

DOCUMENT SOURCE	University of California at Berkeley The Bancroft Library/The University Archives, Berkeley CA	
RECORDS SERIES TITLE	ERNEST O. LAWRENCE GENERAL FILMS 1930-1959	
MANUSCRIPTS ID NO.	MS 72/117C	COPY
BARON NO.	3/18	
FOLDER NAME	BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LAB	
NOTES		
FOUNDER BY DATE FOLIO	A. HINES 4/28/94	

724370

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BROOKHAVEN NATIONAL LABORATORY
Associated Universities, Inc.
Upton, Long Island, N.Y.

Refer: RA-423

March 31, 1948

Dr. Ralph Johnson
Research Division
Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ralph:

Jim Fisk sent a letter recently to Phil summarizing the decisions made at the recent Berkeley conference. All of the items mentioned coincide with my own memory of the conference, except for the matter of the name "Bevatron."

The desire to have a single generally accepted name was sprung on us by Jim without warning and we did not have any satisfactory alternate name to suggest at that meeting. It seems to be the general opinion that "Bevatron" was not completely satisfactory as a name, but would probably win out over "proton synchrotron" because of its shortness. We realize that a single name is desirable for the two machines, especially in the A.E.C. offices. However, I came away from the Berkeley conference with the impression that "Bevatron" would win by a default, only if no other satisfactory name came along in the near future.

Morse, Haworth, and myself had no strong opinions which were antagonistic to "Bevatron", but when I returned to Brookhaven I found a unanimous objection to this name from the Accelerator Project staff. This objection was so considerable that the staff argued for over several hours on the subject of names and came up with the alternative suggestion "Cosmotron". It is our belief that this name is more general, more understandable to the lay public, based on a more commonly understood derivative, and would be more acceptable to newspaper writers and other lay men. We think that since the proton synchrotron is intended to reproduce, in the laboratory, cosmic ray primary particles (protons) and reproduce cosmic ray phenomena, that the word "Cosmotron" is a satisfactory representation of the purpose.

I have tried this name out on several people outside our Project and on McDewitt, in the public relations office, and all of these people have felt it was considerably better than "Bevatron". Under the circumstances, I would like to request that a decision to use the name "Bevatron" in the A.E.C. office be postponed until such time as there is an opportunity for "Cosmotron" to be used enough to find out whether it is an acceptable alternative. In this connection, is it proper for me to use the name in any forthcoming news releases from Brookhaven?

I hope that you will discuss this with other people in the Washington office, and especially with Jim. Please let me know what conclusions you can come to and whether or not we should feel free to exploit this new name for the machines.

Very truly yours,

H. STANLEY LIVINGSTON
Accelerator Project Chairman

1171834