

Ke 67661
courtesy Lee Johnson

25 Humberston Ave
Capt. [unclear]
[unclear]
[unclear]

Rough Draft

Notes for Dr. Leo Szilard
Dictated: October 30, 1953

PART I

It is perfectly normal and proper that the public should be interested in what statesmen have to say. But it is not normal and dangerous if their voice is the only voice that is heard. What they say they say for a purpose and ~~more~~ ^{as} often ~~as~~ ^{as} ~~than~~ not even the members of the Cabinet talk to cross purposes. As often as not, they contradict each other and sometimes they contradict themselves. ~~The scientists who were vocal~~ ^{was} for a short period after the war the voice of scientists ~~were~~ heard. They felt they had something to say and they made a great effort to say it. ~~They~~ ^{They} came out of their laboratories and ~~libraries~~, made frequent trips to Washington, spoke on the radio and television and held press conferences. No scientist can keep up this activity for long and remain a scientist. Gradually the scientist lapsed into silence. The question is hasn't the time come for them to speak up again?

Scientists are, by and large, not ~~more~~ ^{some} intelligent than ~~any~~ ^{any} other group that can be singled out by virtue of ~~its~~ ^{their} profession or vocation. They cannot be considered ~~the elite~~ ^{isolate} either intellectually or morally, and yet, in the crisis in which we find ourselves they ~~could~~ ^{there is} render a valuable service. ~~What distinguished them from other groups are two characteristics.~~ ^{something unique about them.}

Any one of these two, they share with many other groups, but the two taken together seems to be pretty unique for scientists.

Scientists are, by and large, addicted to the truth, to thinking the truth and to stating the truth. Not ~~many~~ ^{most} scientists become ~~administrators~~ ^{be}. Will ~~they~~ ^{their} find themselves in a conflict of loyalties which is so strong that their loyalty to truth ~~may~~ ^{take} second place? The second characteristic of a scientist,

as a group, is the fact that success in science can be measured much more objectively than in scholarship. The addiction of clergymen, historians or humanists to the truth may be as strong as the addiction of creative scientists. But in the absence

but purposes

What did they say

isolate
either intellectually or morally
there is
something unique about them
Luther Meade
Leyburn
or Dushoff
or
Leyburn

most
be
their
with this
may

ROUGH DRAFT

Part I--Page 2

of objective standards as to who the outstanding clergymen, historians or humanists are, this remains controversial and the consensus is difficult to reach. These are the reasons why it seems to me that scientists are in a unique position in the community. And since, in addition, they are not entirely free from responsibility for the crisis in which we find ourselves, they are singled out on this ground also. Moreover, being endowed with a strong critical sense, scientists, perhaps more than any other group, must regard what has been dished out to the public ever since the end of the war as an insult to the public's intelligence, and it presents a challenge to them to which sooner or later they might respond.

R 41

The first part of the document is a letter from the
 author to the editor of the journal. The letter
 discusses the author's interest in the subject
 and the reasons for writing the paper. The author
 mentions that the paper is based on a study
 conducted in the laboratory of the author's
 university. The author also mentions that the
 paper is a preliminary report and that the
 author is open to suggestions and criticisms.
 The second part of the document is the abstract
 of the paper. The abstract summarizes the
 main findings of the study and the author's
 conclusions. The abstract is followed by the
 introduction of the paper. The introduction
 discusses the background of the study and the
 objectives of the research. The introduction
 also mentions the methods used in the study
 and the results of the study. The introduction
 concludes with a statement of the author's
 conclusions and a statement of the author's
 interest in the subject.

Rough Draft

Notes for Dr. Leo Szilard
Dictated: October 30, 1953

PART II

The problem of American-Russian relations came, I believe, first to my attention in 1944 while I was working on the uranium project of the University of Chicago. At that time, Ed ^{ey}Cruitz, now head of the Physics Department at Carnegie Institute of Technology, told me that Zay Jeffreys believes the reason for the great concern of the Army Engineers to keep the existence of the bomb secret is a fear that public opinion would prevent the use of the bomb against Japan. These people felt that we shall have to fight Russia after the war, that atomic bombs would play a major role in that war, and that it would be impossible to get Congressional support for the bomb unless the usefulness of the bomb had been demonstrated. Soon afterwards, J. C. Sterns, who was second in command in the project, told me that in his discussions with the Army Engineers, they repeatedly told him that when this war was over we shall have to fight Russia. Mr. Sterns was quite unhappy about this when he talked to me and said that he had asked them why we must fight Russia. My own feeling was that there was a very good answer to this question and that the answer should have been: we shall have to fight Russia because existence of atomic bombs will make it possible for us and for them to fight each other. This, I believe, is in fact good and sufficient reason, and the conflict which it represents cannot be resolved until the discussion is raised to the next higher level.

When two major military powers are physically in a position to fight a war, the outcome of which cannot be predicted with certainty, there sets in a vicious circle which is as follows: the government of both of these countries will consider as the most important task to be in a position to win that war if it comes. Therefore they jockey for strategic positions, conclude alliances to secure military bases and engage in propoganda all for the purpose of making it more sure that it is they who will win the war. But every step that Russia takes or that America

Rough Draft

Notes for Dr. Leo Szilard
Part II--Page 2

takes which is designed to improve the chances of winning the war also increases the chances of having the war. If both governments were entirely consistent and logical in their policy and subordinated everything to this most admittedly important aim to win the war if it comes, there would be, in fact, not the slightest chance of avoiding the war. Only because it is not true, what these days is presumed to be true, that the only loyalty that moves human beings is their loyalty to their nation, because the individuals who make policy are governed by a whole spectrum of loyalties rather than by one over-riding loyalty alone and because there is confusion and inconsistency do we have a chance of escaping the iron vise of this vicious circle.

Vol II folder ~~---~~

85

" Various notes

Polks'