolerant. Controlled burns at the proper time generally do not incinerate the entire forest and all living things. The cruel irony is that the Park Service has spent more money in the last 10 years to rationalize what it did to Yellowstone than would have been required to carry out a program of controlled burns that could have saved the Yellowstone forest that was destroyed.

Bill Wattenburg
University Foundation, California State University, Chico 95929, CA, USA. E-mail: wattenburg@ aol.com

CORRECTIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

The DNA on the cover of the Genome issue of 23 October was printed incorrectly. The image, meant to be a right-handed helix, was to portray genomic information as a reflection of the commonality of information among life-forms. In showing the mirror image (left-handed DNA), the idea was demonstrated more literally than planned.

In the report "Organic carbon fluxes and ecological recovery from the Cretaceous-Tertiary mass extinction" by Steven D'Hondt *et al.* (9 Oct., p. 276), the images for figures 1 and 2 on page 277 were inadvertently interchanged.