

UCLA

Electronic Green Journal

Title

The Chlorine Debate: A Selected Bibliography

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/5g9433sb>

Journal

Electronic Green Journal, 1(3)

Authors

Lewis, Deanna L.
Chepesiuk, Ron

Publication Date

1995

DOI

10.5070/G31310194

Copyright Information

Copyright 1995 by the author(s). All rights reserved unless otherwise indicated. Contact the author(s) for any necessary permissions. Learn more at <https://escholarship.org/terms>

Peer reviewed

The Chlorine Debate: A Selected Bibliography

Deanna Lewis <lewisd@admin.winthrop.edu>

and

Ron Chepesiuk <chepesiukr@winthrop.edu>

Dacus Library, Winthrop University, Rock Hill, SC 29733, USA. TEL: 803-323-2131.

Chlorine is one of the world's most widely used chemicals, the building element vital to almost every United States industry. We use chlorine and chlorine-based products whenever we drink a glass of water, buy food wrapped in plastic, purchase produce in the supermarket, pour bleach into a washing machine, have a prescription filled, print out a computer document or drive a car.

Chlorine, a member of the halogen (salt-forming) group of metallic elements, was first made by Swedish chemist Carl Wilhelm Scheele in 1774, who treated hydrochloric acid with manganese dioxide. In 1810, the English chemist Sir Humphrey Davy determined that chlorine was a chemical element and named it from the Greek word meaning greenish-yellow. One hundred and eighty-five years later, chlorine compounds are ubiquitous components in the manufacturing of paper, plastics, insecticides, cleaning fluids, antifreeze, paints, medicines, and petroleum products. The unfortunate and unavoidable by-product of these manufacturing processes is dioxin, one of the most toxic substances on the planet. Dioxins are also produced whenever chlorine containing substances, such as PVC, are burned.

Life as we know it will change, if a Greenpeace campaign is successful. The powerful environmental group has mounted a well-organized campaign that has as its objective nothing less than a total, worldwide ban on chlorine. With the public health and billions of dollars at stake, the debate over chlorine has become one of the world's most contentious and controversial issues. "Is a chlorine-free future possible?" asked Bonnie Rice, a spokesperson for Greenpeace's Chlorine Free Campaign. "Yes, it can be done without massive disruption of the economy and of society, if it is done in the right manner."

The chlorine industry and its allies say a total ban on chlorine would be neither wise, possible, nor economically feasible. "We find the chlorine campaign outrageous in its scope and purpose," explained Leo Anziano, the Chairman of the Washington-based Chlorine Chemistry Council, an organization that lobbies on behalf of the chlorine industry. "We believe it's based on pure emotion and not on science. Without any real study, it's been determined that all organochlorines (compounds containing chlorine) are harmful". The chlorine industry has presented many statistics on what it says will be the cost to society of substituting other substances for chlorine, and these figures are staggering. The net cost to consumers would exceed \$90 billion a year, about \$1,440 a year for a family of four, according to studies conducted by the Chlorine Institute. About 1.3 million jobs depend on the chlorine industry, an amount equal to the number of jobs in the state of Oregon. Wages and salaries paid to those employees totaled more than \$31 billion in 1990, approximately the same as the total payroll that year for all state and local government employees in Oregon.

"With its call for a total ban, Greenpeace has gone beyond common sense and is jeopardizing the health and economic well-being of this country," Anziano charged. Greenpeace is also well-armed with statistics. Their

spokesmen argue that, if implemented with careful planning, the transition to a chlorine-free economy could save money, create new jobs, and be "economically and socially just." Greenpeace puts the savings from phasing-out chlorine at \$80 to \$160 billion annually.

