

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN

The A. P. R. O. Bulletin is the official copyrighted publication of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (A.P.R.O.), 4145 E. Desert Place, Tucson, Arizona, and is issued every other month to members only. The Aerial Phenomena Research Organization is a non-profit group dedicated to the eventual solution of the mystery of the unidentified objects which have been present in the skies for hundreds of years. Inquiries regarding membership may be made to the above address.

TUCSON, ARIZONA— JULY, 1964

UFO LANDING AT AIR FORCE BASE

Splitting Disc Seen In Arkansas

The following report is forwarded by Lucius Farish of Plumerville, Arkansas, and seems to describe the entry into the atmosphere of disc-shaped or cigar-shaped objects from a distant point in space.

"On the evening of Tuesday, January 28, 1964, I was examining the star field of the star, Eta Tauri, a star similar to ours at the distance of 11 light-years or 11x10-12 miles. At 8:37 p.m., an unusual star appeared in the field which was not there a few minutes before. At this time it appeared at 8.3 magnitude and increased slightly in brightness. At first I believed it to be a nova (exploding star). Time: 8:54 p.m., magnitude 7.4—it appeared with a disc shape, but I disregarded this because of the possibility of poor atmospheric conditions at the time. Time: 9:15 p.m., magnitude 5-7—it appeared more disc-shaped but I was not sure at the time again. At 9:34 p.m., the object had split into two sections with the same original shape as the first one. At 9:45 p.m., it became evident to me that these were the real things. For another half hour, they became brighter than before. At 10:22 p.m., they became of naked-eye visibility at 3rd magnitude. After they became visible, I followed them with 7x36 binoculars. They became brighter and brighter by every accompanying minute, until their actual shape was visible (about the diameter of the moon when full). At 10:30 p.m., high frequency (and deafening) sound was heard. At this time, the UFOs began to move in a southeast direction and disappeared in the south-southeast."

By phone and personal interview Mr. Farish learned the following facts concerning this sighting: "The color of the UFOs was white, although this could not be ascertained through the telescope, because the observer was using a neutral filter. Some details were visi-

(See Disc—Page 4)

Kids Called Hoaxers By U.S.A.F.

At about 10:30 on the evening of 30 April 1964, Linda Davis, 11, of Canyon Ferry, Montana, looked out her window and saw a "bright glow." At the same time, two young members of the Harold Rust family nearby, saw something strange. A lighted object landed, then took off. They called the local sheriff's office and got the brush-off. The youngsters were alone in their homes in a Federal housing area at the time. When their parents came home, the children told them and the parents investigated. They found four 8"x10" rectangular indentations, about 4-8 inches deep, arranged in an irregular rectangle, about 13 feet apart. Near the approximate middle of the arrangement of holes was a cactus which was burned near the top, and the ground was still warm.

Another recall to Sheriff Dave Middlemas was made by the parents and this initiated an investigation which later brought Dr. J. A. Hynek of Northwestern University, the AF's consulting astrophysicist, Air Force officers from Malstrom AFB near Great Falls, Montana, arrived in a C-47 at Helena, 20 miles west of Canyon Ferry, then motored to Canyon Ferry. When approached by a newsman, one officer only chuckled, whereas Lt. Col. H. L. Newfield said: "We are not at liberty to say anything at this point. I'm not sure we will make a positive statement about this at any time." Newfield was Director of Base Operations at Malstrom.

The information gleaned via letter and telephone by APRO included the following:

The holes were found 125 feet from the rear of the Davis house and about the same distance from the Lake (Canyon Ferry) nearby.

Although the youngsters were the butt of considerable ridicule and cruel jokes at school in the following days, they did not change their story.

When asked if they had heard about

(See Hoaxers—Page 5)

The following is a chronological account of the landing of an unconventional aerial object on the North Range Extension of Holloman Air Force Base on Thursday, 30 April, 1964.

The pilot of a B-57 bomber engaged in a routine mission in the vicinity of Stallion Site, a few miles east of San Antonio, New Mexico, called Mission Control on the radio and informed the Controller there: "I'm not alone up here." To which he received the following query: "What do you mean?"

