

THE U.F.O. Investigator

RECEIVED

JAN 29 1980

UNIV. WIS. LIBRARY

Vol. III, No. 8

FACTS ABOUT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena

May-June, 1966

AF ADMITS FAULTY UFO INVESTIGATION

Outside Scientists To Check Unknowns

The Air Force has admitted to a Congressional committee that it has not properly followed up unexplained UFO reports.

This and other surprising disclosures were made at a closed hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, on April 5, 1966. Midway of the session, Chairman E. Mendel Rivers unexpectedly changed to an open hearing. This automatically put all AF statements and submitted documents on public record, including these admissions:

1. Some UFOs the AF publicly claimed were identified actually are unexplained.
2. The AF hypothesis that all UFOs have ordinary explanations may be an error, causing new scientific information to be overlooked.
3. Six prominent scientists, asked by the AF to review the UFO program, criticized the Air Force for not scientifically exploring unexplained sightings. The panel urged that teams of non-AF scientists fully investigate such cases, with detailed reports to Congress and the public.

At first glance, these admissions might appear to indicate an about-face in AF "explain-away" policy. Instead, AF Secretary Harold Brown and his advisers added the usual debunking claims: No evidence of UFO reality, no witnesses ridiculed, no information withheld.

Two conflicting opinions have resulted. The first: The AF could not be expected to end the secrecy and reveal its hidden conclusions all at once, but that its admissions were a sincere first step. The second, opposing opinion: The admissions, expected to be confined to a closed hearing, were only to ward off a full-scale Congressional investigation; that instead of reducing secrecy, the AF will step up its belittling of competent UFO observers to stop the increasing public criticism.

So that NICAP members can judge for themselves, here are the most significant items in the official record:

Chairman Rivers (to AF Secretary): "We can't just write them [UFOS] off. There are too many responsible people who are concerned."

Secretary Brown, in a prepared statement, said UFOs posed no threat, were not extraterrestrial, and were 90% explained. He then put on record an AF memorandum to the AF Scientific Advisory Board, signed by Maj. Gen. E. B. LeBailly, Director of Information, which said "...many of the reports that cannot be explained have come from intelligent and technically well qualified individuals whose integrity cannot be questioned." LeBailly asked for a scientific panel to review Project Blue Book.

The six selected scientists were Dr. Bryan O'Brien, member, National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Robert W. Porter, guided missile and satellite authority; Dr. Carl Sagen, astrophysicist, member NASA planetary atmosphere study group (Dr. Sagen has suggested that advanced races have surveyed the earth periodically, may have established a solar-system base); Dr. Lauris S. Carter, former USAF Chief Scientific Adviser; Mr. Jesse Orlansky, industrial psychologist with the Institute for Defense Analysis. Dr. Willis H. Ware—no data. [Names confirmed separately by NICAP.]

The panel's recommendations: Contracts with universities for scientific teams to investigate unexplained UFO cases promptly—perhaps 100 reports a year; AF investigating officers to work with the teams, and one university or non-profit organization to coordinate this research with Project Blue Book; anything suggesting withholding of UFO information to be deleted from Blue Book reports.

Chairman Rivers asked if anyone in authority alleged that UFOs come from other planets.

Secretary Brown said no one in the AF had said this, as far as he knew. (Col. J. Bryan, III, USAFR, Ret., Lt. Col. Howard Strand, a Base Commander in the Air National Guard, and other AF officers have publicly stated this belief.)

Dr. J. Allen Hynek, AF-UFO Consultant, admitting public concern is growing, said for 20 years he had tried to be open-minded though the UFO subject "seemed utterly ridiculous. . ."

[No. 55]

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

HEARING

BY

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

OF THE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 5, 1966



[Pages of all documents printed in behalf of the activities of the House Committee on Armed Services are numbered cumulatively to permit a comprehensive index at the end of the Congress. Page numbers lower than those in this document refer to other subjects.]

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

50-066 O

WASHINGTON : 1966

THE **UFO INVESTIGATOR**

Published by
The National Investigations Committee
on Aerial Phenomena
1536 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright, 1966, National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP). All rights reserved, except that up to 300 words may be quoted by press media, providing NICAP is credited.