The phase-out of chlorine would take place over a 30-year period and would involve substituting what Greenpeace describes as "traditional materials and non-chlorinated plastics." In the pulp and paper industry, for example, a totally chlorine-free bleaching process would be implemented, while, in dry cleaning, water-based systems would replace chlorine-based solvents. Nothing is more contentious in the chlorine debate than Greenpeace's firm position that all chlorine and organochlorines threaten people and so should be banned. "Industry produces more than 11,000 chlorine chemicals, each of which could take years of study," explains Jack Weinberg, a spokesperson for Greenpeace's Chlorine Campaign. "Traditionally, we have looked at chemicals as being innocent until proven guilty. We need to change that approach."

Industry warns that it is a big mistake not to distinguish among chlorinated compounds because the mere presence of chlorine does not render a compound carcinogenic or harmful. "Regulations should target specific substances whose environmental harm has already been demonstrated through rigorous scientific studies," says Anziano. "The sloppy reasoning used by Greenpeace and their allies is no substitute for careful risk analysis."

Science aside, much of the chlorine debate has been emotional, and nothing has made tempers flare more than the issue of whether a link exists between breast cancer and chlorinated pesticides and other chlorine-based chemicals. Greenpeace has released a report, "Chlorine, Human Health and the Environment: The Breast Cancer Warning," which reviews "new scientific evidence" linking chlorine-based chemicals to breast cancer, an epidemic that kills 50,000 women annually in the U.S. alone. Not surprisingly, industry has produced its own "scientific evidence." For example, a study released by CanTox, a Canadian environmental consulting group, concluded that "it is evident ... the proposed causal association (of breast cancer) to bio-accumulative chlorinated organic compounds should be rejected."

In the titanic struggle over chlorine's future, industry is clearly on the defensive. Recognizing that the court of public opinion will be the final arbiter on the issue, it has begun to shift its own public relations machine into gear. The Chemical Manufacturers Association has established the Chlorine Chemistry Council, which has a multi-million dollar budget, while big chemical companies such as Dow Chemical have created full-time positions with names like "Director of Chlorine Issues." "We need to offer the public a different view of chlorine chemistry than the one the anti-chlorine forces have been purveying for years", says Brad Lienhart, Managing Director of the Chlorine Chemistry Council.

The anti-chlorine camp, however, has garnered the support of several influential scientific, environmental, and international organizations, including the International Joint Commission on the Great Lakes, the Paris Commission on the North Atlantic (a multinational-level meeting of 15 European governments and the European Community), the 21-nation Barcelona Convention on the Mediterranean, and the American Public Health Association.

Strong anti-chlorine sentiment exists in the White House, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the U.S. Congress. President Clinton's proposal for the Clean Water Act involves a strategy for reducing or prohibiting chlorine use. Meanwhile, the chlorine industry is worried that the EPA might curtail or even

ban the production of chlorine and organochlorines. These developments are making many chemical companies such as Vulcan and Dow Chemical look quietly for alternatives to chlorine. Dow, for example, has created a new business called Advanced Cleaning Systems, which provides water-based cleaning technology for green industrial niches. "In the future, we have to be more critical of irresponsible chlorine use to protect the essential uses of chlorine," Tom Parrott, Vulcan's Director of Environmental Health and Safety, explained to *Chemical Week*.

The following bibliography has been compiled to aid researchers interested in studying the chlorine issue. Although the detrimental effect of chloroflourocarbons (CFCs) on the ozone layer is a very important topic, it has been excluded from this bibliography because of the massive amount of literature available.

The bibliography includes monographs, journal and newspaper articles, UN, U.S., and international documents, Internet resources, and organizations to contact for more information. Except for newspaper articles, the bibliography fully covers the period from 1985 to 1994; because of the voluminous newspaper coverage, only articles from 1994 have been included. It is arranged by type of document, and, within types, the arrangement is alphabetical by author and chronological.

MONOGRAPHS

Assessment of the economic benefits of chlor-alkali chemicals to the United States and Canadian economy. 1993. [n.p.]: Charles River Associates, Inc. for the Chlorine Institute.

Greenpeace publications

1994. Achieving zero dioxin: an emergency strategy for dioxin elimination. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1994. Chlorine bibliography. [Raleigh, N.C.]: Greenpeace.

