

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Thurston E. Manning

DATE: 10 January 1967

FROM: Robert J. Low

SUBJECT: UFO Project

Ted:

The session Thursday evening at the Harvest House (Century Room, 8:00 p.m.) will cover two items:

- I. A report by the CU group on where we stand, what we've accomplished;
- II. A statement by the visitors on what they consider to be the scope of the project.

While the need to review Item Number I is obvious, it's a little less obvious for Number II, because we have a contract Statement of Work that is supposed to set the limits of the project. The wording of the Work Statement, however, provides a lot of flexibility, and there is question within our group about how far we should go in making recommendations on policy questions. The following kinds of policies are involved:

1. Do we address ourselves to, and give a judgment on it in the final report, the question of whether the Air Force and other agencies of the government are withholding important information about UFOs? This is a problem that produces a good deal of public concern; it may or may not be our function to deal with it. I'm inclined to think

~~that~~ it is ?

that's.

2. Do we make a recommendation on what the nation ought to do about UFOs after we're through with our study? Presumably the problem won't go away just because the University of Colorado spends a year or so studying it. So what is it in the national interest to do in the way of spending taxpayers' money on continuing the investigation of UFOs? These are the specific points on which we might make recommendations: Should Project Blue Book be continued? At the present level of activity, or at an augmented or reduced level? Should the present branch of the Air Force, which is an intelligence organization, continue to carry responsibility for the investigation? If not that branch, then which one? In the Air Force? Elsewhere in the government? In private hands (not, however, I think we all agree, at Colorado)? Is any expenditure of taxpayers' funds justified?

It is possible, of course, for us to confine ourselves to the "scientific" aspects of the problem - that is, to an evaluation of the mystery involved in unexplained sighting reports. I have the feeling that we can contribute more by addressing ourselves to the questions in 1 and 2 than we can by assessing the "scientific" problem. It would be wonderful if we could say that all of the unexplaineds can be ascribed to natural phenomena (i.e. no spaceships guided by thinking beings), but I think that there is just about

Dean Thurston E. Manning

-2-

10 January 1967

a zero probability that we will be successful in doing that. The best that can be expected is that we might explain some of the sightings now unexplained, but, in all probability, we will be able to say no more about the remaining unexplaineds than that they're unexplained. So the phenomenological problem remains, and we don't accomplish very much unless we tackle the policy questions.

This is what we'll be talking about Thursday evening, and I'm delighted that you can be there. I think this is going to be one of the key sessions of the whole project.

Attached is a schedule of events for the two days of meetings. As you can see, Thursday evening is the important session. The rest of the time is taken up in briefings by the Air Force on military weapons (to equip us to distinguish between weapons and UFOs). If you and Jeanne find you can make it for a drink at our house at 5:30 Thursday, that would be great. Just come if you can; no need to let us know either way.

END

RJL:mla