NICAP Staff: Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe, Director & Editor-in-Chief; Richard H. Hall, Assistant Director & Associate Editor; Gordon Lore, Editorial Assistant; Charles C. Turner, Office Manager; Don Berliner, part-time staff assistant.

BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Dr. Marcus Bach, author, educator, lecturer, Palos Verdes Estate, Cal.; Rev. Albert Baller, minister, Clinton, Mass.; Col. J. Bryan, III, USAFR, Richmond, Va.; Mr. Frank Edwards, TV-radio commentator, author, lecturer, Indianapolis, Ind.; Col. Robert B. Emerson, USAR, research chemist and physicist, Baton Rouge, La.; Mr. Dewey Fournet, Jr., former AF Intelligence major and Monitor of USAF UFO Project; Mr. J.B. Hartranft, Jr., Pres., Aircraft Owners and Pilots Ass'n., Washington, D.C.; Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, physicist, University of Southern California; Rear Adm. H.B. Knowles, USN, Ret., UFO researcher, Eliot, Maine; Prof. Charles A. Maney, professor emeritus of physics and astronomy, Defiance College, Ohio; Dr. Charles P. Olivier, Pres., American Meteor Society, professor emeritus of astronomy, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Bruce A. Rogers, research engineer, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, College Station, Texas.

However, he added, in the past "matters of great value to science were overlooked, because the new phenomenon simply did not fit the accepted scientific outlook. . ."

Hynek also said the AF "working hypotheses"—that all UFO reports were errors, hallucinations or hoaxes—had been "very successful" but might be a roadblock to research, for "if one digs too intently for coal he is apt to miss diamonds. . . And in dealing with truly puzzling cases, we have tended either to say that, if an investigation had been pursued long enough, the misidentified object would have been recognized, or that the sighting had no validity to begin with."



Dr. Hynek

Hynek also admitted he had told the AF that Project Blue Book was not fully investigating UFO unknowns: ". . . enough puzzling sightings have been reported by intelligent and often technically competent people to warrant closer attention than Project Blue Book can possibly encompass. . ."

Questioned by Congressman William H. Bates, Mass., Hynek said he knew of no competent scientists who would say UFOs come from outer space. (Several well-known scientists are on record, including Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, biophysicist, Univ. of Calif.)

Congressman Bates put on record extensive evidence in the Exeter, N.H. case, Sept. 3, 1965, sent to him by Raymond E. Fowler, Chairman NICAP Massachusetts Subcommittee, including: Reports by the Exeter police witnesses, a letter by Lt. Col. J. P. Spaulding (an AF spokesman) admitting the Exeter police sightings were unexplained (despite an earlier AF claim), and a letter to the police officers by the Project chief, Major Hector Quintanilla, blaming NICAP for stirring up the Exeter publicity.

After Hynek admitted to Chairman Rivers he could not explain the Exeter case, Congressman Bates asked him about "20 puzzling cases" from above average observers which he had mentioned earlier. Hynek cited a report by two university students and other witnesses who said a UFO with four red lights and one large white light had closely approached their car.

"I questioned these people for some two hours," Hynek stated. "They were very intelligent. . ."

After appearing to accept their report, Hynek reversed himself and rejected it: "Why would they be the only four people to see this? . . . Was this some sort of a strange psychic projection, or something these people were particularly prone to? . . . I find it most difficult to ascribe a physical tangibility that there was an actual craft here. I would rather seek some other scientific explanation."

Congressman Lucien N. Nedzi, Mich., asked if the AF and foreign countries coordinated UFO reports. Secretary Brown said that neither the U.S. nor foreign nations had any scientific UFO information to exchange.

Congressman Nedzi to Hynek: "Has there ever been any evidence in any of these unexplained sightings that would indicate that there is some kind of extraterrestrial intelligence involved?"

Hynek: "I have not seen any evidence to confirm this. . . however, the possibility should be kept open as a possible hypothesis. I don't think we should ever close our minds to it."

