

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. Condon
FROM: R. J. Low
SUBJ: Recent file memos by EUC

March 8, 1968.

Ed:

Thanks for sending me copies of your four file memos of March 1 and 2. I am in full agreement, subject to one or two minor points, with the details you have recorded. I would like, in addition, to make note of a couple of points that have not yet been covered.

Memo of March 2nd concerning the September 18th meeting with Saunders. Saunders, I recall, was guarded about revealing the extent to which he thought it was probable the Colorado Study would find convincing evidence of UFOs as intelligently guided extraterrestrial craft. I remember you asked him how likely he would judge this was, and his answer was 1 in 10⁷ or perhaps 10⁻², but perhaps you thought - I know I did - that he was not being honest in saying this, because in fact he felt convinced of the existence of ETI but was reluctant to say so - at least to us.

My memory of your statement ("extremely unlikely that we would get evidence pointing clearly toward the reality of extra-terrestrial visitors") is that you put it more mildly than that, more like: "I haven't seen any good evidence of ETI yet, and I would be surprised if, in the short time remaining in the project, we get any." At the same time, you made the important point that those who hold the opinion that ETI is a real phenomenon have the obligation to bring forward the evidence that justifies this belief. You put the burden on him and persons who take the position he does to produce the evidence and indicated you would consider it carefully and objectively.

Finally, I would like to make a record of the fact that I was nervous about Saunders - nervous, that is, that he was prejudiced and would not, as you put it, deal with the evidence in an honest scientific way - from the beginning. I mentioned this first to Stuart Cook just a couple of weeks after the project started, and he assured me that, as a scientist, Saunders would be guided by the scientific evidence.

Memo of March 1st concerning the drug and narcotics activities of Armstrong and Wadsworth. There is an indication that Roger Harkins was also involved in the threat to discredit the project by exposing Wadsworth's activities. Ahrens said he overheard Roger say to Wadsworth - Ahrens indicated he said it jokingly - that, if his activities were revealed to

-2-

the authorities, it would prove very embarrassing to the project.

Laurie objected to use of the word "induce" to describe Mary Lou's role with respect to her in the LSD matter, but, after questioning her more closely, I conclude the word was used accurately. While Mary Lou didn't actually plead with Laurie to take it, she did (and at the time Laurie was just barely 18) offer her plenty of encouragement if she had the inclination. She offered to serve as Laurie's "guide" any time she wanted to try it, and she told Laurie it was a great experience, one that she shouldn't miss. That sounds like inducement to me.

I think it should be noted, in connection with Saunders's work on the project, that he resisted suggestions to do psychology. His work concerned itself solely with the statistical treatment of the physical aspects of sighting reports. Even though he was aware that the O'Brien Committee had stressed the need to study the psychology of the problem as well as the physics of it, we couldn't get Dave to do any work on the former. When Aldora Lee came aboard, Dave made sure that she reported directly to him rather than to you or me, and, if I had not insisted on it, Lee would have devoted her entire effort to testing persons' attitudes toward UFOs, and nothing would have been accomplished on the opinion survey. It is only the latter that holds any promise of telling us about the persons who see UFOs and how they compare with the population at large. It is my impression that Saunders did not want such an investigation undertaken. If one assumes his purpose was to demonstrate the physical reality of ETI, then it follows that he would have no interest in doing psychology, because the possibility exists that one might find that sighters, by and large, are odd balls. I now recall that many months ago Saunders did try some correlation tests on such data as he had computerized at the time. The only result of that work, that he told me about at any rate, was the remarkable finding - I don't know at what level of significance - that blue UFOs have a longer duration than UFOs of other colors. One could speculate that he had run correlations - I will try to check this at the Computer Center - and that, finding nothing interesting, he turned to orthoteny to see if that would yield more promising evidence.

There is, finally, the peculiar circumstance that the press, when the announcement of the discharges was made, referred to Saunders as "co-principal investigator." In the same connection, on the forms I

-3-

submitted in behalf of Saunders, one to continue his appointment beyond January 31st and the other to terminate him on February 8th, the title shown was crossed out and in its place appeared "co-principal investigator." That change, of course, was not made in this office. The form didn't go to your office. I do not know, although I have checked, in which office the change was made, nor how it came about. The fact is, of course, that Saunders was never at any time a co-principal investigator. I have always followed carefully the titles used in the original proposal, a subject about which, I recall, there was considerable discussion. That shows you as scientific director and then shows you again, along with Stuart Cook and Franklin Roach, as principal investigator. The staff list shows, on the budget page, "principal investigators." No mention is made of "co-principal investigators." Three persons are listed under the title of "faculty investigators." They are: Saunders, Scott, and Wertheimer. I called Dean Little's office today (March 8th) and asked him to let the record show that Saunders was a faculty investigator rather than co-principal investigator.

END