R.S. ewis

RADIATION HAZARDS / yours of 12.17.70

I had meant to stay in closer touch with you about your plans for this issue.

IN ANY EVENT, it seems to me that it would be unfortunate to continue a debate on a set of premises that are already obsolete (namely that the 170 mr standard is being defacto defended). Also I have every hope that the AEC is going through a crisis of decision that may result in further formalization of their expectations.

This does not seem like a good time for a journal on a monthly schedule to seize on the issue. But if you do, I hope you will give fair representation to Seaborg's statement -- not only by publishing its import, but by looking for a fair recognition that this is current policy in the other pieces that you accept (or by appropriate editorial comment if its is ignored.)

When the d ust has settled, there will be plenty of room for further analysis on the basis of these new premmises.

If you are still moving ahead-- do you want to use this particular piece, or suggest any small scale revisions that might adapt it better to your own nmeds?

Ву	coinc	idenc	e Mis	s Cul	len'	s le	tter o	of 5/4	i jı	ıst
arr	ived.	If I	can	have	anot	her r	nonth	(from	n no	(w
I w	i11 a	mp1if	y the	econ	omic	argi	ument	but	I v	7i.11
b <b>e</b>	inter	ested	mean	while	in	your	react	tions	to	<b>et</b> he
abo	WA									

		- 1
		- [
		-
		П
		-1

~~~----

PROFESSOR JOSHUA LEDERBERG Department of Genetics School of Medicine Stanford University Stanford, California 94305