old, predatory efforts by the South American nations and New Zealand and Australia to show that they owned it, because they were north of it, have been nullified.

But, if you are interested more than that you come to this point. They have discovered some fantastic mineral resources in that area. This is a great coal area. You may ask, "How did they ever get coal under all that ice?" Of course the answer is that the Antarctic back in those days was where the Equator is now. Antarctic had a very nice, salubrious climate. Probably it was even a tropical climate. In addition to full deposits there are potentially valuable mineral resources in that area.

Lastly, it is the seat of accurate knowledge of weather formation. The meteorologists firmly believe that before too long you will have not alone short-range forecasts of tremendous accuracy but you will have long-range forecasts of accuracy. It will come about only with the knowledge that we are developing in the Antarctic, which will have to be supplemented by some other areas; but that is what is claimed will bring it about.

If you say that long-range forecasting has no economic sense to it, that it is not valuable to agriculture, and it is not valuable to economics, I think it is like the ostrich with his vision blurred by his head in the sand.

What then is my reason for bringing up the Antarctic? Because when Byrd went down there nobody knew any of those things. Similarly no one really knows what Apollo on the moon will find when they get investigating up there. There are some people who say, "Oh, well, it is a wonderful thing, because it will settle a great many questions that have bothered people who are concerned with how the universe was built, how our planets came into being and the probable life-duration span on the earth and the sun." They see all kinds of potentials. You cannot prove any of them until someone goes up there. One cannot even prove that there are mineral resources there, and that if there are how they can be gotten out.

But when you think that one pound of uranium, if it could produce the energy efficiently say by 100 percent of its mass, represents 11 billion, 400 million kilowatt hours, and if you look at the tremendous progress through direct conversion of energy without going through the older thermal cycles of the steam systems and the jet systems, and when you see the progress being made in