The pilot explained "I've got a UFO." The Controller then asked, "What does it look like?" and the pilot answered: "It's egg-shaped and white."

"Any markings?" asked Control. "The same as the one at Socorro," the pilot said, then added, "I'm going to make another pass."

Minutes later the huge, cumbersome bomber had made its turn and had come in over the area where the UFO was first seen, whereupon the pilot called Control again and reported: "It's on the ground!"

At this point communications ceased. Photo crews were alerted and asked to stand by.

This information was first relayed to APRO by a very reliable source. However, we felt it was necessary to check, if possible, our other sources in the Alamogordo area, and to our great surprise got confirmation almost immediately. Our first inquiry was to Terry Clarke, of Radio Station KALG, who was surprised to hear that we already knew of the landing. He said he had intended to write the details and forward them to us. His information had come from a ham radio operator who had been monitoring various frequencies while checking out some equipment, when he picked up the frequency which the bomber and Mission Control were using. He listened, fascinated, until communications ceased.

The word got around fast, apparently, for when Mrs. Lorenzen called Arlynn Bruer of The Alamogordo Daily News,

(See Landing—Page 3)

Rec 30/1/65

The A. P. R. O. BULLETIN

Published by
THE AERIAL PHENOMENA RESEARCH
ORGANIZATION
4145 E. Desert Place
Tucson, Arizona
Copyright 1964, Coral E. Lorenzen
Editor and Director

Information appearing in this bulletin may be used by other UAO research periodicals providing names and address credit is properly given to this organization and periodical.

Coral E. Lorenzen — International Director and Editor
A. E. Brown, B.S.E.E. — Director of Research
L. J. Lorenzen — Director of Public Relations
John T. Hopf — Photographic Consultant
Oliver Dean — Photographic Consultant

SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVES

(The following listed individuals participate in planning and policy-making as Staff Members, in addition to coordinating investigative efforts in the areas indicated following their names.)

Dr. Olavo T. Fontes, M.D. — Brazil
K. Gosta Rehn — Sweden
Graham Conway — Eastern Canada
Aime Michel — France
Horacio Gonzales Gauteaume — Venezuela
Peter E. Norris, L.L.D. — Australia
Jun' Ichi Takanashi — Japan
Juan C. Remonda — Argentina
Sergio Robba — Italy
Arist. Mitropoulos — Greece
Rev. N. C. G. Cruttwell, New Guinea
Eduardo Buelte — Spain
Norman Alford — New Zealand
Austin Byrne — Ireland

SPECIAL CONSULTANT

Prof. Charles Maney,—Physics

ALAMOGORDO PRINTING CO., INC

Editorial

Member Richard Fagone of Medford, Massachusetts, has been good enough to forward copies of a letter he received from his district Congressional Representative, Torbert H. Macdonald, in answer to his own letter inquiring about Congressional hearings on UFOs. Macdonald's letter enclosed a letter he in turn received from Colonel William E. Poe of the Congressional Inquiry Division, Office of Legislative Liaison, in reply to his (Macdonald's) inquiry on behalf of his constituent, Mr. Fagone. We quote:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515
September 21, 1964

Mr. Richard A. Fagone
63 Princeton Street
Medford, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Fagone:

I am sending you herewith a letter just received by me from the Department of the Air Force, regarding reports on Unidentified Flying Objects.

The letter is self-explanatory, and I

hope that the information in the attached letter will be enlightening to you. If you feel I may be of further service in any way, please let me know.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely yours,

Torbert H. Macdonald, M.C.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
Washington
Office of the Secretary

September 18, 1964

Dear Mr. Macdonald:

This is in response to your recent inquiry in behalf of Mr. Richard A. Fagone, concerning reports on Unidentified Flying Objects (UFOs).

The Air Force has copies of "The UFO Evidence," a publication of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP). The publication is a voluminous collection of reports, facts, opinions, excerpts of investigative reports and correspondence all designed to support the conclusion of NICAP that UFOs are a problem of National import.

In the investigation of over 8,000 UFO reports during the past 16 years, there has been no evidence presented to the Air Force that unexplained UFOs represent extra-terrestrial vehicles under intelligent control. On the contrary, Air Force investigators have proved almost conclusively that there is a logical explanation for all aerial phenomena, whether created and sent aloft by man, generated by atmospheric conditions, or caused by celestial bodies and their residue of meteoric activity.

