The problem with the EM unit.

The EM unit can cause unintended results when not understood. Let me save you the stress.

Let's go staright to an example:

Example

Consider the markup below:

```
<!DOCTYPE html>
2 <html lang="en">
4 <meta charset="utf-8" />
5 <title>A Simple Page</title>
6 6 6 link rel="stylesheet" href="s
8 <body>
    <div class="one">
                One Hello World!
                <div class="two">
11
                   Two Hello World
12
                    <div class="th
13
                    Three Hello Wor
                    </div>
15
                </div>
17
     </div>
18 </body>
```

Please look very closely. Class, .one is a parent to .two and .two is a parent to three. Some deep nested stuff going on there.

So, if you styled the text in .one like this:

```
2 | font-size: 1.5em
3 }
```

What would be the value of the font size in pixels? Yes, 24px. Remember, 1em is equal to 16px, the browser's default size. 1.5em is equal to 1.5 * 16px.

<u>_</u>

Alright, that's done.

In the nested class .two, what happens if you did this:

```
.two {
  font-size: 1.5em
}
```

What would the font-size be? 24px?

No! Sadly, no!

In case you missed it, I said this in the last section:

1em may also represent the font size of the parent element. Which is why it is loosely described as the "current font size".

In .two the font size would be 1.5 * 24px, i.e 36px

Where did the 24px come from? The parent element, .one

It's the same with the nested class, .three

```
.three {
  font-size: 1.5em
}
```

This wouldn't be 1.5 * 16px. It'd be 1.5 times the font-size of the parent element. i.e 1.5 * 36px.

This is probably NOT the behaviour you expect. In many cases you just want a simple metric to scale against.

Why the hassle?

In the next lesson, I'll introduce you to the rem unit. It pretty much resolves

this weird (maybe, not weird) issue with the em unit.