with the question of what information a reference should contain and the form in which it should be given. Even on the latter point, it provides for some latitude: Not only does it give two basic formats, author first and title first, with equal status; but it recognized that "the sequence of individual bibliographic elements within a given reference may need to vary, depending on the use of the reference." Nevertheless, it does constitute a formal standard relative to which our practices can and should be judged.

The matter will pretty certainly come up for discussion again at the next meeting of the Publications Board, scheduled for next March. I am not overly hopeful that the new standard will be adopted *in toto*. I am not even certain that I even favor such complete adoption. I am all too aware of the difficulty of training copymakers, let alone authors, that they should write, for example,

LaRue, George S.; Fairbank, William M.; Hebard, Arthur F. Phys. Rev. Lett. 1977; **38:** 1011–1014.

instead of

George S. LaRue, William M. Fairbank, and Arthur F. Hebard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38,** 1011 (1977).

Adoption will not eliminate all the problems. But it would be a partial remedy.

GEORGE L. TRIGG
Editor
Physical Review Letters
Brookhaven National Laboratory
6/10/77 *Upton, New York*

Michelson-Morley again

J. W. Haslett (May, page 101) could not have chosen a poorer experimental example to support his contention. The apparatus of T. S. Jaseja just repeats the Michelson-Morley spatial (fringe-shift) domain measurement in the temporal (frequency-shift) domain.

Once and for all it should be made clear that the logic of Michelson-Morley is faulty, and experiments of this sort will yield null results, ether or no. Michelson postulated a fringe shift if c changed to $c + \Delta c$. What he, and others, forgot is that $c = \nu\lambda$. If c is changed then ν or λ, or some combination of the two, must also be changed, leading to a different (or, correctly, zero) fringe shift.

The last thing the relativists should do is cite experimental evidence, because that evidence,[1] in the case of the red-shift equation, destroys their position and their theory.

Ether theories die easily by three ploys of the establishment: ignore, ridicule, suppress. Haslett's use of the second of these weapons stands him at the same level as his logic.

Reference

1. E. W. Silvertooth, Applied Optics, March 1977, page 543.

E. W. SILVERTOOTH
6/10/77 *Flintridge, California* □