The Air Force does not withhold information on UFOs from the public. It has sometimes been necessary to refrain from releasing names of individuals in order to protect them from the curious, and there are occasions when investigative procedures have not been released because they might involve evaluation of other intelligence information. However, the results of all Air Force investigations have always been made available to bona fide news representatives and scientific researchers. Press releases have been issued as warranted, and yearly summaries of information compiled for dissemination to the public upon request. The latest summary was recently sent to Mr. Fagone in response to his request made direct to the Air Force.

The Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations of the Senate Government Operations Committee has indicated from time to time its interest in the UFO phenomena, and it has been furnished all the information it requested. After preliminary investigation, the Subcommittee staff indicated that it did not intend to hold hearings on the subject.

The Air Force will continue its inves-

tigation of UFOs from the standpoint of defense of our country. Reports will continue to be analyzed and evaluated and releases made to the public when warranted.

Your continued interest in Air Force matters is appreciated.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. POE,
Colonel, USAF
Congressional Inquiry
Division, Office of
Legislative Liaison.

Attachment

Honorable Torbert H. Macdonald,
House of Representatives.

APRO, or should we more accurately say, the Lorenzens, have been the targets of a good deal of pressure to advocate mail campaigns to members of Congress of the United States of America. We have given our reasons, but at this time would like to add a little by way of illustrating our point.

APRO was founded in 1952—the Director's interest in unknown sky objects dates back to childhood — 1934, to be exact. In 1952, as well as during the ensuing years until about 1956, APRO occasionally advocated mail campaigns to members of Congress, but after the 1957 flap, sufficient evidence was at hand to indicate that this sort of pressure was costly and inadequate, especially in the face of evidence that the Air Force was not the central agency designated by the U. S. Government to investigate, correlate, research and analyze UFO reports. This latter thesis, which we explored in depth in an editorial entitled "The Reason" in the November 1963 issue of the Bulletin. Additional supporting evidence of the existence of a separate, anonymous UFO analysis committee came to light during the spring flap in the Southwest.

During her correspondence with C. G. Jung, Mrs. Lorenzen read his book, "A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky," which prompted her to delve more deeply into his writings and "analytical psychology." This led to an independent study of trends, political influences, the influence of politics on trends, and vice versa. Utilizing a knowledge of the highly individualistic characteristics of the human psyche, she finally came to the conclusion that almost perfect conditions, foolproof evidence and an opportune time, would be absolutely necessary for UFO enthusiasts to actually pressure the U. S. Congress into forcing any kind of an admission concerning UFOs out of the agency presently pre-occupied with them.

(See Editorial—Page 5)

Landing . . .

(Continued from Page 1)

he had also heard about the landing but said that when he attempted to get confirmation by check with Air Force authorities at Holloman, he got the "usual run-around" so gave up on it. He was more or less surprised that we knew of it.

There are, of course, details which cannot be given here, inasmuch as they would compromise those who occasionally relay information to us. We can say, however, that our original informant has no connection with either Terry Clarke or Arlynn Bruer, and we doubt if he has even met them. Although Terry and Arlynn are both newsmen and know each other, they work independently, as they are in a competitive business. Therefore, we had three entirely independent, unconnected sources of information.

During our conversations with Mr. Clarke and Mr. Bruer, they both mentioned a rumor to the effect that a UFO was in a hangar at Holloman and under heavy guard. Clarke said this rumor started when an Airman excitedly told a group of people in The Men's Store in Alamogordo that the AF had a UFO under guard at the Base. A day or two later, however, the same Airman came into the same store and said he had been mistaken and there was no such thing.

One is tempted, immediately, to think that the Airman told the truth the first time, but then knowledge of his leaking information came to the attention of authorities at the Base, he was instructed to go back to the store and retract his original story. However, in this case, there is more than meets the eye.