1994. Dioxin factories: a study of the creation and discharge of dioxins and other organochlorines from the production of PVC. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1994. Dressed to kill: the dangers of dry cleaning and the case for chlorine free alternatives. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1994. Transition planning for the chlorine phase-out: economic benefits, costs, and opportunities. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1993. Breast cancer and the environment: the chlorine connection. 2nd ed. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1993. PVC: An environmental perspective. Devon, UK: Greenpeace Exeter Laboratory.

1992. Chlorine: An industry with no future. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1992. Death in small doses: the effects of organochlorines on aquatic ecosystems. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace International.

1992. Dry cleaning: Hidden hazards. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace International.

1992. Death in small doses: the effects of organochlorines on aquatic ecosystems. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

1991. The product is the poison: the case for a chlorine phase-out. 2 vols. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

Scientific analysis indicates that the available data do not support a causal relationship between chlorinated organic compounds and human breast cancer. 1992. Mississauga, Ont.: CanTox, Inc. for the Chlorine Institute.

Thornton, J. 1993. Chlorine, human health, and the environment: the breast cancer warning. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

UNITED STATES, UNITED NATIONS, and INTERNATIONAL DOCUMENTS

European Communities Commission. 1989. Commission decision of 21 December 1988 relating to a proceeding pursuant to Article 85 of the EEC Treaty (IV/31.865, PVC). Luxembourg: Office for Official Publications of the European Communities.

International Joint Commission. Technology for reducing organo-chlorines in pulp mill effluents. [Windsor, Ont.]: International Joint Commission.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

1994. Guide to cleaner technologies: Alternatives to chlorinated solvents for cleaning and decreasing. Cincinnati, Ohio: Office of Research and Development.

1993. Response to the International Joint Commission. Chicago, Ill.: Environmental Protection Agency, Great Lakes National Program Office.

1991a. Alternatives for CFC-113 and chloroform in metal cleaning. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation.

1991b. Aqueous and semi-aqueous alternatives for CFC-113 and methyl chloroform cleaning of printed circuit board assemblies. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Air and Radiation.

World Health Organization. 1991. Chlorinated drinking-water, chlorination by-products, some other halogenated compounds, cobalt and cobalt compounds. IARC Monographs on the Evaluation of the Carcinogenic Risks to Humans. Lyon, France: World Health Organization, International Agency for Research on Cancer.

JOURNAL ARTICLES

Abelson, P. H. 1994a. Chemicals: Perception versus facts. *Science* 264 (8 April): 183. 1994b. Chlorine and organochlorine compounds. *Science* 264 (26 August): 1155.

Albert, R. J. 1994. Survey shows worldwide growth in mills using TCF processes. *Pulp & Paper* 68 (June): 93-103.

Amato, I. 1994. The crusade to ban chlorine. *Garbage*, 6 (Summer): 30-39. 1993. The crusade against chlorine. *Science* 261 (9 July): 152-54.

Anderson, C. 1991. Cholera epidemic traced to risk miscalculation: Cancer fear led to halting chlorination. *Nature* 354 (28 February): 255.

Anderson, E. V. 1993. Chlorine producers fight back against call for chemical's phaseout. *Chemical & Engineering News* 71 (10 May): 11-12.

Armstrong, L. and Scott, A. 1992. Exposing the sanitary products "Whitewash" and what you can do about it. *Women & Environments* 13 (2): 7-11.

Begley, S. and M. Hager. 1994. Don't drink the dioxin. *Newsweek* <19 September>: 57.

Bolch, B. and H. Lyons. 1994. Bad chemistry. *National Review* 46 (18): 58-59.

Cairncross, F. 1992. Everybody's atmosphere. *Economist* 323 (30 May): S17-S21.

Chlorine: Persistent poison. 1993. Special issue of *GreenDisk Paperless Environmental Journal* 2, no. 3.