Chairman Rivers then put several items on the record, including: (a) A letter from Congressman Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader, protesting the "swamp gas" answer in two Michigan sightings, stating the American people are entitled to better explanations, and naming a retired AF colonel who had seen a UFO and was ready to testify. (b) A syndicated article by Roscoe Drummond, citing NICAP evidence and urging a "more credible and detached appraisal of evidence." (c) Six articles by news correspondent Bulkley S. Griffin, who after long investigation declared the AF was publishing incorrect explanations and withholding facts from the public. (d) A letter to Chairman Rivers by AF Col. D. W. Covell, Congressional Inquiry Division, denying there ever was a Top Secret conclusion that UFOs were interplanetary [this conclusion was confirmed by Capt. E. J. Ruppelt, former Project Blue Book chief]. (e) Two letters to Chairman Rivers from John R. Gray, aerospace engineer, strongly supporting NICAP and criticizing AF secrecy. (f) A LIFE article quoting Maj. Quintanilla as agreeing it is impossible to prove flying saucers "do not exist, and that the AF will not give up chasing UFOs. 'Imagine,' Quintanilla was quoted, 'what a great help it would be to get our hands on a ship from another planet and examine its powerplant.'"

FLORIDA GOVERNOR SIGHTS UFO

A UFO which paced the Florida chief executive's campaign plane for 40 miles over north Florida April 25 also was witnessed by a group of newsmen and officials. Governor Haydon Burns, a candidate for re-election, confirmed the sighting but declined to discuss it. This apparently was his second UFO sighting; a Miami TV station last fall reported, in a documentary, that Gov. Burns had seen a UFO.

Co-pilot Herb Bates first noticed the UFO as the Convair took off from Orlando headed for Tallahassee (state capital). To him, the object or objects appeared as two bright yellow globes side by side. At about 6000 feet altitude in the vicinity of Ocala, everyone on board had been alerted and watched the UFO pace the plane on the starboard side. Some said the two bright lights were crescent shaped, and a dimmer connecting section or column of light was visible between them. The reddish or yellow-orange lights fluctuated in brightness, but were very distinct.

After several minutes, Governor Burns ordered his pilot to turn toward the UFO. The lights quickly began a steep climb, then disappeared. At this point the Capitol bureau chief for the Tampa Tribune, Duane Bradford, said "the thought occurred to me that this UFO business was somewhat less than funny."

In addition to the newsmen on board, witnesses included the governor's executive assistant, Frank Stockton, and Capt. Nathan Sharron of the State Highway Patrol.

Central Bureau Chief Bill Mansfield of the Miami Herald said the press contingent first learned about it when Governor Burns walked back into the cabin and exclaimed, "We have a UFO out there. I'm going to order the pilot to turn into it." Confirming the description of the UFO, Mansfield added, "Something was out there. Something we all saw clearly. Something that is yet to be explained."

Prominent Physicist Joins NICAP Panel

Mr. Jamison R. Harrison, prominent consulting engineer on physics and electronics, has just joined NICAP's Panel of Scientific Advisers.

A graduate of Tufts College and Wesleyan University, Mr. Harrison has held many important positions, including: Head of the Physics Department, Franklin Technological Institute, Boston; Head of the Physics and Radio Communication Department, Tufts College, 1936-1947; Director of the U.S. Army Signal Corps research on Piezo-Electricity, 1943-1947; Member of the Research Committee on Underseas Warfare, National Research Council. Mr. Harrison also is a member of several engineering societies, a contributor to engineering journals, and editor of a horticultural magazine. He is a resident of Bedford, Mass.

Continued from Page 2 Column 2

Congressman Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania. "...none of the unexplained objects have been sighted on radar?"

Maj. Quintanilla: "We have no radar cases which are unexplained." [Scores of recorded radar and visual-radar cases have never been explained.]

Congressman Schweiker: "Did you have a report [on the Exeter case] filed to you by Major Griffin and Lt. Brant (Pease AFB)?"

Maj. Quintanilla: "Yes, sir, we did."

Congressman Schweiker: "What were their conclusions?"

Maj. Quintanilla: "They couldn't explain it." (At no time did he admit he had told the press the Exeter witnesses were misled by stars or low-flying aircraft, an answer later retracted.)

Congressman Schweiker then asked if the Beaver County UFO photo was explained. Dr. Hynek implied it was a fake, a double exposure. Quintanilla said the photographer, James Lucci, had refused to submit the negative.

Congressman Schweiker: "On what basis? ... Maybe these people are a little skeptical about turning over negatives without some assurance. ... the newspaper (Beaver County Times) claims they saw the negatives, examined by their photographic experts, and they are authentic."

Helicopter Pilot Reveals 1960 Sighting

Writing from the battle zone in Viet Nam, an Army helicopter pilot engaged in combat assault mission has revealed a detailed sighting of a UFO in 1960. His name and serial number are on file, but we are withholding his name to protect him from possible reprimand.

While on flying duty at Fort Bragg, N.C., in August 1960, the pilot saw a shiny saucer-shaped object come of storm clouds and approach at low level.

"The object tilted upward at the front, sliding to a graceful halt almost in the same movement as one would observe in a helicopter while making the same maneuver," he told NICAP.

Viewing the UFO almost horizontally at this point, the pilot noticed a dome on top, somewhat taller than is usually depicted in artist's conceptions of "flying saucers." He carefully observed the UFO for about 30 seconds, as it rocked from side to side, apparently only 1/2 mile away. Assuming that distance, he estimated the craft was 35 feet in diameter, with a rounded dome about 10 feet tall. Small markings like portholes were visible on the dome.

"It looked to be made of some highly polished aluminum alloy similar to some of our high speed jets," he said, "and it glittered in the sun shining through the clouds."

Finally the UFO began ascending into the storm, slowly at first, then gradually accelerating, until it had vanished. The pilot reported the sighting to his superiors, but "nothing official was ever written about it."

Canadian Parliament Member Urges UFO Study

A plea for a new, serious study of Canada's UFO reports was made by a Member of the Canadian House of Commons on April 21, 1966.

The Hon. William Dean Howe, of Ottawa, stated that we are long past the time when all UFO reports can be written off as hallucinations, hoaxes or alcoholic fantasies.

"Most reports," he said, "come from people of good reputations, whose testimony would be accepted without question under any other circumstances. ... There is too much unexplained evidence to ignore."

Mr. Howe said that Canadians should be free to report sightings "without fear of ridicule." Though Mr. Howe has reached no conclusions regarding the UFOs, he specifically called for the Canadian Government to assign a department to conduct constant investigations of reports.

Immediately afterward, Canada's Associate Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Leo Cadieux, said he would see that an investigation into UFO reports was initiated "at least as far as the Defence Research Board is concerned."

After adjournment, Chairman Rivers was quoted as being satisfied with AF scientific-team proposals, and that his committee had no plans for a full-scale investigation. But several legislators on the committee, along with other Congressmen, have stated they are not satisfied.

Some are convinced there should be a full-scale investigation. Two Congressmen are considering the use of their own scientists to check on reports by competent observers. Requests for NICAP evidence, from both Congressmen and Senators, are increasing, and arrangements are being made for a private briefing by NICAP.

Though most news coverage of the Armed Service Committee session was brief, this hearing actually was an important advance, and not only because of the AF admissions. It was a hint of what can be brought out in a longer Congressional investigation, by the Senate Space or Armed Services Committees or the House Space Committee.

Influential members of all three have asked for NICAP's evidence, in considering UFO hearings.

Meantime, NICAP will closely watch the official handling of future UFO reports. We shall be glad to cooperate if the secrecy and belittling of competent observers is ended—by the AF or a higher agency which may control the UFO policy.

NICAP OPERATION COSTS

In talking with a group of members recently, we found that very few realized what it costs to operate NICAP. Also, most of them thought—as we did at first—that the membership increase from nationwide publicity would end our financial troubles, giving us funds for the extra staff workers we so badly need.

We still hope this will happen. But temporarily, at least, added costs still exceed our increased income. Answering the flood of mail requires a huge amount of postage, plus extra printing costs for NICAP literature, forms and envelopes. Phone bills (three trunk lines) have tripled—long distance calls to arrange press and broadcast coverage, for investigations of important sightings, etc.

Costs Per Month

Postage (not including UFO Investigator mailing)	\$1750.00
Printing of envelopes, literature, letterheads, etc.	385.00
Rent of stamp meter	45.00
Rent of offices (increased help, overflow of files, etc. forced us to lease added space)	390.00
Telephone bills, three lines, frequent long distance calls	210.00
UFO Investigator: Set-up on Justowriter; make-up; printing, stuffing, and mailing including postage, \$1990 per issue. Pro-rated per month (The issue is sent first-class because third-class mailing has repeatedly resulted in hundreds of losses or long-delayed arrivals)	995.00
Pro-rated taxes: FICA and property taxes, per month	180.00
Expenses for investigations, publicity trips	210.00
Office supplies	65.00
Janitor cleaning supplies	10.00
Pay for six regular staff members, one part-time, one part-time janitor	2665.00
Monthly average, past two months	6620.00
Unusual expenses in past two months:	
Press conference at National Press Club, Washington, resulting in nationwide coverage:	
Charges by Press Club	220.00
Expenses of Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, Board Member, to present scientific information (round trip from Los Angeles, and expenses in Washington)	354.50
Purchase of work tables, chairs, two typewriters for additional workers	435.00
Total unusual expenses	\$1009.50
Pro-rated per month	\$ 504.75

Even ignoring the "unusual expenses," the monthly rate of \$6620.00, if this kept up, would equal \$79,840 per year. NICAP membership is approaching 9000. Even if we have 100% renewals, added 1000 more members this year, and sold 1000 copies of THE UFO EVIDENCE, (some at the reduced combination price) we would still be about \$25,000 in the red.

Obviously, we cannot continue at the present rate of outgo without a large increase in members. We expect a sizable increase from the literature already mailed. Nationwide publicity set for the near future will bring another flood of queries and should net us still more members.

If each NICAP member would try hard to get us new members, we would not only be able to cover all necessary costs but secure at least a few urgently needed staff assistants.

At present, we cannot even meet average Washington pay scales. (We have just lost our office manager, who resigned to take a much better paying position). The lowest-grade typist in the Pentagon gets more than we can offer an experienced stenographer or file clerk. Most employees and executives in organizations comparable to NICAP get double or triple our salaries.

This is not a complaint; no one forces us to stay on this demanding job. But it would be a big help if we had enough people to handle all urgent projects. We'll be grateful for your support.

MEMBER HELP

Several members with special skills have offered us their services, directly or through nearest subcommittees. We are now preparing to utilize these offers, and we would greatly appreciate hearing from other members with special training or experience—as, for instance, in investigations, analyses, publicity, etc.

Consultants in scientific and technical fields could be of great help; also communications specialists, library and research experts; detectives (for special investigations); artists; legislators, pilots and other aviation experts.

If you wish to offer such services, please submit the necessary information on a 3 x 5 file card for easy handling. In the upper left corner, please list the service offered (artwork, clerical, chemical analysis, radar analysis, investigations (through a NICAP Subcommittee), etc. In the upper right corner, please name your state, with your name, address, telephone number below. At the bottom, you can add whatever additional information you think necessary.

We are grateful to all the members who have asked how they can help promote the UFO investigation.

EARTH LAWS AND SPACEMAN

Because of the increasingly close encounters and reported shootings at UFOs, we believe the following statements from an earlier issue are very timely.

According to a Justice Department spokesman, space men probably would not be protected by earth laws unless they were human in form. The statement was made by Assistant Attorney General Norbert A. Schlei, Office of Legal Counsel, replying to this hypothetical question from NICAP member Larry M. Bryant:

"If a human being killed a space man, in a moment of panic and fear, would this be murder? Or could the person defend his action on the legal ground that he had not committed homicide since the being was not 'human'?"

On July 11, 1963, Assistant Attorney General Schlei answered as follows:

"This is in reply to your letter. . . asking whether private citizens would be criminally liable if, alarmed in the presence of a vehicle of extra-terrestrial origin, they were to make an unprovoked attack killing the hominoid members of its crew."

Emphasizing that the Department of Justice could give legal opinions only to the President and heads of Government departments, Mr. Schlei added:

"However, as a matter of information, it does not seem likely that present criminal laws against homicide would play a primary role in restraining attacks by excited citizens if the situation you describe were to arise. Since criminal laws are usually construed strictly, it is doubtful that laws against homicide would apply to the killing of intelligent, man-like creatures alien to this planet, unless such creatures were members of the human species. Whether killing these creatures would violate other criminal laws — for instance, the laws against cruelty to animals or disorderly conduct — would ordinarily depend on the laws of the particular state in which the killing occurred. If further laws were to prove necessary, they could be enacted, but until it is clearer what problems of safety, health or commerce such creatures might bring, there is little basis for describing the kinds of laws which might prove appropriate."

Replying to the same question, Professor James P. Whyte, School of Law, College of William and Mary, agreed with Assistant Attorney General Schlei.

Assuming for discussion that UFO's are occupied, he said, the question is whether they are occupied by human beings sufficiently similar to "homo sapiens."

"The intelligence of these occupants might or might not be a factor," said Professor Whyte. "It is just as much homicide to kill an idiot as it is to kill a genius."

NICAP: It is interesting to note that this hypothetical question, which a decade ago probably would have been ignored or treated as a joke, was considered seriously by the Department of Justice and a distinguished professor of law.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON LIBRARY AND MUSEUM

REQUEST FOR REPRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Name Grant Cameron Today's Date _____

Reading Room Request? ☒ Off-Site Researcher ☐ (Coordinating Archivist Initials _____)

Collection WHCF - Name File Box Number _____

Folder Title or File Symbol (Include dates, volume #s and folder #s, as appropriate)	Form of Document	Document Number if applicable	Document Description: Correspondents, Title, or Page Number(s), as appropriate (Please be as specific as possible.)	Document Date	Number of Pages
<i>Condon, Edward V.</i>	<i>Letters brochure</i>		<i>Popele / Juanita correspondence (plus brochure front pg.)</i>	<i>11/66</i>	<i>6</i>

Address for off-site researcher (If not on Xerox Order Information Sheet)

Total Pages Copied 6

Fee .90

Phone _____

Email address _____

GENERAL

November 4, 1966

FOR MRS. ROBERTS

Juanita,

The attached file is self-explanatory.

I see nothing to be done now except send the whole works to Central Files and forget it.

Paul Popple

Encls.

PMP:aer

9/20/66 ltr to Juanita fm E U Condon,
Boulder, Colo, re AF grant to Univ of
Colo to conduct study of UFO's;

- PMP 10/6 referral to SecDef for memo;

10/12/66 Steadman (OSD/DOD) memo to PMP:

10/13/66 Popple to Marvin Watson memo

// w/MW "do not send"(to Condon) instruction. //

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

THE WHITE HOUSE OFFICE

REFERRAL

To: Secretary of Defense

Date: October 6, 1966

ACTION REQUESTED

_____ Draft reply for:
_____ President's signature.
_____ Undersigned's signature.

(*) _____ ☒ Memorandum for use as enclosure to reply.

_____ Direct reply.
_____ Furnish information copy.

_____ Suitable acknowledgment or other appropriate handling.

_____ Furnish copy of reply, if any.

_____ For your information.

_____ For comment.

NOTE

Prompt action is essential.

If more than 48 hours' delay is encountered, please telephone the undersigned immediately, Code 1450.

Basic correspondence should be returned when draft reply, memorandum, or comment is requested.

REMARKS:

(*) Memorandum requested re final paragraph only.

Description:

_____ ☒ Letter: _____ Telegram: Other:

To: Mrs. Juanita D Roberts, Personal Secretary to the President

From: E. U. Condon, Condon for Regent Hq., 761 Cascade Ave., Boulder, Colorado

Date: September 20, 1966

80302

Subject: AF grant to U of Colorado to conduct study of UFO's.

By direction of the President:

aer
3

Paul M Popple
Assistant to the President

(White House File Copy)

Rec'd 9-21-66
445P

CONDON FOR REGENT HEADQUARTERS

761 CASCADE AVENUE
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302
TELEPHONE 443-7448

September 20, 1966.

Please address campaign
contributions to
GEORGE C. WILLIAMS
Finance Chairman
in care of
First National Bank in Boulder
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Juanita D. Roberts,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.
Dear Miss Roberts:

I deeply appreciate the President's thoughtfulness in sending me the photo taken at the White House on August 1 on the occasion of the twentieth anniversary of the signing of the Atomic Energy Act.

As you see from this letterhead and the enclosure, I am campaigning like mad for election to the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado. As the Chief well knows it would be extremely valuable to me to have a print of the same picture that was autographed by him. Would it be too much of an imposition to ask to have another print made, and then, some day, when he has nothing more important to do for a few seconds, for you to slip it in front of him when he was a pen in hand and have him write something like, "With best wishes to Dr. Condon, from Lyndon" or whatever else he chose to write in similar vein? I ought to get it, of course, well before November 8.

If you have a chance to tell him, he will also be interested to know that in a few weeks the Air Force will announce making a grant to the University of Colorado for us to conduct the study about UFOs (flying saucers) that grew out of criticism of the Air Force on this by the House Committee on Armed Services last spring. I am to be in charge and will do my best to put together a serious and responsible team to deal with it.

Thanking you,

Sincerely, *Ell Condon*

*Would he be willing to
announce this at a White House press conference?*

VOTE for CONDON for REGENT

September 26, 1966

Dear Mr. Condon:

Mr. Moyers has asked me to reply to your letter. After considering your suggestion for a White House release we feel that it would be more appropriate for the Air Force to make the announcement.

Best wishes.

Sincerely,

Harold C. Pachios
Associate Press Secretary

Mr. E. U. Condon
Joint Institute for Laboratory
Astrophysics
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80304

MEMORANDUM

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 13, 1966

FOR MR. W. MARVIN WATSON

Univ of Colorado

E. U.

The attached letter from Dr. Condon to Juanita Roberts was
bucked to me on October 6. Since I had no knowledge about
the Air Force grant for the UFO study, I asked Defense to
give me a memo. Defense responded with a copy of its press
release dated the following day. Thus, we can now only express
our "regret" that it was not possible for the President to make
this announcement at a press conference. (It would not have
been advisable to release this from the White House, in any case.)

Now the question remains: Do we want to send Condon the
inscribed photo he requests for use in his campaign^{for} election
to the Board of Regents?

Paul M. Popple ← *Rtn to*

Attachments

November 4, 1966

SEND PHOTO _____

DO NOT SEND _____ ☒

FOR MRS. ROBERTS

Juanita,

The attached file is self-explanatory.

I see nothing to be done now
except send the whole works to
Central Files and forget it.

Paul
Paul Popple

Encls.

CONDON *for* **REGENT**

Edward U. Condon should be elected to the Board of Regents of the University of Colorado because of his outstanding achievements in teaching, research and public affairs:

1. Condon believes that the University of Colorado is becoming one of the great universities of America and is now a major asset to Colorado's educational, cultural and economic growth.

2. Condon is in the forefront of the effort to win for Colorado the new \$375 million National Accelerator Laboratory of the Atomic Energy Commission, serving as Chairman of the University's Proton Accelerator Committee, Co-chairman of the Governor's Scientific Advisory Commission, and as Member of the Colorado Scientific Development Commission, established in May 1966 by the special session of the Colorado General Assembly.

3. Condon is constantly seeking ways to advance the University of Colorado, by promoting working relations with the National Bureau of Standards, by working for its world-famous Summer Institute for Theoretical Physics, and for its new graduate program in chemical physics, of which he is Chairman.

4. Condon's experience in public affairs includes service as Scientific Advisor to the Special Senate Committee on Atomic Energy which drafted legislation establishing the Atomic Energy Commission, as Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Color Television to the U. S. Senate, and as a Member of the President's Evaluation Commission for the Naval Atomic Bomb Tests at Bikini in 1946.

5. Condon was appointed Director of the National Bureau of Standards in 1945 by President Truman, and in 1950 established its Boulder Laboratories, a milestone in Colorado's scientific development. In 1951 he became Director of Research and Development for Corning Glass Works and continues as an active member of that company's consulting staff.

6. Condon's work in World War II included leadership of research in microwave radar for the Westinghouse Electric Corporation, and membership on the Government S-1 Committee which established the atomic bomb project, and work on that project.

7. Condon's scientific research has been honored by his election to the National Academy of Sciences, the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, the American Philosophical Society, the Société Française de Physique (Paris), the Royal Swedish Academy of Engineering Sciences (Stockholm), and the award of honorary degrees by four universities, including the University of Delhi, India.

8. Condon's professional stature has been recognized by election to high office: President of the American Physical Society (1946), President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science (1953), President of the American Association of Physics Teachers (1964).

9. Condon has taught at Columbia University, Princeton University, University of Michigan, University of Minnesota, Stanford University, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Washington University, before joining the CU faculty in 1963.

