

SCIENCE

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE
1515 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, NW, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005 • 387-7171

Cumms Langer
Langer

April 6

Dear Mat:

I've been referring people to you--constantly it seems to me--since my CEW articles came out and hope you are not feeling even more swamped by it than usual. Ted Sherburne told me you spoke to his group in New York. I hope the Cornell people got their speakers--did you go to that? The Foreign Relations Committee was poking around for awhile and were interested in getting you to testify but I haven't heard whether anything came of that.

About your question. There was no official response from the Pentagon to the articles. The Star sent Richard Fryklund, then their military reporter and now a Pentagon employee, over there following publication to see what he could dig up. According to my report, which is second or third hand, they were unhappy about the articles but were forced to confirm their accuracy. I think they deliberately avoided public comment in the hope that the flurry of news articles would be foreshortened. I have gotten no wind at all of a response to the petition. I just tried to call someone in the Office of Science and Technology who told me in the late fall that they were awaiting the petition and might take some action when it arrived, but he is unavailable. If it would be helpful, I could try to call him next week. (If there is any reason to mention Pentagon response in your Post piece, it should be phrased something like "the substance of the articles was confirmed privately by the Pentagon", since my information is not direct.)

I guess you didn't know that Sandy and I have been separated, for about a year. Our plans, both separately and with respect to each other, are very vague. I think there is a good chance that he will be at Harvard next fall at the School of Education, and take his Guggenheim in England in the spring. But I don't know for sure.

Best,

Ellie

HARVARD UNIVERSITY
THE BIOLOGICAL LABORATORIES
16 DIVINITY AVENUE
CAMBRIDGE 38, MASSACHUSETTS

July 29, 1964

Miss Eleanor Langer
Science Magazine
1515 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C.

Dear Ellie,

Thank you for your reply of July 23 suggesting that I submit my review to the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists rather than to Science. I shall do exactly that.

As ever,

Matthew Meselson

July 23, 1964

Professor Matthew Meselson
Biological Laboratories
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dear Matt:

Dan is away, and having left the initial unpleasant job of informing contributors about the demise of Science & Public Policy to him, I am now taking care of some mopping up operations. I have taken up the matter of publishing your review in Science with the powers that be, and my advice, frankly, is for you to publish it in the Bulletin instead. They didn't say yes and they didn't say no, but my impression is that the book review section is filled up for the next couple of months and that there would be some reluctance to review Rothschild's book after that.

It was very honorable of you to return the check, but since our Board of Directors in its infinite wisdom decreed that contributors to Science & Public Policy should be paid, I am sending it back to you.

For whatever it's worth, I want you to know that I am very sorry about this outcome. I think your review is a fine one, and would have liked to see it appear here.

Best,



Elinor Langer

EL:rg

May 11, 1964

Professor Matthew Meselson
Biological Laboratories
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dear Matt:

Enclosed are the proofs of your book review. A few minor changes were made, mainly for stylistic purposes, since you looked over the manuscript here last week. Since we're close to press time, we'll go ahead with things as they are unless we hear from you.

Thanks again for writing the review. Come visit again when you have a chance.

Best,



Elinor Langer

EL:rg

April 1, 1964

Professor Matthew Meselson
Biological Laboratories
Harvard University
Cambridge 38, Massachusetts

Dear Mat:

I feel very pleased and relieved that you have agreed to review General Rothschild's book for the first issue of Science and Public Policy. The book seems to me a peculiarly disarming one, and it demands a kind of analysis and refutation that I am afraid it will not get in very many places. Some people will undoubtedly quarrel with his main belief--that these weapons are more humane--and I hope you will talk about that too, but I suspect most people will deal with it from the wrong angle.

As far as the details go, we would like the review as soon as possible, but in any event no later than May 1. There are no rigid requirements for length, but it should probably be in the neighborhood of 2000 words. Finally, to get to more worldly matters, we are authorized to pay \$100 for book reviews.

Let me tell you again how glad I am you are reviewing the book. If any problems arise--if you feel you would like more space, for example--please don't hesitate to give Dan Greenberg or me a call. Otherwise, we will just expect to receive your review within the month, and are looking forward to it.

Best wishes,



Elinor Langer

EL:rg