Chlorine debate becoming heated. 1994. *Chemical Marketing Reporter* no245 (14 February): 3.

Chlorine is now linked to cancer, other ills. *Better Nutrition for Today's Living* 56 (11): 28.

Chlorine under fire in Great Lakes region. 1993. *Chemical Marketing Reporter* 244 (18 October): 5.

Chlorinophobia. 1994. *National Review* 46 (15 August): 19.

Clemings, R. 1994. Cancer on tap? The case against chlorine. *Longevity* 6 (8): 24.

Coghlan, A. 1991. Finns clean up paper plant with enzymes. *New Scientist* 130 (15 June): 28.

Cohan, P. 1990. Methyl chloroform ban could damage industry. *Adhesives Age* 33 (June): 36.

Cottle, M. 1994. Which is cleaner? *Mother Jones* 19 (6): 20.

Cox, R. 1994. Ketchum if you can: Clorox Corporation versus Greenpeace. *Propaganda Review* no. 11, 34.

Dioxin battle flares anew in capital. 1992. *Chemical Marketing Reporter* 241 (15 June): 3.

Dioxin-in-paper update. 1989. Science News 136 (6): 94.

Does the Montreal Protocol go far enough? 1988. Environmental Forum 5 (July/August): 14-16.

Doniger, D. D. and D. A. Wirth. 1986. Cooling the chemical summer: A call for action. Amicus Journal 8 (Fall): 13-15.

Ducey, M. J. 1987. Pulp bleaching concerns focus on ClO₂ generation, effluent control. Pulp & Paper 61 (June): 89-92.

EPA wants close scrutiny of chlorine. 1994. Science News 145 (12 February): 111.

Fackelmann, K. A. 1992. Hints of chlorine-cancer connection. Science News 142 (11 July): 23.

Fact sheet: US actions for a better environment a sustained commitment. 1992. US Department of State Dispatch, July, 29-30.

Flam, F. 1994. Chemists get a taste of life at gathering in San Diego: PCBs into pussycats. Science 264 (1 April): 32-33.

Floegel, M. 1992. Chlorine: An environmentalist perspective. Pulp & Paper 66 (February): 172.

Foltz-Gray, D. The swimming pool solution. Health (San Francisco, Calif.) 6 (February/March): 114.

Fumento, M. 1994. Chemical warfare. Reason 26 (June): 42.

Galin, R. 1994. Industry says cluster rules, based on inaccurate data, go too far. Pulp & Paper 68 (April): 99-101.

Galluch, R. J. 1989. Alternate process for bleaching could help in reducing TOCl_s, dioxin. Pulp & Paper 63 (September): 145-47.

Gibson, W. D. 1986. Chlorine Institute goes to Washington. Chemical Week 138 (16 April): 34- 35.

Ginsburg, R. 1994. Moving forward: Environmental health policy. New Solutions 4 (2): 3-4.

Great Lakes recommendation adds to pressure on chlorine. 1994. Chemical Marketing Reporter 245 (21 February): 3.

Greene, G. and V. Ratner. 1994. A toxic link to breast cancer? Nation 258 (24): 866-69.

Greenfreeze: From impossible to available in twelve months. [1993?]. Toxic Trade Update, no. 7.1, 48.

Greening printed-circuit boards. 1992. Popular Science 241 (July): 24.

Grim new report requires urgent action. 1991. *Friends of the Earth* 21 (5): 3.

Hastings, J., P. Long, and M. Mason. 1994. Chlorine worries keep bubbling up. *Health (New York)* 8 (November/December): 10-11.

Hayes, D. 1989. Highest disregard. *Mother Jones* 14 (December): 32-6.

Hileman, B. 1994a. Chlorine industry running flat out despite persistent health fears. *Chemical & Engineering News* 72 (21 November): 12-26.

1994b. Curbs on chlorine sought: EPA plan outrages chemical makers. *Chemical & Engineering News* 72 (7 February): 4-5.

