

Encl 5a

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

1006 JILA Bldg.

20 May 1968

Mr. Joseph H. Allen, President
McGraw-Hill, Inc.,
330 West 42nd Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

Dear Mr. Allen:

I am astonished that Scientific Research would publish such an article as that which appears on p. 11 of the May 13 issue without checking with me to guard against error. Because they did not do so, and because, thereby, many falsehoods and misrepresentations were given wide currency in the scientific community through their irresponsible publication, I feel that I must serve notice on you that my lawyers are reviewing the situation with a view to libel action against McGraw-Hill, Inc. as publisher of this unfortunate article.

Since 1929 I have had a number of pleasant associations with McGraw-Hill, principally with the McGraw-Hill Book Company, which in that year published the first English language book on quantum mechanics, "Quantum Mechanics" by Prof. Morse and myself. McGraw-Hill also publishes the "Handbook of Physics" edited by myself and Hugh Odishaw, now in its second edition. McGraw-Hill also uses me as consulting editor on a series of physics textbooks. I have also helped with certain portions of the McGraw-Hill Encyclopedia of Science and Technology. All such associations with McGraw-Hill book Company must now be considered as suspended until McGraw-Hill makes satisfactory atonement for their grievous error in publishing the p. 11, May 13, article in Scientific Research.

As a first and partial step in this direction, but in no sense implying a complete satisfaction of the harm done me (and yourselves by the implication that one of your authors and editors is "unscientific"), I enclose a reply which I expect you to publish in a prominent place in the May 27 issue of Scientific Research. I also think it would be a good idea and would contribute greatly to the perspective of your readers for you to republish the enclosed editorial from the Bryan (Ohio) Times which I think is one of the best statements I have seen about the UFO situation. To break up the solid type you might also wish to publish the enclosed cartoon with due credit to the Boulder Daily Camera for May 5.

I expect you to provide me with 500 reprints without charge.

Sincerely,



E. U. Condon

EUC:kes
Encls.

+ ... 10. 1

1 1

* ... 1. P ...

Boulder, Colorado

May 20, 1968

Editor, Scientific Research

Condon Replies to Ufological Critics

When Look Magazine for May 14 spewed forth 7.75 million copies of a malicious article containing falsehoods and misrepresentations about the UFO study of which I am scientific director, a new record for reader ennui was established: I have received fewer than 20 letters about it in the two weeks after publication. The Look publisher, Gardner Cowles, has demonstrated his lack of interest in "truth and responsibility in publishing" by not responding personally to my offer to help him correct the errors printed because of his editors' irresponsibility. Such yellow journalism is not worth anyone's attention.

But when Scientific Research (May 13, p. 11) prints an article on this subject also containing falsehoods and misrepresentations, without giving me a chance to check it for errors, I must comment, because McGraw-Hill, Inc. has hitherto had a fine reputation in the scientific community. I have hitherto had many pleasant associations with McGraw-Hill since 1929 when they published "Quantum Mechanics" by myself and P. M. Morse.

Scientific Research erred in uncritical acceptance of a distorted version of the situation as supplied to them by two disgruntled former employees of the UFO project. The article says that Saunders and Levine criticize me for taking "what they call an 'unscientific' approach." To call me unscientific is as libelous per se as to call a good woman a whore. My lawyers are planning appropriate action against Saunders, Levine and McGraw-Hill, Inc.

The article falsely asserts that the two men were discharged for scientific correspondence with outsiders. The fact is that one factor in their discharge was that they supplied outsiders with material taken from personal files (not project files) and have admitted doing this in the expectation that this action

would prove damaging to the University of Colorado. This misconduct is clearly on record in the Look article and in statements made in a press conference held in Washington on April 30 by Donald Keyhoe, Director of NICAP.

Furthermore, the article says that "McDonald accuses Condon of having rejected serious consideration of the extraterrestrial hypothesis." This accusation is completely false and attests only to McDonald's ignorance about my work.

The article says that "Levine maintains that a lot of evidence points toward the extraterrestrial origin of UFOs." If Levine has such evidence, let him publish it. Convincing evidence on this point would be the greatest scientific discovery in several thousand years. By the same token, a scientist who announces it as a fact without full evidence to back it up is a fool.

Our report on this study, to which the two men who misled Scientific Research have contributed so little, is expected to be complete by September 30 and to be publicly available in the fall. Until then fair-minded people will reserve judgment.

E. U. Condon,
Department of Physics and Astrophysics,
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80302

Encl 5
President Smiley

UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO
BOULDER, COLORADO 80302

XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

1006 JILA Bldg.

22 May 1968

Mr. Joseph H. Allen, President
McGraw-Hill, Inc.,
330 West 42nd Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

Dear Mr. Allen:

Yesterday afternoon Adamson telephoned to ask my permission to publish in Scientific Research for May 27 an emasculated version of my letter. I gave that permission on the explicit understanding that such publication in no way contributes to the satisfaction of my grievances against McGraw Hill, Inc., for the libelous material published on pp. 11-12 of the May 13 issue. This condition is herewith made part of the written records. Do not send me any reprints of that letter: they are worthless.

Earlier in the day Mr. Tuohig, obviously misled by Adamson, telephoned to tell about the efforts their reporter Roger Smith had made to reach me for comment. This element is being fraudulently misrepresented: Roger Smith did reach me once but the only thing he asked me was the expected date of completion of the UFO report, and I told him it was planned for September 30, a fact which he did not even use in the May 13 article. Emphatically, he did not reveal his intent to write an article about the Saunders-Levine libel actions or ask for comment on that.

The situation, as it now appears, shows a much worse behavior on the part of Adamson than I suspected at first.

