

As for being unable to follow my reasoning in the second paragraph of page two, a misplaced comma after "aircraft" in the third last line may be the culprit. It should follow "for example". Does that help?

I must differ with you about your statement that I attributed statements to you which you did not say in your article in the encyclopedia. In my letter, I was referring to the article written by Mr. Arkady Leokum, who based his article on yours. He quoted your article as follows: "If saucers were really spaceships, there would be a certain pattern in the reports. But there is no such pattern". I pointed out to Mr. Leokum that patterns do exist in these reports (and Hynek identifies many of them) and that identical structure of some of the objects reported is one of these patterns. Mr. Leokum even mentioned shape and size. Do shape and size not constitute structure?

It suddenly occurred to me that perhaps you did not see a copy of Mr. Leokum's article which may be the cause of your confusion on this matter. I attach a copy for your information.

I note that you made no mention of the statistics I quoted in my letter, with particular reference to the implication that satellites were a major cause of sighting reports. I "believe" I have established that there is no significant relationship.

I could go on for many more pages but I am sure you have had enough of me by now. I do wish to find out more about this whole matter and I read everything available, regardless of the point of view taken, and I try to keep an open mind. This, at least, is more than Dr. Condon did, as he was publicly denouncing the whole subject shortly after beginning his "scientific study". Is that the proper way for a scientist to approach his work?

I will indeed read your book "Man's Reach for the Stars", and I hope you will in turn read mine "Science, the Public and the UFO".

It was a pleasure to hear from you.

Yours sincerely,

Arthur Bray