them, and only by their continued conscientiousness can referees expect to be utilized by the editors. (We can also expect some keen competition among referees.)

Such a policy may reduce the size of *The Physical Review* to less than that of physics journals not requiring such high standards of refereeing. But then, I assume *The Physical Review* doesn't want to be the biggest —only the best.

RICHARD J. WEISS
US Army Materials Research Agency

Educational competition?

The special March issue on introductory physics education must lead to speculation on the nature of future physics courses and on the directions to be taken by new curriculum-development groups. That we are soon to have a variety of approaches for teaching physics is a most exciting prospect. At last a teacher has options from which to choose a course (or courses) that best suit him and his pupils.

I am surprised by reference in the lead article of this issue to "the status of PSSC's prospective competitor, Harvard Project Physics." I prefer to think of these courses not as competitive but as complementary, designed to reach different segments of the high-school population.

I see these four courses sitting with equal rank on my bookshelf, with room for those new ones still to come. This kind of innovation and the opportunity for choice must pay off in better physics matched to the needs of more pupils. As we meet the needs of more young people, more of them will *elect* to take the course.

We cannot afford to regard new science courses as competitors. Competition infers selection of the "best" and places new hurdles in the path of the teacher. We should not encourage teachers to become disciples of a particular creed, but rather we must help them to be flexible, selective and innovative in their use of new materials.

ROBERT D. HAAS
Clairemont (Calif.) High School □