When on May 17 I first saw the offending May 13 issue, I telephoned a friend in New York to ask him to look into it for me. Yesterday morning I received a report from him, dated May 17, by mail from which I quote:

"I talked with - - - - of Scientific Research and learned that the article (of which I enclose a tear-sheet in case your copy has not arrived) required several revisions because Saunders and Levine kept vacillating as to their position regarding the suit. It was on; it was off; it might be on; there was just an outside chance that it might not be brought; etc.; etc. All of which leads me to the conclusion that they are -- though perhaps they are not openly showing it -- by no means certain of the wisdom of pressing the matter further than the kind of harrassment they have thus far engaged in."

A little calendar arithmetic: if on May 21 the May 27 issue was almost closed up for press, then the same situation must have obtained on May 7 with respect to the May 13 issue, and therefore the editorial work on the offending article was completed before May 7.

Saunders and Levine had summonses served on me on April 29, the very day that Look for May 14 went on the newsstands and the day before Keyhoe held a press conference in Washington to make libelous attacks on me and to defame the University of Colorado. All three of these events were obviously synchronized in a conspiratorial attempt to harm me and the University of Colorado.

It is useful to me to know from the above quoted report that Saunders and Levine were vacillating about real libel action within a few days after initiating action against me. It clearly reveals them as unethically using the courts for vexatious harrassment.

However, in connection with my relations with McGraw-Hill, the report presents a picture of Saunders and Levine being in touch with Scientific Research about the libel action over a period of several days in which the article was changed more than once while they vacillated. Hence, there was plenty of time during the week of April 29 for Adamson to have made genuinely effective efforts to reach me in contrast to the fake attempt made by Roger Smith. His attempt I regard as nothing but a feint, in order that they could later take up the virtuous stance which they misled Mr. Tuohig into taking yesterday.

The correctness of this picture of the real state of affairs is supported by an additional fact which Adamson told me yesterday. In bragging about the nice things said about me by Dr. Ratchford of the AFOSR, he recalled that that part of the offending article was obtained for Scientific Research through the repertorial efforts of Paul Sears of Boulder. I know Paul Sears. He has been working with me because Scientific Research had earlier commissioned him to write a biographical sketch about me to be used next fall, at the time of public release of the UFO report. In view of what has happened I withdraw permission for the use of such an article without explicit approval of the copy by me.

My point here is that if Adamson had really wanted my comment on the May 13 article about the Saunders-Levine libel action he could have asked Paul Sears to reach me and have him get my comment, instead of using Roger Smith for the one fake attempt already described. I think he did not use Paul Sears because (a) he really did not want my comment and (b) he expected Paul Sears would be friendly to me and would not go along with the kind of stab-in-the-back article which he was preparing. Perhaps it was only bumbling ineptitude. Whatever the reason, this completes a picture of Adamson as only wanting to be able to claim that he tried to reach me, while making sure that he did not.

I do not speculate on whether Adamson merely wanted a cheap scoop for his throw-away newspaper, or whether he may also be a part of the group that is attempting to discredit the University of Colorado study.

As a publisher, you should be deeply interested in what these men (Saunders, Levine, Keyhoe, McDonald, Fuller, and probably others) are trying to do, and to use your magazine for doing. There are motives here of genuine belief in flying saucers as visitors from outer space. There are also commercial motives: I have been told that Fuller has made more than a million dollars in book royalties and sale of movie rights on his two UFO books, "Incident at Exeter" and "The Interrupted Journey."

22 May 1968

The various persons named and others have come to the conclusion that the tendency of our report on our UFO study will be deflationary with respect to public interest in UFOs. This worries them to the extent (a) that some may be fanatic believers, (b) that the effect may be to reduce government expenditures on future UFO studies (McDonald publicly pleads that government UFO spending ought to "dwarf the space program") and (c) that the effect may be to reduce the publishing market for trashy UFO literature.

They have decided that the study must, therefore, be discredited at all costs to diminish the extent of these effects which they expect our report otherwise would have. Mind you, I do not say that our report will be of this kind, simply that those who are frantically starting this early attack believe that it will be, and so they seek to discredit it before it is actually written.

This whole situation is so fantastic that it may seem incredible to an intelligent business leader like yourself. I only bother to tell you these things out of a certain basic friendliness to McGraw-Hill over 40 years that has not been completely eradicated by the May 13 article in Scientific Research. Even if you are not convinced now, observe the events that have happened and will happen in the rest of 1968 and see for yourself how they will fit in to this pattern.

Your staff ought to be thinking in terms of a major retraction and exposure of what is really going on as litigation between us then may not be necessary. In the meantime, my lawyers and I are studying the May 13 issue carefully to decide on a proper course of action. I reaffirm my position of no other dealings with McGraw-Hill until this matter is satisfactorily settled.

Perhaps McGraw-Hill is interested in publication of our UFO report. If so, an approach should be made to Dean Eugene Wilson, vice-president for business affairs of the University of Colorado. Exact plans are not yet made, but we are thinking along these lines. We will prepare camera-ready copy for photo reproduction and 25 copies to the Air Force to fulfill our contract. This manuscript is to be copyrighted by the University, subject only to the Government's royalty-free right for copies for its own use. After review by a committee of the National Academy of Sciences it is ready for publication. The full document, which will have many appendices with supporting material, would be ready for quick publication by photo methods. This could be done either by a commercial publisher or by the GPO. Simultaneously with the foregoing we will have prepared an abridgement of the main document covering the principal material in suitable trade book size for near simultaneous publication with the main document both in hardback and in paperback.

Sincerely,



E. U. Condon

EUC:kes

- cc - Hon. Harold Brown, Secretary of the Air Force
- President Joseph R. Smiley, University of Colorado
- President Frederick Seitz, National Academy of Sciences
- Dr. J. Thomas Ratchford, AFOSR