

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR
THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE

Science serves its readers as a forum for the presentation and discussion of important issues related to the advancement of science, including the presentation of minority or conflicting points of view, rather than by publishing only material on which a consensus has been reached. Accordingly, all articles published in *Science*—including editorials, news and comment, and book reviews—are signed and reflect the individual views of the authors and not official points of view adopted by the AAAS or the institutions with which the authors are affiliated.

Editorial Board

ROBERT L. BOWMAN	WILLARD F. LIBBY
MELVIN CALVIN	GORDON J. F. MACDONALD
JOSEPH W. CHAMBERLAIN	EVERETT I. MENDELSON
FARRINGTON DANIELS	NEAL E. MILLER
JOHN T. EDSALL	JOHN R. PIERCE
DAVID R. GODDARD	COLIN S. PITTENDRIGH
EMIL HAURY	KENNETH S. PITZER
ALEXANDER HOLLAENDER	ALEXANDER RICH
ROBERT JASTROW	DEWITT STETTIN, JR.
EDWIN M. LERNER, II	EDWARD L. TATUM
CLARENCE M. ZENER	

Editorial Staff

Editor

PHILIP H. ABELSON

Publisher

DAEL WOLFLE

Business Manager

HANS NUSSBAUM

Managing Editor: ROBERT V. ORMES

Assistant Editors: ELLEN E. MURPHY, JOHN E. RINGLE

Assistant to the Editor: NANCY TEIMOURIAN

News and Comment: DANIEL S. GREENBERG, JOHN WALSH, ELINOR LANGER, MARION ZEIGER, JANE AYRES

Europe: VICTOR K. MCELHENY, Flat 3, 18 Kensington Court Place, London, W.8, England (Western 5360)

Book Reviews: SARAH S. DEES

Editorial Assistants: JAMES BLESSING, ISABELLA BOULDIN, ELEANORE BUTZ, BEN CARLIN, SYLVIA EBERHART, GRAYCE FINGER, NANCY HAMILTON, OLIVER HEATWOLE, ANNE HOLDSWORTH, MARCIA JODLBAUER, RUTH KINGERLEE, KATHERINE LIVINGSTON, ELLEN SALTZ

Advertising Staff

Director

EARL J. SCHERAGO

Production Manager

RAYMONDE SALAMA

Sales: New York, N.Y., 11 W. 42 St. (212-PE-6-1858): RICHARD L. CHARLES, ROBERT S. BUGBEE

Scotch Plains, N.J., 12 Unami Lane (201-889-4873): C. RICHARD CALLIS

Chicago, Ill., 6 W. Ontario St. (312-DE-7-4973): HERBERT BURKLUND

Los Angeles 45, Calif., 8255 Beverly Blvd. (213-653-9817): WINN NANCE

EDITORIAL CORRESPONDENCE: 1515 Massachusetts Ave., NW, Washington, D.C. 20005. Phone: 202-387-7171. Cable: Advancesci, Washington. Copies of "Instructions for Contributors" can be obtained from the editorial office. ADVERTISING CORRESPONDENCE: Rm. 1740, 11 W. 42 St., New York, N.Y. 10036. Phone: 212-PE 6-1858.

Adoption of the Metric System

The time has come to face squarely the question of whether the U.S. will switch from the yardstick to the meter stick and from the pound and quart to the kilogram and liter. In 1866 Congress made the metric system legal in the U.S. It is generally used in scientific work and has become standard practice in some branches of industry; its advantages over the inch/pound system are widely recognized. Pressure for general adoption is increased by the fact that India, China, Japan, the U.S.S.R., and other countries have converted or are in the process of converting, and now the United Kingdom has decided to make the same move.

The British action follows on a series of studies of the costs and advantages of conversion, of which one of the major ones was a joint report by the British Association for the Advancement of Science and the Association of British Chambers of Commerce. More recently, recommendations of the British Standards Institution (following consultations with industry), the Federation of British Industries, and the Minister of Technology led the British Government, on 25 May, to announce plans for conversion to the metric system over the next 10 years. Most press and industry reactions have been favorable. Some have been enthusiastic and some reluctant, but the prevailing attitude seems to be that a changeover is both desirable and inevitable, and that the sooner the job gets started the lower will be the cost and the better it will be for all concerned.

The advantages and disadvantages of a change to metric units are essentially the same in the U.S. as in the U.K. That it is easier to learn and use metric units is generally accepted. Foreign trade would be facilitated. Some branches of industry have already gone over to metric standards. World-wide agreement is obviously desirable.

On the other hand, those who prefer to continue with inch/pound units can muster some strong arguments for their position. The cost of conversion would be substantial. Machines, replacement parts, and machine tools cannot suddenly be scrapped and replaced with new ones built to a different set of measures. Conversion costs would fall more heavily on some branches of industry than on others. Complete conversion is probably unattainable; land titles in feet or acres might remain unchanged for generations, and some generally used international units are based on the inch. Although foreign trade would probably be helped, foreign purchases are more dependent upon quality and cost than upon the units in which goods are measured.

A precipitate change would lead to much confusion and probably to unnecessary cost. A decision not to change would leave us, in the words of the *London Times*, as "odd man out among the [world's] major producers." The immediate step to take is a detailed analysis and evaluation by the Department of Commerce of the costs of conversion, the methods that might be used by government in a free-market economy, the incentives that might be necessary to aid some branches of industry, the alternative routes that could be followed in accomplishing the change, and the consequences of not changing. Hearings will soon be held on bills, authorizing such a study, that have been introduced by Senator Claiborne Pell and Congressman George Miller. These bills have been endorsed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Department of Commerce. They should be passed so that the Department of Commerce can get started.—DAEL WOLFLE