1994c. New approaches to toxic chemical control urged. *Chemical & Engineering News* 72 (21 February): 5.

1994d. Report says chlorinated organics are safe for use. *Chemical & Engineering News* 72 (29 August): 8.

1993a. Chlorine industry groups make moves to ease concerns about their products. *Chemical & Engineering News* 71 (31 May): 19-20.

1993b. Concerns broaden over chlorine and chlorinated hydrocarbons. *Chemical and Engineering News* 71 (19 April): 11-20.

1993c. Debate over phaseout of chlorine, chlorinated organics continues. *Chemical & Engineering News* 71 (6 December): 31-32.

1992. Cancer risk found from water chlorination. *Chemical & Engineering News* 70 (13 July): 7-8.

Holloway, M. 1991. The perils of chlorine. *Audubon* 93 (November/December): 30-32.

1991b. A Press release on dioxin sets the record wrong. *Scientific American* 264 (4): 24.

Hunter, D. 1993. Viewpoint: Chlorine: agendas, issues, and options. *Chemical Week* 153 (3 November): 4.

Kenny, A. 1994. The Earth is fine; the problem is the greens. *Spectator*, <12 Mar>: 9-11.

Kirschner, E. 1994. Michigan panel rebuts chlorine ban proposal. *Chemical & Engineering News* 72 (11 July): 5.

1993a. Chlorine: Can we live with it, can we live without it? *Chemical Week* 153 (3 November): 31.

1993b. Total chlorine phaseout would cost \$102 billion/year, say CI. *Chemical Week* 152 (28 April): 12. and

R. Begley. 1994. IJC renews call for chlorine phaseout and industry participation. *Chemical Week* 154 (23 February): 12.

Krieger, J. Consortium to spur new pulp bleaching process. *Chemical & Engineering News* 71 (16 August): 6.

Kriz, M. 1994. Clashing over chlorine. *National Journal* 26 (March): 659-61.

Kroesa, R. 1990. The Greenpeace view of business paper. *Pulp & Paper* 64 (September): 318.

Krukowski, J. 1993. Breast cancer/chlorine debate reignites. *Pollution Engineering*, 15 January, 21-2.

Louisiana plant uses new technology for dechlorination. 1994. *American City & County* 109 (2): 33.

Lucas, A. 1994. Dioxin, TCF debate heats up. *Chemical Week* 155 (14 September): 10.

Ludwiszewski, R. 1994. Heading toward a chlorine ban. *Water/Engineering & Management* 141(June): 12.

Luthe, C., et al. 1994. Dioxins from mill combustion processes: Minimizing their impact on effluent discharges. *Pulp & Paper Canada* 95 (12): 88-94.

Mackenzie, D. 1994. Clinton backs call to ban chlorine. *New Scientist* 141 (12 February): 10.

Marshall, D. 1994. Breast cancer: The toxin trail. *Lear's* 7(2): 36-37.

McCully, P. 1991. A message to the executives and shareholders of E. I. Dupont de Nemours and Co. and Imperial Chemical Industries, Ltd. 1991. *Ecologist* : 114-116.

McDonough, T. J. 1992. Chlorine to disappear from future paper industry bleaching sequences. *Pulp & Paper* 66 (September): 61-63.

McGrath, R. 1989. Discoveries about dioxin formation have changed some mill operations. *Pulp & Paper* 63 (April): 133-36.

Meadows, D. 1994. Chlorine: Can't "ban" it, just don't use it. *Neighborhood Work* 17 (4): 8.

Methylene chloride: Controversy cloaks a powerful stripper. 1986. *Home Mechanix* 82 (October): 85.

Moberg, D. 1994. Chemical reaction. *In These Times* 18 (8): 26-27.

1993. Sunset for chlorine? *E: The Environmental Magazine* 4 (July/Aug): 26-31.

Morris, R., et al. 1992. Chlorination, chlorination by-products, and cancer. *American Journal of Public Health* 82 (7): 955-963.

