and is the individual we must ultimately reach if our efforts are to benefit society.

At a time when other prominent professional journals in this country are moving toward making their journals more "readable," obligatory adoption of the metric system can only be viewed as a step backward, rather than a step forward by our professional societies.

R. S. Adams, Jr.

I had to "erupt" within myself to the effect of "Hurray, hurray, hurray!" when I finished reading the letter to the editor by Koehler and Moodie.

Every time I encounter these unfamiliar units of measure now I try to tell myself that I should just simmer down and learn to think in those terms, but I do not. Instead of this, or even the apathy, mentioned by Koehler and Moodie, I find myself becoming shall we say politely, "very impatient!"

I believe the comments Koehler and Moodie make are excellent. I praise them for having the guts to do it. I second their thoughts, and I add: Can't we at least have our familiar "local" English terms, perhaps in parenthesis, along with the metric units? It would facilitate learning the new units.

Edward R. Schumann

I concur with the comments of Koehler and Moodie. Though we may be forced by Journal policy to publish in metric units our day-to-day contacts are with people who are totally unfamiliar with these units. Therefore, everything must be converted to the common English system before talking or conversing with these people.

I think their proposal of using the English system (with the metric system) would be a much better means of presenting the data than we are now forced to use.

D. E. Smika

We join with Koehler and Moodie in urging that the editorial policy be changed to allow for a choice in units.

Whereas we all recognize the advantages that would accrue from a universal language of weights and measures, the present idealistic policy of our Society publications will do little to convince the engineers in land and commerce to change their legal descriptions from acres and bushels to hectares and hecatoliters.

D. W. James

Kudos to Koehler and Moodie! Forthrightly, they raise an issue that deserves not to be brushed aside. The voluminous flow of publications promises to accelerate; reading time is at a premium; conversion tables, etc. are cumbersome; comprehension suffers; the result, less reading and understanding. If reader interest wanes, the Society and its publications lose.

Why such rigidity in the obligatory use of metric units? Let's call a spade a spade as appropriate in scientific parlance; for example, mm for depths, diameters, lengths—but please, not kilograms per hectare. Even inches of precipitation have been made less meaningful because of the vogue toward metric conversion. Would it be asking too much of the Society to permit author discretion as to the system of unit expression used?

Otis L. Copeland

Three cheers for the letter of Koehler and Moodie. In field experiments, it is almost impossible to lay them out, apply and take the necessary measurements in the metric system. The equipment, plot supervisors, and other help, and the clientele all are not acquainted with this system. As a result, we are by conditioning used to thinking and working in terms of acres, pounds, bushels, and degree Fahrenheit. In order to write or read an article, conversions must be made in order to really understand the relationships. In reviewing an article, before being sent in for publication recently, an error in converting to the metric system had been made and because no one was used to thinking in these terms only after converting to degree Fahrenheit, bushels, etc., was the error noticed.

I believe Koehler and Moodie put the issue very well, and I would like to second the motion.

Wallace W. Nelson