

In <1993Apr5.195215.16833@pixel.kodak.com> dj@ekcolor.ssd.kodak.com (Dave Jones) writes:

>Keith Mancus (mancus@sweetpea.jsc.nasa.gov) wrote:

>> Bruce\_Dunn@mindlink.bc.ca (Bruce Dunn) writes:

>> > SI neatly separates the concepts of "mass", "force" and "weight"

>> > which have gotten horribly tangled up in the US system.

>> This is not a problem with English units. A pound is defined to

>> be a unit of force, period. There is a perfectly good unit called

>> the slug, which is the mass of an object weighing 32.2 lbs at sea level.

>> (g = 32.2 ft/sec<sup>2</sup>, of course.)

>American Military English units, perhaps. Us real English types were once

>taught that a pound is mass and a poundal is force (being that force that

>causes 1 pound to accelerate at 1 ft.s<sup>-2</sup>). We had a rare olde tyme doing

>our exams in those units and metric as well.

American, perhaps, but nothing military about it. I learned (mostly)

slugs when we talked English units in high school physics and while

the teacher was an ex-Navy fighter jock the book certainly wasn't

produced by the military.

[Poundals were just too flinking small and made the math come out

funny; sort of the same reason proponents of SI give for using that.]

"Insisting on perfect safety is for people who don't have the balls to live

in the real world." -- Mary Shafer, NASA Ames Dryden

Fred.McCall@dseg.ti.com - I don't speak for others and they don't speak for me.