Munson, M. 1994. Clean-water acts. *Prevention* 46 (8): 30-34.

Naddeo, R., V. Magnotta, and T. Kulikowski. 1992. Oxidative methods offer alternative to chlorine bleaching of wastepaper. *Pulp & Paper* 66 (November): 71-4.

Nordwall, B. D. 1992. Hughes soldering changes to aid environment, cut manufacturing costs. *Aviation Week & Space Technology* 136 (17 February): 45.

Odor control systems use biological alternatives. 1994. *American City & Council*, 109 (10): 101.

Orris, P., S. Kieding, and R. Miller. 1993. The controversy over chlorine resolution for APHA on chlorinated organic chemicals. *New Solutions* 4(1): 3-12.

Patrick, K. L. 1993. TCF driven by sound of different drummer. *Pulp & Paper* 67 (September): 9.

Pressure mounts to save Great Lakes. 1994. *New Scientist* 141 (5 March): 8.

Raloff, J. 1994. The role of chlorine and its future. *Science News*, January, 59.

1990. White paper with less dioxin. *Science News* 137 (12 May): 303.

Roberts, L. 1991. Flap erupts over dioxin meeting. *Science* 251(22 February): 866-867.

Roberts, M. 1993. PVC: Greens' next target in European chlorine battle. *Chemical Week* 153 (3 November): 29.

Rogers, M. 1992. Chemicals in deacidification process face ban from EPA. *Library Journal* 117 (15 November): 15-16.

Sheridan, J. H. 1994. Chlorine chemistry: An endangered species? *Industry Week* 243 (3 January): 49-50.

Silber, K. 1994. Caustic chlorine debate spills over. *Insight on the News* 10 (40): 6.

Skerret, P. J. 1992. Chlorination questions. *Popular Science* 240 (April): 48-9.

Smock, D. 1994. How will the toxins debate affect plastics? *Plastics World* 52 (November): 27- 29.

Stiak, J. 1992. The trouble with chlorine. *Buzzworm* 4 (November/December): 22.

Stinson, S. 1989. Paper mill wastes show low dioxin levels. *Chemical & Engineering News* 67 (24 July): 28.

Stone, R. 1994. EPA queasy over chlorine rule. *Science* 264 (24 June): 1835.

Storck, W. 1987. Chlorinated solvent use hurt by federal rules. *Chemical & Engineering News* 65 (28 September): 11.

Valenti, M. 1994. Nonchlorinated coolant and lubricant. *Mechanical Engineering* 116 (11): 56.

Watts, S. 1989. "Green" look for computer print outs. *New Scientist* 122 (15 April): 27.

Webber, F. 1994. Chlorine debate becoming heated. *Chemical Marketing Reporter* 245 (14 February): 3.

Weisburger, E. K. 1994. *Environmental Health Perspectives* 102 (6/7): 510.

Weltman E. 1994. The chlorine-breast cancer link. *Multinational Monitor*, January, 11-12.

NEWSPAPER ARTICLES

Bauman, M. 1994. Proposal limits chlorine use. *USA Today*, 2 February, sec. A, p. 4.

Bolton, J. 1994. How safe is chlorinated water? *Los Angeles Times*, 25 September, sec. K, p. 9.

Bronstein, S. 1994. *Atlanta Constitution*, 14 September, sec. A, p. 7.

Bukro, C. 1994. Proposed chlorine clamp angers industry. Byproducts of chlorine linked to two cancers. *Chicago Tribune*, 13 February, sec. 7, p. 5.

Cohn, D. V. 1994. 2 fishermen tell of toxic cloud after chlorine leak at Blue Plains. *Washington Post*, 18 August, sec. C, p. 1.

Gossen, R. G. 1994. Studies throw doubt on chlorine toxicity. *Wall Street Journal*, 10 May, sec A, p. 2.

Irwin, J. Bad chemical mix sends 33 to hospital. *Chicago Tribune*, 21 May, sec 1D, p. 5.

