field in the science of living systems. Further information concerning the results of the SRI experiments can be obtained from Russell Targ or Hal Puthoff at SRI. Targ and Puthoff were formerly involved in high-power laser physics and quantum electronics and have recently entered the field I call "teleneural physics."

The point I would like to make in this letter is that if the experimental results with Geller and with other subjects are correct representations of neural interactions with other living systems and with matter, then the physics community should not, in my estimation, disregard the results as being "nonphysical," quackery or fraud. Rather, a new stance of openness, with skepticism, of course, might better be assumed and the questioning mind of the interested not hindered from exploratory work in this area.

References

1. I. M. Kogan, Telecommunications and Radio Engineering **21**, 75 (1966); **22**, 141 (1967); **23**, 122 (1968).
2. H. K. Puharich, Internat. Jour. Neuropsychiatry **2**, 474 (1966).
3. A. Puharich, *The Sacred Mushroom*, Doubleday, New York (1959), Appendix 1.
4. Time, 12 March 1973.

WILBUR FRANKLIN
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Centralized preprints

Recently the Publications Committee of the Division of Particles and Fields of the American Physical Society has proposed establishing a centralized preprint duplication and distribution system. This would replace the existing unorganized system, in which each institution sends out preprints on a large scale, by one in which a central depository would handle the distribution and duplication (perhaps on microfiche). I am highly unfavorable to such a suggestion. A centralized system seems most unwise to me, for it would further the already apparent trend to replace quality with quantity, by pressuring premature publication. The need is not for more unrefereed, unreadable reports, but for fewer. Obviously, in spite of assertions to the contrary, these proposals are an attack on the journal system and the associated virtues of objective standards and universal accessibility which, if not achieved, are at least the goal. Frankly, it is hard to believe that advances in physics require such an instantaneous "publication" scheme, and it seems undesirable for the physics community to set up a system that might well have the effect of lowering quality of work done and of papers written, as well as intensifying the struggle for priority.

The present *ad hoc* preprint system shares many of these disadvantages, although not to the same degree. A more modest proposal, which has been suggested to me by a colleague would seem to offer some improvement: Instead of institutions mailing out 200 or so preprints as they do now, they would send one to SLAC. Anyone interested would learn the title from the (already existing) SLAC listing, and then could obtain a preprint by writing directly to the author. (Of course, this is just what people at institutions not on the mailing lists do now.) In this way, only preprints desired would be collected, and there would be no undesirable archival connotations of publication.

KIMBALL A. MILTON
University of California
Los Angeles

COMMENT: At its March 1973 meeting, the Publications Board of the American Institute of Physics (a board which is advisory to AIP's Governing Board and consists of editors of all the journals published by AIP, including the journals of the Member Societies) unanimously passed a motion "[deploring] the centralized dissemination of material in preprint form as being contrary to the best interests of orderly physics communication." A similar resolution was adopted at the last meeting of the Publications Commission of the International Union of Pure and Applied Physics, an organization whose principal business is the sponsorship of international physics conferences.

It is clear that neither of these resolutions is aimed at the present *ad hoc* preprint systems. Instead, they address themselves to precisely the problems outlined so eloquently by Milton. The journal system, imperfect though it is, has evolved from its beginnings in the 17th century as the sciences have evolved, and is now precariously balanced between information needs and resources. It might be better to think of ways to strengthen it, rather than circumvent it.

A. W. K. METZNER
Director, Publications
AIP

Departmental discourtesy

I would like to draw attention to the apparently increasing tendency of departmental chairmen in both the US and Canada to fail to acknowledge formal applications for advertised posi-