than most specialized geology journals. It is interesting that Janke does not mention the *Journal of Geophysical Research*, which ranked 60th; *Geochimica et Cosmochimica Acta* (104th); and the *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology* (146th). Similar comments could be made with respect to other fields, such as veterinary science and pathology, which are more dependent on basic biomedical and multidisciplinary journals than on those in their own narrow specialty.

Certainly *JCR* and other citation data *can* be misused. But so can other techniques. Objective sociometric data or statistics can be manipulated for political or other objectives. Should we abandon the census for this reason?

A number of "harried" librarians and departmental chairmen are using *JCR* data to weed out rarely used journals but also to add journals previously excluded. Most scientists are aware that society is demanding more efficiency in the operation of research establishments, but Janke and Bide do not discuss cost-effectiveness for libraries with finite budgets. Bide would justify the purchase of expensive journals even if they are used only once. Weinstock (*2*) demolished an earlier assertion that a library can aspire to order anything and everything. The ultimate extension of such an assertion is that each specialized library should become a Library of Congress.

Janke refers to his previously expressed doubts about citation analysis but doesn't cite any evidence to support his earlier contentions. Can he provide any examples of "papers, however bad, being heavily cited, while others remain uncited because they are too far ahead of their time" (*3*)?

The assumption that original and creative papers cite few other papers is completely contrary to fact. In the 10 years that the *Science Citation Index* has been published, there has not been any perceptible change in the rate of citation by or to the average paper.

The factual answers to many of the speculative questions I posed in my article are available in my weekly articles in *Current Contents* (*4*). I gladly confess that I am an empiricist.

Countless examples could be cited to prove that the impact numbers game can work to the advantage of small journals that would otherwise be neglected in favor of larger or more familiar and prestigious journals. Furthermore, before the existence of *JCR*, would it have been obvious that the virology journals had become basic to plant pathology collections, or that the *Journal of Experimental Medicine* covers mainly immunology, or that the *Journal of Petrology*, although 636th in citations, ranked 50th by impact? (The last observation is based on data compiled after my article was published.)

Bide and Janke seem to give my colleagues in the library and information sciences little credit for their ability to analyze data.

EUGENE GARFIELD
Institute for Scientific Information,
325 Chestnut Street,
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

References

1. *ISI Journal Citation Reports (JCR)*: part 1, *Journal Ranking Package*; part 2, *Reference Data*; part 3, *Source Data Package* (Institute for Scientific Information, Philadelphia, 1973).
2. M. Wienstock, *Nature (Lond.)* **233**, 434 (1971).
3. N. C. Janke, *Science* **156**, 892 (1967).
4. E. Garfield, *Cur. Contents*, No. 31, p. 5 (4 August 1971); No. 45, p. 5 (10 November 1971); No. 2, p. 3 (12 January 1972); No. 5, p. 6 (2 February 1972); No. 7, p. 5 (16 February 1972); No. 8, p. 6 (23 February 1972); No. 9, p. 5 (1 March 1972); No. 14, p. 5 (5 April 1972); No. 16, p. 5 (19 April 1972); No. 23, p. M1 (7 June 1972); No. 31, p. 5 (2 August 1972); No. 3, p. 5 (17 January 1973); No. 6, p. 5 (7 February 1973); No. 10, p. 5 (7 March 1973); No. 12, p. 5 (21 March 1973); No. 13, p. 5 (28 March 1973); No. 22, p. 5 (30 May 1973); No. 33, p. 7 (15 August 1973); No. 34, p. 5 (22 August 1973); No. 39, p. 5 (26 September 1973).

Mesoamerican Calendar

My attention has been called to an error in my report (7 Sept., p. 939) on the Mesoamerican calendar. Charles H. Smiley of Brown University has kindly pointed out that it is only the Goodman-Martínez-Thompson correlation whose zero starting point corresponds to the zenithal sun position I have postulated as the origin of the Mesoamerican calendar, and not the Spinden correlation, which is some 52 days out of phase with it. Thus, inadvertently, my findings have provided further reason to accept the validity of the former system and to finally reject the latter. This conclusion is also warranted by radiocarbon dating done at the University of Pennsylvania and called to my attention by Henry N. Michael of Temple University.

VINCENT H. MALMSTROM
Department of Geography and Geology,
Middlebury College,
Middlebury, Vermont 05753