Knickerbocker, B. 1994. Clinton would bottle up use of chlorine. *Christian Science Monitor*, 22 February, 1.

McFarling, U. L. 1994. An order of chips and orange juice. *Boston Globe*, 9 May, 27.

Noah, T. 1994. EPA proposal on Water-Act provision suggests study of stiffer chlorine laws. *The Wall Street Journal*. 2 February, sec. B, p. 5.

Panel finds threat to Great Lakes. 1994. *New York Times*, 22 February, sec. C, p. 4, Late NY edition.

Riordan, T. 1994. Patents. *New York Times*, 2 May, sec. D, p. 2.

Seabrook, C. 1994. Scientists debate: Chlorine-free world a necessity or folly? *Atlanta Journal and Atlanta Constitution*, 19 February, sec. A, p. 1.

Swanson, S. 1994. Chlorine's time just may be up. *Chicago Tribune*, 27 February, sec. 2C, p. 1.

Tyson, R. 1994. Chlorine ban is urged for USA, Canada. *USA Today*. 18 February 1994. Sec. A, p. 1.

USA Today. Chlorine targeted for cutback. 2 February 1994. Sec. A, p. 1.

VIDEOS

Planet Chlorine. 1993. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace. 3 min.

PVC: the hidden costs. 1993. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace.

Incineration under fire. 1991. Washington, D.C.: Greenpeace. 30 min.

INTERNET and COMPUTER RESOURCES

Gophers

[EnviroLink](mailto:gopher://gopher.envirolink.org): - gopher://gopher.envirolink.org

[Greenpeace Gopher](mailto:gopher://adam.greenpeace.org) - gopher://adam.greenpeace.org

Discussion groups

Dioxin-L.

listproc@essential.org (Postings are also available at the [Citizens Clearinghouse for Hazardous Waste](mailto:gopher://gopher.essential.org/11/ftp/pub/cchw) - gopher://gopher.essential.org/11/ ftp/pub/cchw)

Other Internet resources EPA-PRESS. Official U.S. Environmental Protection Agency press releases distributed via its listserver. Subscribe to: listserver@dggis.rtpnc.epa.gov U.S. Environmental Protection Agency Library: Telnet to epaibm.rtpnc.epa.gov, port 23 using telnet. Use the account name "PUBLIC, OLS" to log in

ORGANIZATIONS

American Public Health Association, (APHA) 1015 15th St. NW Washington, D.C. 20005 phone: (202) 789-5600

Chemical Manufacturers Association, 2501 Main Street NW Washington DC, 20037 phone: (202) 887-1237

Chlorinated Paraffins Industry Association, 1616 P St. NW, Suite 412 Washington, DC 20036 phone: (202) 939-3444

Chlorine Institute, 2001 L St., N.W., Suite 506 Washington, DC 20036 phone: (202) 775-2790

Citizens for a Better Environment, 407 S. Dearborn, Suite 1775 Chicago, IL 60605 phone: (312) 939-1530

Clean Water Action, c/o David Zwick 1320 18th St. NW 3rd Fl. Suite 300 Washington, DC 20036 phone: (202) 457-1286

Great Lakes United State University College at Buffalo Cassety Hall 1300 Elmwood Ave. Buffalo, NY 14222 phone: (716) 886-0142

Greenpeace, USA 1426 U Street NW Washington, D.C. 20009 phone: (202) 462-1177 e-mail:
greenpeace.usa@green2.dat.de

Greenpeace, Great Lakes Office 1017 W. Jackson Boulevard Chicago, IL 60607

Pesticide Action Network, North America Regional Center (PANNA RC) 965 Mission St., No. 514 San
Francisco, CA 94103 phone: (415) 541-9140

United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) 401 M St. S.W. Washington, DC 20460 phone: (202)
260-2090

MISCELLANEOUS

1-800-ECOLINE. Toll free referral and information service sponsored by the Together Foundation and the
Environmental Studies Program at the University of Vermont.