There was some talk, during a period of about a week immediately following the Socorro incident, to the effect that the Socorro object had been a secret vehicle belonging to the Air Force. When the information about a UAO landing under the very noses of Range personnel leaked out, there is every reason to believe that Holloman authorities would do just about anything to plant the idea of an Air Force vehicle in the minds of the public. The best way would be just as the Airman did it. He wasn't an officer who could be considered "authoritative," but an Airman who "made a mistake." But—there would be planted in the public mind the possibility that the Airman had seen a new test vehicle which was strange to him, and mistook it for a "UFO." Therefore, when he came back to the store to retract his original story, the recipients might think and logically, that the object was a new test vehicle and that he was sent to

cover up his gross error in talking about it.

There is considerable doubt, in view of the performance of the UFOs, that our Air Force could capture one—even on the ground. Zamora's testimony concerning the rapid take-off and ascent of the Socorro object indicates this most graphically. So the story of a captured UFO was obviously a plant or an honest error. If the public could be made to think that the thing was a test vehicle without a direct statement from authoritative sources, then the Socorro object, as well as the reported landing would be discounted by all except the most knowledgeable people, as mistaken identity. Or the Airman may have heard about the landing, saw a closely guarded hangar (not uncommon at Holloman) and leaped to conclusions.

Along with the information about the landing at Holloman, came an account, however sketchy, about a guard who came upon a UFO at night, emptied his side arm at it, then hysterically drove pell mell back from the range to Base Headquarters—this at White Sands, south of Holloman. He had to be hospitalized and put under sedation.

Two other Range sightings of UFOs were gathered in the course of the investigation of the landing. On the 15th of May, between 11:30 and 12:15 p.m., Surveillance Radar as well as FPS-16 radars at Stallion Site, tracked two objects in the vicinity north of Stallion Site. The UFOs performed, "perfect, precise flight maneuvers"—including side-by-side flight, separating, then re-joining each other in formation and up and down "Pogo" maneuvers.

Visual confirmation was made by a trained radar operator who saw the two objects, described them as brown in color and football shaped. They were flying at very low altitude and disappeared out of sight beyond buildings at the instrumentation site where the radar operator observed them.

Disturbing is the fact that one or both of the objects were alternately responding with the standard FAA recognition signal (sometimes called IFF). To avoid the necessity of having to depend entirely on radar "skin track," i.e., reflection of the radar beam from the plane's surface, there is in use in most military and commercial aircraft a "transponder" system. It operates generally as follows: An "interrogate" signal is transmitted periodically from the tracking ground station. This signal consists of a series of pulses arranged in a particular time sequence or "code." When the "transponder" (a combination receiver and transmitter) receives the correct code it responds by transmitting a code of its

own which is displayed at the ground station. This is called a "recognition signal." Either of two frequencies are commonly used, with a different code on each frequency. It was both of these codes that the two football-shaped objects were alternately beaming while in flight on the range north of Stallion Site.

Seven days later, on the 22nd of May, an automatic track was obtained of an unidentified flying object with an exceedingly low speed of up to 2,000 feet per minute (a very slow 25 mph) which came within 3700 yards of one of the Range radar installations. The skies were clear and there was no indication that the objects tracked were any kind of atmospheric phenomena, and certainly not conventional aircraft.

With the advent of the later two sightings, Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen decided to do a little "fishing." They hoped to gain a little further information on all sightings if possible, but were fully prepared for the possibility of a denial. They gave the press wires a release concerning the landing, the purported captured UFO and the other two sightings at Holloman. The release went out on 24 May, and on the 25th, Sunday, Holloman "answered" our release with an AP release datelined Holloman. It said that the Air Force confirmed that "a radar unit" at Holloman had twice tracked UFOs in the area of White Sands on Friday, and that the report was being investigated. It was suggested that some natural phenomenon such as a dust storm probably was responsible. The release also said that the spokesman could find no basis for a report from "an aerial phenomena research group" in Tucson of a visual sighting at Holloman or that an egg-shaped object was under guard in a Holloman hangar. He was probably right—PIOs are not informed about highly classified UFO matters.

So we did learn something — there were two sightings on Friday, the 22nd of May, instead of one. The "dust storm" explanation doesn't account for the radar contacts, either. "The skies were clear," our informant told us. A dust storm, or a "dust devil" as they are called, look like miniature tornado spouts and can be seen for miles — even the smallest and thinnest ones. The radar operator who tracked the object on the 22nd, would have easily recognized the track of a dust storm, or dust devil.

