



## “Proof of the Pudding”<sup>1</sup>

## “Form Follows Function”<sup>2</sup>

The rapid expansion of JEMT from its inception can be laid directly to the wise policies of its founding editor, Iain Le May, which were so successfully further developed by Iain Finnie and Shiro Kobayashi. Not only is the *Journal* self supporting, in a modest way it is revenue producing. This is an achievement in itself and the more so considering the size of the Materials Division relative to others in ASME.

The formidable roster of Associate Editors, who (it must be admitted not without some occasional minor grumbling over the work load) ceaselessly forward manuscripts for review to a courageous band of anonymous critics, have contributed to make the JEMT of archival importance as attested by its increased allo-

cated pagination. The rapid review and publication turn-around time (generally about six months) has made it an acceptable vehicle for authors desirous of rapid dissemination of their material, be it research, review or case history.

The presentation of invited review papers in fields of current importance, as well as the inclusion of a sizeable body of case history applications together with the usual complement of in-depth research studies, have made it a practical as well as useful tool for the Materials Engineer.

This capsule history clearly shows that in the past, what was done was done right. What of the future? The success of any *Journal* is not only a dual responsibility of the authors and editors. The reader is the third party to a working triumvirate and his responsibility is not less than that of the other two. In selecting appropriate papers for inclusion in JEMT, the reader response to past publications is of great importance. How can it be relevant to the reader's interests and needs if these are not forcefully represented? To assist the new editorial team of Krafft and Sullivan both to maintain the high standards of the past and to be responsive to readership relevancy, comments and suggestions are solicited.

<sup>1</sup>Lewis Carroll

<sup>2</sup>Le Corbusier

### Fifth Henniker Conference on National Materials Policy

The fifth conference on National Materials Policy was held from July 30 to August 4 in Henniker, New Hampshire. Franklin P. Huddle served as chairman of the conference and James Holt, Department of the Interior, was co-chairman. The purpose of these conferences is to provide recommendations to government on materials policy. The specific theme of this one was to develop ideas on how industry can contribute inputs to such important issue areas as investment policy, tariff regulation, environmental control, etc., that affect government-industry relations in materials areas.

The lack of ongoing means of communication between government and industry in these areas was evident, as much of the early part of the conference was spent familiarizing those not in government with existing government information systems. Notwithstanding these communication problems and the diverse backgrounds of the participants, a surprising degree of unanimity was reached on the issues at hand. In particular, the view was expressed that government should take into account the effects of policy measures in other areas on materials. A prime example of this is the failure to consider the materials impacts of mandatory automobile fuel consumption standards, which are being met by significant reductions in automobile weight, and thus have led to major increases in demand for light-weight materials.

One general recommendation was that communications be improved between the materials community and government. In this regard, the Materials Division is organizing an improved method of communications to make the expertise of its members more readily available to government, hopefully to improve the quality of materials policy decisions.

Christopher M. Niemczewski  
Communicated by  
Andrew Bielloch,  
Chairman, Materials Division