mal lethal dose of histamine which they did not define in terms of milligrams per kilogram of body weight, but which killed all of their control animals. Under these conditions a protective action of rutin against histamine could not have been demonstrated if their animals, in other respects, were comparable to ours. The dose of rutin which they administered was considerably smaller than that used by us. However, in our study, variation in rutin dosage was not attempted, and a smaller dose might have protected the animals as well as the amount actually used.

Raiman, *et al.* stated that one animal, given rutin 1 hr before the shocking dose of serum, was not protected. This is not surprising, although it is only a single example. We demonstrated that 10 mg of rutin/animal was not sufficient to protect against histamine shock if the rutin was given an hour before the histamine. It might be expected, therefore, that 2 mg/animal would prove to be infective after this length of time.

Although we believe that rutin acts in an indirect manner and is therefore not a true antihistamine drug, it does protect against histamine shock. The evidence given by Hiramatsu (*Jap. J. Derm. Urol.*, 1941, 49, 304) and by Raiman, Later, and Necheles indicates that it also protects against anaphylactic shock and strengthens, rather than weakens, the theory that the symptoms of anaphylaxis are produced by liberated histamine. Neither the contrary thesis suggested by Raiman, *et al.* nor their alternative that rutin prevents liberation of histamine by the antigen receives any support from the above-mentioned findings. The close relationship of histamine to anaphylactic shock is well illustrated by the following statement from a recent review of antihistamine compounds by Loew (*Physiol. Rev.*, 1947, 27, 562): "All antihistamine drugs which so effectively antagonize the bronchioconstrictive action of histamine are capable of diminishing the severity of anaphylaxis in the guinea pig, in which animal bronchioconstriction is the prominent feature of anaphylaxis."

ROBERT H. WILSON and FLOYD DEEDS
Pharmacology Division, Bureau of Agricultural and Industrial Chemistry,
U. S. Department of Agriculture, Albany, California

The Geological Society of America: A Proposed Section on Geomorphology and Glacial Geology

On December 31, 1947, at Chateau Laurier, Ottawa, about 35 fellows of the Geological Society of America met to discuss the desirability of organizing a Section on Geomorphology and Glacial Geology within the structure of the Society. It was voted that membership of the Society be informed of this proposal, their opinions canvassed, and the results published in the Interim Proceedings of the Society.

The proposed Section would promote the development of geomorphology and glacial geology through the organization of technical sessions and symposia at the Society's meetings. The Section might engage in such other functions as criticism of geomorphic manuscripts submitted to the Society for publication, establishment and operation of a journal or bulletin, encouragement and support of research projects, development of professional opportunities in applied geomorphology, preparation of a directory of geomorphologists, and the translation of important foreign papers.

Arthur N. Strahler, of Columbia University, was given the responsibility of canvassing fellows and members of the Society, to determine their reaction to the organization of such a section. In addition, a committee consisting of M. M. Leighton, Illinois State Geologist, chairman, and Drs. Strahler and Koons was appointed to cooperate with the secretary of the Society in arranging a program dealing with geomorphology, Pleistocene geology, and related subjects at the New York meeting in November 1948.

HOWARD A. MEYERHOFF
Smith College

FIAT Review of German Science

The readers of *Science* will be interested to know that the first volumes of the FIAT Review of German Science, 1939–1946, have begun to appear. According to T. W. Schaeffer, of the Research Control Branch, Office of Military Government for Wuerttemberg-Baden, the following volumes have already appeared and are distributed by the Office of Technical Services in the Department of Commerce according to recommendations of the Library of Congress: *Biochemistry*, Vol. I (three more volumes to appear, edited by Richard Kuhn); *Physics of solids*, Vol. I (one more volume to appear, edited by G. Joos); *Radiology* (diagnostic and therapeutic), H. Holthusen; *Bacteriology and immunology*, H. Schmidt; *Virus diseases of man*, R. Bieling and H. Heinlein; and *Anatomy, histology, and embryology*, P. Stöhr.

The whole project is to contain 16 volumes of physics, 24 of chemistry, 7 of mathematics, 27 of different branches of medicine, 4 of biology, and 8 of science of the earth. However, according to latest news there are financial difficulties for the military government in bringing this work to conclusion. Moreover, an edition identical with that edited by the military government is in preparation under German auspices. This is to appear under the title *Naturforschung und Medizin in Deutschland, 1939–1946*, and, so far as possible, will be printed from the same plates. (The same volumes of this edition have already appeared as in the allied edition.)

Judging from the volume on biochemistry, which the writer has received, it would seem desirable that efforts to publish at least the larger part of the manuscripts should be continued. The material published in this volume was only in part printed in German science journals during the war; a great deal is new. This volume contains reviews on fat and fat metabolism, by K. Thomas and G. Weitzel, and on inert soaps, by D. Jerchel; four different chapters on natural pigments, mostly from the school of the late Hans Fischer, including posthumous material; and three original papers from O. Warburg, nearly identical with those published in his recent book, *Heavy metals as active groups of enzymes.*

OTTO MEYERHOF
University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine