

Dr. Condon

MEMORANDUM

TO: UFO Investigating Group
FROM: Robert Low
SUBJECT: Air Force Briefing on January 12, 13.
DATE: December 30, 1966

Gentlemen:

The Air Force briefing is turning into more of an operation than expected. In the first place, the members of the advisory group to the Air Force on the operation of the UFO study will be here. They are:

- Dr. John W. Evans, Director of Sacramento Peak Observatory, Sunspot, New Mexico (a laboratory of Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories).
- Dr. John Howard, Chief Scientist, AFCRL.
- Dr. Kenneth Kissell, Aerospace Research Laboratory, Office of Aerospace Research, Wright-Patterson AFB.
- Dr. Herman J. Sander, AFOSR, Washington.

Hippler, Quintanilla, and Ratchford will be here and, in addition, John Coleman, Executive Secretary of the National Academy of Sciences. It is possible that Dr. M. Gilbert of AFCRL will also come along.

This is quite a distinguished group and throws a rather new light on the two-day session, especially in view of the fact that, according to the tentative schedule, we plan on the evening of the 12th to have a round-table discussion to consider the visitors' views of the scope of the project and a review by the Condon committee of progress to date.

The schedule for the two-day session is tentatively as follows:

<u>Thursday</u> <i>Jan 12</i>	1:30 - 4:30 p.m.	Unclassified briefing, UMC Conference Center, Room 157.
	5:30 - 7:00 p.m.	Cocktails, R. J. Low's house, 1340 King Avenue (ladies welcome).
	7:00 - 8:00 p.m.	Harvest House, Century Room, dutch dinner.
	8:00 - 10:00 p.m.	Roundtable discussion, Harvest House, Century Room.
<u>Friday</u> <i>Jan 13</i>	9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.	Classified briefing: (The briefing will be held at the National Bureau of Standards, room number to be announced later.) <i>Room 1107</i>

END OF MEMO

RJL:mla

2/1

Ed:

Jan 12 1967

Here are some thoughts about what you might say we've decided to do:

1. Study promising physical explanations, of which at the moment the two most interesting are the Klass hypothesis (ball lightning, plasmas generally) and the Robey cometoids. We're still studying the best way to look into these possibilities; for example, Robey has submitted a proposal ^{of} a subcontract, and Melpar is submitting one.
2. Study (as I see it, this is primarily my responsibility) all the celebrated old sightings, so we're familiar with them and have an opinion on whether the interpretations are reasonable.
3. Form a CU team to study current sightings. Contact AP to give us fast notification.
4. Sign up investigators, or collaborators, at selected, geographically dispersed universities around the country to stand by to study sightings in their local areas upon request by us.
5. Record of briefings (two more coming up next week in chemistry and radar) incorporated into a sort of chronicle of the project will show that we are going out into the scientific community to solicit counsel and advice wherever and whenever we think it can help.
6. *Handbook, manual, and questionnaire.*
~~7.~~ You might want to say something about the Wertheimer hypothesis. As a matter of fact, I think it's important to do so, because of the implication that, at the end of the project, there is about a zero probability that we will be able to explain the mystery of the UFOs. Hence, one might, at this stage of the study, predict that we will make the least spectacular progress in the scientific phase of the work, and our ^{biggest} contribution to an easing of the problem (the problem being public concern and anxiety about UFOs and the need to make a decision what to do about the best way to spend, or not to spend at all, taxpayers' money ^{on} UFO studies after we're through *with*

-2-

our work and the need to decide how to conduct the study - whether in FTD or in the Air Force at all or even within the government - if we recommend that the work of Blue Book should go forward) might well fall in the non-scientific area. That is, our role might best be fulfilled by acknowledging that we have a problem, that the problem is going to remain, and that the following is what we propose the country should do about it. "The following" would then be our answers to these questions: How much, if any, taxpayers' money should be spent on continuing an investigation of UFOs? Should FTD continue the study, if it should be continued at all, and, if not, who should? What steps should be taken to improve the data? Will it help to improve the data?

8. The other non-scientific question is an investigation into the alleged Air Force mishandling of sightings, the alleged conspiracy. Do we consider that our function?

END

RJK.