ume when funds, space, and availability permit. A thorough "search of the literature" is still a good safeguard against expending research funds on work which has already been reported elsewhere. If the fast-aging journal is discarded and its citations are not blended into any subsequent studies, what is to prevent the research it has reported from being done over again?

Actually, there appear to be two evaluations involved in the information-knowledge process. The first is editorial —whether to accept or reject a manuscript; the second is documentary and may occur years after the publication of the paper. The paper's research impact is then measured as a weight factor in a citation study. Its scientific durability may then be impartially assessed. I suggest reference to the paper by Raisig on "Mathematical evaluation of the scientific serial" [*Science* **131**, 1417 (1960)] for one recent, improved means of making this evaluation.

JOHN BUCKLEY
Yale School of Nursing, New Haven, Connecticut

Stern's View of Lewis H. Morgan

In a recent issue [*Science* **131**, 1435 (1960)] you published a review of Carl Resek's *Lewis Henry Morgan, American Scholar* in which the reviewer, comparing Resek's work to that of my late husband, Bernhard J. Stern, states that "in Stern's hands, Morgan, caught in a crossfire of Marxism and Boasian anti-evolutionism, suffers the worst of both worlds and emerges as a virtual class enemy as well as a 'not erudite,' unoriginal thinker with a few good ideas and more bad ones."

Not only is this estimate of Bernhard J. Stern's *Lewis Henry Morgan, Social Evolutionist* (University of Chicago Press, 1931) intemperate and lacking in scientific objectivity but it is totally erroneous.

Since Stern's book is out of print, may I request that you set the record straight by publishing some of his evaluations of Morgan. In the final chapter summarizing Morgan's contributions, he says:

"Pioneers in unploughed fields of science scrape the soil thinly leaving the more intensive work to be done by generations that follow. They may plant some seeds of thought that later prove infertile, for their knowledge of the character of the field is imperfect. Morgan was such a pioneer. He was among the first to extend the science of social origins into the remote past. In doing so he used an evolutionary method popular in his period but since discarded as applied to the study of culture. Divorced from its evolutionary setting much of Morgan's work remains a permanent contribution to the yet infant science of anthropology. His Iroquois study is still considered a classic. His discovery of the kinship systems was epoch-making and irrespective of his interpretations and his arrangement, his compilation in the field has proved to be a lasting storehouse of fact for all later anthropologists. . . ."

CHARLOTTE C. STERN
423 West 120 Street, New York, New York

Sweating in Man

Victor Cummings [*Science* **131**, 1675 (1960)], in his article on thermoregulatory and emotional sweating in man, is apparently unaware of the careful work of Chalmers and Keele [*J. Physiol.* **114**, 510 (1951); *Brit. J. Dermatol.* **64**, 43 (1952)], who demonstrated that neither type of sweating is blocked by an intradermal adrenergic blocking agent but that both are blocked by atropine; these results are essentially identical with Cummings'.

It is unfortunate that Cummings raised again the specter of adrenergic innervation of human sweat glands without presenting a more forthright analysis of the available evidence which tends to put the ghost to rest. The pertinent points, covered in the review of Randall and Kimura [*Pharmacol. Revs.* **7**, 365 (1955)] except where noted, are as follows.

1) Human sweat glands respond to directly administered epinephrine and related compounds, and to acetylcholine. Both substances act on the same glands [Mellinkoff and Sonnenschein, *Science* **120**, 997 (1954)].

2) The response to exogenous epinephrine is blocked by local or systemically administered adrenergic blocking drugs (for example, dibenamine).

3) Emotionally induced sweating is blocked by systemically administered dibenamine, but not by locally administered dibenamine; it is blocked by locally administered atropine.

4) Dibenamine analogs have been shown in other circumstances to have central blocking activity [Sawyer and Parkerson, *Endocrinology* **52**, 346 (1953)].

The simplest and most likely explanation of these observations is that there is no adrenergic innervation of human sweat glands and that adrenergic blocking drugs reduce sweating only by their central blocking action. The question of the physiological significance of the responsiveness of the glands to directly administered epinephrine remains open.

RALPH R. SONNENSCHEIN
University of California Medical Center, Los Angeles