Because of the large number of sightings in April and May which fell along straight lines on the map, the approximate location of the Range landing was marked on the map and a ruler applied.

(See Landing—Page 4)

Landing . . .

(Continued from Page 3)

(See article on straight line pattern, this issue.) It was found that a straight line drawn from Socorro where the Zamora sighting took place, to Round Mountain near Tularosa, New Mexico, where a motorist observed a bright object coming down, intersects the Holloman north range extension near Stallion Site, as well as Highway 380, north of the site, near San Antonio, New Mexico.

Another line, from Round Mountain through Albuquerque, Rock Springs, Wyoming, Canyon-Ferry, Montana, also intersects the north range. The third possibility is the line running from Las Cruces through Edgewood, La Madera, Colorado to Cheyenne, Wyoming, all of which points are locations of landed or low-flying UFOs.

If we remain completely objective we cannot presume that the Holloman landing falls on one of the lines, but the fact still remains that three of the previously established orthotonic lines intersect the north Holloman Range extension.

Discussion

The first point which must be dealt with in relation to the Holloman landing is, of course: was it real? There are certain things which have not been printed in this article in order to protect our sources, but Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen are completely convinced concerning the authenticity of the information and the reliability of the sources.

It is impressing to note that the pilot of the B-57 knew what the markings on the object at Socorro looked like. This indicates that the military at White Sands and Holloman had been secretly briefed. He probably knew he ran the risk of alerting many of the personnel at both bases, as well as any off base radio operator who happened to tune in on the frequency, but in order to alert proper military authorities he had to take that risk. The incident was discussed almost freely and certainly in depth by a large number of the personnel at both bases.

On the Saturday following the landing, a group of civilian pilots, returning from a convention in Louisiana, set down their planes at Holloman for a short time. They were all approached by an Air Force major who showed them a paper with the marking of the Socorro object and asked them if they had ever seen anything like it before. No one had, but the very fact that this was done indicates the seriousness with which the military was treating the whole situa-

tion.

The greatest significance of the information concerning sightings in the vicinity of the White Sands-Holloman Range, is the fact that those "UFOs" utilized an electronic recognition signal. The fact opens up all sorts of avenues of thought and speculation. For one: Military people have lamented that they do not pick these objects up on radar. Possibly they have, at times, but didn't know it because the objects responded to the transponded signal with the correct code.

There are other facets of this situation which are interesting, but they will be discussed in another article dealing with the significance of that Southwestern Flap.

Disc

(Continued from Page 1)

ble on the objects, but nothing definite could be seen. The observer described it as similar to looking at the moon, in which you can ascertain that there are details on the surface, but you cannot distinguish them. His place of observation was at his home at the address given above. The motion of the objects was a kind of corkscrew motion, and uniform. The objects had a sort of pulsating effect. He was using a 6 inch telescope at 65 power.

"On February 12, 1964, the same observer observed another UFO in the same general area as the first two. It was more of a bluish color. This UFO had no details visible. The motion and pulsation was the same as in the first sighting. This UFO was viewed with the same telescope at the same power, but without the neutral filter. It moved through a relative 6 degrees per minute. There was no change in brightness. It was completely silent; magnitude 5.2. The observer determined the distance to be about 17 miles. 3.3 minutes of arc."

The above is one of the most detailed sightings of UFOs in the outer atmosphere that we have ever examined. But the most important part of this incident is the fact that the observer was Mr. John M. Brannen, of Little Rock, Arkansas, President of the Arkansas Astronomical Association.

Urgent!

Some of you are receiving the Bulletin despite non-payment of dues. Please remit immediately so that you will receive ensuring issues. \$3.50 per year—RENEW NOW!

Incident At La Madera

At about 1 a.m. on the morning of 26 April 1964, Orlando Gallegos of Espanola, New Mexico, went outside his father's house at La Madera to chase some horses out of the yard at his father's request. His attention was arrested by a bluish glow about 200 feet from the house. He walked toward the glow and was surprised to see a "butane-tank shaped object" which appeared to be "as long as a telephone pole" apparently resting on the ground between a parking and dumping area and the dirt road which led from Petaca to La Madera.

