

Dr. J. Allen Hynek who has been closely involved in the study of UFO reports for over twenty years has probably studied more data pertaining to UFOs than anyone else in the entire world, and he is one of those who reached a consensus other than that of the National Academy. His book ("The UFO Experience - A Scientific Inquiry", Regnery, 1972) was just recently published. It is most enlightening, particularly insofar as the "infamous" (my term) Condon Committee is concerned, and the Review Panel.

My reply to your letter of the 20th March was deliberately delayed because I knew, from having read some of the galley's of Hynek's book before publication, that my views would be upheld by him. Now that his book is available, I suggest you read it.

I admit to a poor choice of words in my use of "proved wrong". You are quite right, of course. However, substituting your own choice of words at this point in my statement does not change the status of the hypothesis. The hypothesis is still a valid one in my opinion, despite the opinion of the NAS Panel which feels it is the "least likely".

The "inadequate" coverage by encyclopedias is, of course, my own point of view. To me the coverage is inadequate because many important facts (not opinions or beliefs) are omitted, and I refer you to your statement which implied that most UFO reports were the result of satellite observations. Basic facts were omitted, and the statistics I quoted (the USAF's) show that very few reports in the late 1950's can be attributed to satellites.

The fact that your editor changed your opening statement is unfortunate but it does not alter my claim that the statement (after editing) is incorrect. My dispute was with the article as published, not as you may have written it.

I must take issue with your term "flying saucer craze". A craze, according to Webster, is "a mania, something that is temporarily the fashion, a fad". In whose opinion is it a craze? Has it been proved to be a craze? The matter with which I have been dealing (UFO or flying saucer sighting reports) concerns facts which the Condon Committee investigated. I see no evidence in their report that the matter is essentially a psychological problem. Hynek agrees. Misidentified and unidentified physical objects and natural phenomena can hardly constitute a "craze". Perhaps we both suffer from the normal human failing of poor communication.

You appear to have misread my letter in numerous ways. Another example is your statement "it was not, as you incorrectly surmise, to prove that UFOs do not exist". I made no such suggestion in my letter as a careful re-reading will show.