the functional approach essential and prerequisite to understanding of any structure but that any scientist who does more than fill catalogs full of numbers uses the functional approach all the time, willy-nilly. He does so because that is one of the functions which human beings are built to carry out.

WILLIAM T. POWERS
4024 Bluebird,
Rolling Meadows, Illinois

William Powers states a viewpoint which we support and have done much to document. Our only regret is that he should have misinterpreted the statements made in our original communication and have attributed to us a position which we deprecate. Far from implying that the differences in "normal" and "anxious" subjects "must be due to brain damage of some sort," as Powers deduced, we stressed that "studies of the microscopic structure of the nervous system have revealed no significant changes in the brains of persons suffering from the common neuroses and psychoses." The remainder of our communication presented evidence that one might be able to measure electrographically dysfunction in this group of chronically anxious subjects who have no known demonstrable damage to structure. Although Powers purports to find us hinting that structural damage is the cause of neurosis or psychoses, there is no such statement or suggestion anywhere mentioned or implied; nor indeed do we subscribe to such a view.

Our brief report concerned one electrographic method which might be used to evaluate brain function or dysfunction, regardless of the basis of the impairment. We would reaffirm our original statement that "perhaps more sensitive methods of measuring responsiveness in the electroencephalogram may demonstrate other evidence of impairment [of function] in the 'functional' disorders of the brain."

CHARLES E. WELLS
HAROLD G. WOLFF
New York Hospital—Cornell,
Medical Center, New York, New York

Conversions

Pembroke J. Hart in his letter on conversions [*Science* **132**, 256 (22 July 1960)] uses a conversion factor of 1.1516 statute miles per nautical mile. This is the factor given in most current reference works, yet since 1 July 1954 the Department of Commerce and the Department of Defense have been using the international nautical mile, defined as exactly 1852 meters, for which the conversion factor is 1.1508 statute miles per nautical mile.

Prior to 1 July 1954 the United States used a nautical mile of 6080.20 feet (1853.248 meters). The international nautical mile at the time of its adoption by the United States was equivalent to 6076.1033 U.S. feet, but effective 1 July 1959 the United States adopted the international yard, equivalent to 0.9144 meter. Therefore the international nautical mile is now equivalent to 6076.11549 international feet.

It is apparent that the term *nautical mile* is ambiguous and, when encountered in a scientific paper, is difficult to interpret. As Hart points out, conversions in the metric system are much simpler.

I suggest that the use of *nautical mile* be restricted to air and surface navigation, where it has real value, and that metric distance units be used in space flight and rocketry.

WILLIAM H. ALLEN
5223 MacArthur Boulevard, N.W.,
Washington, D.C.

Pembroke J. Hart, in his letter on conversions, evidently used for his conversion the "old" nautical mile, which for the United States was 6080.20 feet and for the British, 6080.0 feet. The former would give his ratio of 1.1516 (1.15155).

The "new" nautical mile or international nautical mile, as defined by the International Hydrographic Bureau, was adopted by the United States on 1 July 1954; this length is 6076.1033 feet (*1*), and the ratio is 1.1507575.

H. ROBERT DURSCH
Skagit Valley College,
Mount Vernon, Washington

Reference

1. N. Bowditch, *New American Practical Navigator*, (Government Printing Office, new ed. Washington, D.C., 1958), p. 65 (*U.S. Navy Hydrographic Office Publ. No. 9*).

P. J. Hart's letter complaining about two instances of imprecise conversions from metric to English units is meant to point up one of the advantages of converting to the metric (decimal) system universally. I wish to use it for a different lesson. We should rid ourselves of the pedants who translate a news item about a 4540-kilogram spaceship into 10,009 pounds, as well as the squares who round off the conversion factor and come out with 9988 pounds. I don't have access to the original report but suppose that it came out of the U.S.S.R. as a news item, not as a scientific datum. The aim was to command admiration, not to provide a basis for computing the burning time of the rocket motor. Rendered into English (U.S.), the weight of the satellite, as a news item, is 5 tons.

Now for the generalizations: (i) "If you wish to have what you say remembered, put it in the words that your

hearer will remember it in." (ii) Greater precision is not warranted in the statement than is available in the data.

Hart missed the opportunity to be an exemplary pedant; instead of arriving at 10,009 pounds from the handbook table he could have used the precise conversion factor and come up with 10,008.98542814 pounds.

R. R. NEWELL
50 Yerba Buena Avenue,
San Francisco, California

Humane Treatment of Animals

The bill S. 3570 recently introduced into the Senate by Senator Cooper and others, "To provide for the humane treatment of animals . . .," has been strongly attacked both in *Science* [**132**, 7 (1960)] and in the *Bulletin of the National Society for Medical Research.* These attacks have given what I think to be a false idea of the nature and intent of the bill, and of the motives of its sponsors, and prompt me to make a carefully considered statement of my own opinion.

The issue of humane treatment itself is a moral one: To what extent are we justified in inflicting pain and discomfort on other organisms in our search for knowledge? Bill S. 3570 takes the position "that living vertebrate animals used for scientific experiments shall be spared unnecessary pain and fear; that they shall be used only when no other feasible and satisfactory methods can be used to ascertain biological and scientific information for the cure of disease, alleviation of suffering, prolongation of life, or for military requirements; and that all such animals shall be comfortably housed, well fed, and humanely handled." This is a statement with which, I think, most biologists would agree in principle; personally I should feel more comfortable if the words *potentially valuable* were inserted after the words *scientific information,* but I think that the efforts of the National Society for Medical Research, the Animal Care Panel, and the American Physiological Society over the past several years have been directed toward the general aims stated above.

The second issue posed by the bill is a practical political one: Granted that humane treatment is desirable, is legislation, and in particular this legislation, the best means to assure it? The alternatives would seem to be voluntary action by the investigators or local control by individual communities. The charges recently brought against Stanford University and the College of Medical Evangelists in California show that local action under the influence of extremist pressure groups may still endanger medical research; it seems probable that the existence of federal legislation of the type proposed in S. 3570 would do much to protect laboratories against this sort of local attack. The question of voluntary action is a more debatable one. In my own experience I have never come across an instance of wanton cruelty to experimental animals, but I have encountered numerous cases of neglect due to callousness, inadequate facilities, inexperience, or carelessness; again, it would seem that S. 3570 would help to eliminate such instances.

The reasonable objections which have been made to the specific provisions of S. 3570 are well summarized in the *Science* editorial: "Advance approval of experimental plans by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, burdensome record keeping, annual or more frequent reports to HEW, additional costs . . . and a new and unnecessary amount of red tape." As I read the bill, it seems to me that the requirements are not greatly beyond those now in force. Every application for federal research funds requires submission of an experimental plan which is approved by a panel of scientists. I hope that all of us who publish results of animal experiments do at least the amount of record keeping specified by the bill. Every federal research grant now requires an annual report. The only additional features are that the experimental plan must specify what animals are to be used and what