Gallegos went into the house, and told his family who laughed at him. He came back outside twice to check on the thing but saw nothing and was afraid to approach to a closer vantage point. His description was of a long, tubular appearing object which looked like it was made of metal, about 14 feet in diameter and shooting blue flames out of holes in the sides along the bottom. There was no noise.

The next day, Gallegos, bound for his home in Santa Fe, heard about the incident at Socorro and stopped in Espanola and told Espanola Police Officer Nick Naranjo what he had seen. Espanola police notified State Officer Marvin Romero, who with Officer David Kingsbury, questioned Gallegos at length. They then notified Captain Vigil who in turn notified State Officer Albert Vega at Ojo Caliente and Vega went to the scene to verify the evidence. After receiving word from Vega that something unusual was at the scene, Kingsbury and Vigil went to the Gallegos home near La Madera where they found the ground still smoking, 20 hours after the incident had purportedly occurred.

After hearing of this incident, after arriving back in Tucson from Socorro, Mrs. Lorenzen called Captain Martin Vigil of the New Mexico State Police, identified herself and gave as a reference the name of Sgt. Sam Chavez of Socorro. Captain Vigil and Mrs. Lorenzen then discussed the sighting. These are the facts gleaned from that discussion:

Orlando Gallegos and his family had been visiting at his father's home. On the night in question, Orlando had drunk one beer and one shot of whiskey while at the wedding shower of a friend. The family arrived home at 12:30 a.m. and were still up at 1 a.m. when the father heard animals thundering through his yard and sent his son out to chase them off. Orlando went outside, and after chasing the horses out, spotted the object about 200 feet from the house. He watched it for about one minute after

(See La Madera—Page 6)

Editorial . . .*(Continued from Page 2)*

Few Congressmen are sufficiently knowledgeable in the fields of chemistry, aeronautics, astronomy, electronics, etc., to be able to fully understand the evidence which has been amassed and digested by UFO enthusiasts over a period of years. These men (Congressmen) are mainly concerned with matters of state and their own constituency and rightly so . . . and understandably so. Those of us who feel that a group of statistics should cause a Congressman to get up and fight for public hearings, etc. should take into consideration the fact that the information we have amassed has been available to those interested in it for many years, yet many of us become interested ONLY AFTER A PERSONAL EXPERIENCE.

Then how can we reasonably expect a Congressman who is by and large very concerned with the retirement of Khrushchev, Communist China's test of a nuclear device, his own political career, re-election, etc., to get enthusiastic about the convictions of 10,000 people (at the most), which amounts to only about 1/19,000th of the population of the United States? Granted, many more people are convinced, and many more are 'open-minded' on the subject—but they are not active, and they cannot be induced to participate in mail campaigns when we don't know who they are.

We have been accused of being "against" open hearings. That is not true. But we are not using our pitifully small amount of spare time and meager funds to push something which common sense tells us is doomed to failure under present conditions.

Since the November 1963 editorial about "The Reason" behind the censorship, many members wrote congratulating us on our deduction, as well as asking us to continue our good work. One man wrote: "I sincerely hope that you will, as you indicated, continue to conduct investigations and research, if only for those of us who are intellectually curious about UFOs. It doesn't matter to me if we don't force any official admittance about anything, but I would be greatly disturbed if a good reliable source of information about UFOs were to cease functioning."

The greater part of the mail about that editorial was in the same vein as the above quote, and a total of three members wrote saying they felt we were "failing the members, UFO Research, etc." Those three did renew their memberships, however.

In the final analysis, it seems that APRO will continue to investigate, cor-

relate and research as we have done in the past 13 years.

Hoaxers . . .*(Continued from Page 1)*

the UFO at Socorro, New Mexico, they readily admitted hearing about it on the radio on the evening they saw the object at Canyon Ferry.

A newsman (unnamed) claimed he smelled diesel fuel in one of the holes.

The principal at the Canyon Ferry school took it upon himself to tell the Davis and Rust youngsters he didn't believe them.

The Air Force would not divulge their findings and Sheriff Middlemas was equally quiet about his investigations and findings if any.