Democrat for Regent of the University of Colorado

LYNDON B. JOHNSON LIBRARY AND MUSEUM

REQUEST FOR REPRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS

Name Gilbert Cameron

Today's Date 04/16/03

Reading Room Request? ☒

Off-Site Researcher ☐ (Coordinating Archivist Initials _____)

Collection WHCF - Name File

Box Number _____

Folder Title or File Symbol (Include dates, volume #s and folder #s, as appropriate)	Form of Document	Document Number if applicable	Document Description: Correspondents, Title, or Page Number(s), as appropriate (Please be as specific as possible.)	Document Date	Number of Pages
Teller, Edward			"Johnson & Goldwater" - The secret test. Explan	ND	1

Address for off-site researcher (If not on Xerox Order Information Sheet)

Total Pages Copied 1

649 Sibbstone Ave

Fee .15

Winnipeg, Manitoba Canada R3T2V8

Phone 204-269-8940

Email address presidentialinfo@presidency.com

Johnson or Goldwater— Two Scientists Explain Their Choice

George B. Kistiakowsky, professor of chemistry at Harvard University, served as science adviser to President Eisenhower and is chairman of the National Academy of Science's Committee on Science and Public Policy. He is a founding member and co-chairman of Scientists and Engineers for Johnson.

Since scientists seem to be showing an unusually active interest in the current presidential election campaign, Science has asked two politically active leaders of the scientific community to state the reasons for their political choice. Specifically, they were asked to explain their political preference, "with particular emphasis on matters of direct professional interest to the scientific community, such as federal support for education and basic research . . . (and) . . . how the outcome of the election might affect the present relationship between science and government, including the effects it might have on the development and 'quality of American science.'"

Edward Teller, associate director of the Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, played a key role in the development of the hydrogen bomb, and has been associated with the nation's atomic energy effort for more than two decades. He is a member of the Republican Task Force on Science, Space, and the Atom.

The Case for Johnson, by G. B. Kistiakowsky

Why is President Johnson my choice in the coming election?

Why am I unalterably opposed to Senator Goldwater?

For several reasons, among them what the legislative records of the two men and their public statements during the last few years indicate as to their understanding of the problems of the mid-twentieth century and their plans for dealing with them. Consider the issues of special concern to our technical community—foreign policy and education and science.

Our foreign policy, although not free of setbacks, has been, on balance, a very successful one. Confronted with a strong nuclear armed opponent, our bi-partisan consensus has recognized the clear implications of the nuclear age: we cannot achieve "total victory" as it was conceived in earlier ages without incurring perhaps total destruction of our own civilization. Accordingly our bi-partisan foreign policy has been to:

—Maintain a strong military, with complete civilian control; resist firmly aggressive acts but avoid escalation into general nuclear war. Results: prevention of military takeover of Greece by Communists; resistance to attacks on South Korea, Taiwan and South Vietnam; defeat of Berlin blockade; prevention of Cuba becoming a militarily aggressive bastion, etc.

—Strengthen the non-Communist world economically and militarily by foreign aid, and establish defensive alliances. The Soviets failed to Communize Western Europe; instead they face flourishing economies and a strong NATO alliance. The survival of other free nations aided by us also testifies to the worth of this policy.

—Seek for effectively safeguarded disarmament steps, in the belief that international tension and arms race decrease

The Case for Goldwater, by Edward Teller

There are three issues which have influenced me in making up my mind about the Presidential election. One is connected with science and technology; another is individual initiative; and the third is peace.

Senator Goldwater is not a typical professional politician. The world of technology has a real attraction for him. He loves photography and electronics, and he practices the art of flying. He has made many contacts with the hard laws of nature. I believe he will not take a superficial view of the development of science. While President Kennedy was a real master among politicians, his insatiable intellect attracted him to many other fields. He asked numerous pertinent questions about the essential scientific developments and arrived at detailed decisions in the most advanced technical fields after he had obtained thorough information.

Unfortunately, this wonderful practice fell into disuse last November. It should be revived. I believe that Goldwater will revive it.

In view of the importance of research and development, we should ask to what extent decisions are based on extraneous political factors and to what extent essential technical arguments are taken into consideration. I believe that, in spite of the availability of excellent technical information, political arguments have played an undue role in the decision for a crash program on the moon shot. The program was adopted against the advice of our most respected scientists. One of the strongest opponents of a lavish space program was Dr. Kistiakowsky.

Senator Goldwater has argued against this extravagant program. Under his administration our space program may begin to look more like science and less like a stunt.

During the last few months industrial research and de-