On the 10th day of May, after the N. M. flap seemed to have calmed down, Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen put in a call to Mr. and Mrs. Harold Rust of Canyon Ferry and talked to Mrs. Rust. They learned:

1. That the Davis and Rust families lived in a Federal Housing Project.
2. That no one had heard on TV or seen in print the dimension of the Socorro UFO indentations.
3. That Mrs. Rust was reluctant to talk further because of their position in a Federal housing area.
4. Mrs. Rust promised to write the information desired by the Lorenzens—if her husband felt it was all right — and if Davis, head of the Project, was agreeable. She also said she would write and inform the Lorenzens in either case—if she could give the information or not.
5. To date, nothing has been heard from Mrs. Rust.

APRO has no member close enough to Canyon Ferry to make a personal investigation and the cost of telephone interviews is prohibitive.

Because of the Rust's and Davis' lack of specific information on the Socorro incident, including the indentations, it is reasonable to assume the indentations at Canyon Ferry were genuine—having been made by an unknown flying object at about 10:30 p.m. on 30 April 1964.

News clips from the area seem to indicate adults had seen the object or at least had faith in the Davis and Rust youngsters for "they" talked of an "oblong, glowing object" to newsmen.

Mrs. Davis was surprised to hear about the news report, on the 5th of May, which quoted J. A. Hynek as saying all the sightings except the 23 April Socorro sighting had been explained, and the AF's report in the Chicago Tribune which said the Canyon Ferry incident was a "prank of children."

"I don't know what to say," Mrs. Davis remarked, "because they (the AF) said they could not give out any information." Harold Rust told the AP he didn't care what the AF or other experts said—he believed the children.

Davis also stated "The AF questioned them separately and in a group for 3½ hours and never shook the story of any one of them." He also said there were "four AF officers against 5 children, the oldest 16."

Rust told AP on the 5th of May that the incident of the 29th was not the first UFO sighting in the area and that a "flying saucer" hovered over two men fishing from a boat less than a year before, not far from the site of the landing of the 29th. "They were ridiculed so much they won't talk about it anymore," he said.

We must, if we retain our reason and our ethics, believe the Davis and the Rust children—and doubt the "findings" of the experts, if indeed the reports of same were honest. Because:

We have not located the un-named newsman who smelled fuel in one of the tracks.

The AF gave no reason for labeling the Canyon Ferry incident a hoax. They have not explained how the "hoax" was perpetrated, nor how they went about establishing that it was a hoax. When did those youngsters go out and dig those holes? That night? In the dark? Why didn't someone see the light they used to see by? It would have taken some time to accomplish their supposed prank. But the biggest question is: Where did those youngsters get almost the exact dimensions of the tracks of the Socorro object, including the description of the indentations as "wedge-shaped at the bottom"—when that information was not widely distributed?

We cannot believe that the truth and the details are being withheld by authorities to spare feelings — the kids have already felt the full impact of the ridicule as a result of the AF investigation and subsequent public announcement about the "prank."

It is clear that the facts are being withheld at least in this instance and we can only wonder why.

Back Issues

The office has many back issues of the Bulletin for sale at 50c each. In some instances, however, the stock is so large that it is taking up needed space. We urge members (especially fairly new ones) to order back issues. Three or more issues will be sold for the price of 3 for \$1.00, 4 for \$1.50, postpaid.

La Madera . . .

(Continued from Page 4)

which the flames went out.

When Mrs. Lorenzen talked to Vigil she got the definite impression that the Captain believed Gallegos' story. Vigil said that when he arrived on the scene he carefully noted the hot, smoking ground, glass which looked as though it had been melted, and the indentations. Vigil said there were four — 8x12" indentations which were wedge-shaped at the bottom. There were at least a dozen circular "tracks" about 3½-4" in diameter. An area between 35 and 40 feet in diameter was scorched and smoldering. Patrolman David Kingsbury took color photographs which APRO obtained but which showed nothing, with the exception of a darkened splotch of ground and ground cover.

In a later telephone conversation with Mr. Gallegos, there was only one change in the general picture gained from Captain Vigil, and that was that the blue flames which shot out from the object, were tinged slightly with orange, and that he saw only two indentations, of the wedge-shaped type.

Vigil told Mrs. Lorenzen that Major Connors had come out from Kirtland to observe the scene, as well as to question Gallegos. There had been another sighting of a glowing object which "buzzed" two unidentified men in a car near La Madera Sunday morning. This report was made to State Police before the Gallegos sighting came to light.

In view of the foregoing, it is again strange that Dr. J. Alan Hynek would state later on 5 May that all the sightings had been explained except for the Socorro incident. Even though there was widespread coverage of the Socorro incident such details as the size, spacing and wedge-shaped nature of the tracks or indentations at Socorro were not carried by news media. So we are left with a great puzzle—if the AF can explain the La Madera incident, how do they do so, and why not apply the same explanation to the Socorro incident, which is quite similar, as is applied to the La Madera case?

It is difficult to even assume that Gallegos perpetrated a hoax. True, he saw the object for only a minute, but how and when did he dig the holes? How did he find out the exact physical description of the Socorro indentations, and if he did simulate them, why did he not duplicate the description of the Socorro ship as well, when its dimensions, color and the blue flame were so graphically described in the press?

It is our contention that Gallegos saw what he claims he saw, and we can

think of no conventional explanation for it, which is also logical and reasonable.

Why No Contact?

Since April, 1964, and Lonnie Zamora's historic experience at Socorro, New Mexico, the Lorenzens have been in demand on Radio and TV stations to bring the public up to date on UFO. During these interviews, one question keeps recurring, whether prompted by listeners or as a result of the interviewer's personal curiosity, and it is a good one—a poser: "Why No Contact?"

This question is a legitimate one, considering the fact that we UFO enthusiasts claim the existence of intelligently controlled, occupied unconventional aerial objects, and the voluminous evidence of the same gathered through 17 years of investigation and research. APRO being what it is, it is natural that we should speculate and we have:

To build our theory, we must at first rid ourselves of any wishful idea that a contact communication has taken place, Adamski, Schmidt, etc., to the contrary. The claims of these people are so charged with unscientific hokum as to be discredited even after only a cursory examination. So let us begin our speculation on a factual basis—considering only the "good" or "sound" photographic and observational evidence. There is an abundance of circumstantial evidence which cannot and must not be ignored. And some of this evidence indicates methodical biological and ecological as well as industrial and military surveys being carried out by the UAO occupants.

In logical sequence the fact of their enormous curiosity or interest but the lack of it where physical or communication contacts are concerned, comes to the fore.

Is it possible for the Visitors to be interested in our military potential and not want to contact us? This is the easy one—and the answer is a definite YES! Earthman is frequently interested in the military might of an adversary or potential adversary or even an indifferent nation, without desiring social contact. The other factors—the ecological, biological and industrial surveys are not so easy to understand by themselves but when considered as a group along with the military survey, they make a lot of sense!

When we go to war do we wage war against only the military bases? Hardly—we destroy anything which would give aid and comfort to the enemy! In World War II, the Allied forces bombed military bases, and industrial centers—their intelligence told them what the main

food staple was and where storage was located. And intelligence used certain information to determine the course of psychological warfare. The Axis forces did the same.

The UFOs have methodically showed up at military bases, power plants, main communication centers, and they have collected animal as well as plant specimens.

Does this mean they intend to launch a war against us? Colonize us?

The answer is no—not yet, at least, and perhaps never. It is our own aggressive tendencies which give rise to this fear of certain hostility. True, it should be considered, but considerable thought should be given to other possibilities equally.

Then what is their purpose? In order to advance a theory here, we must temporarily assume a conjecture, if only for a moment.

If, as we suspect, the occupants of the UAOs originate on a planet or planets of another solar system, they have come a long way and compared to the three billions of earth's population, are few in number—perhaps a few thousands—or even hundreds.

On planet 3 of Sol, they find these elements and conditions existing: Many races split and fighting among themselves. A species so emotionally disturbed that they are in constant conflict. The planet is overpopulated, some live in extreme wealth while others starve. These Planet III people contaminate their atmosphere and soil with the deadly by-products of nuclear explosives and have twice maimed, tortured and killed their own kind with nuclear devices.

There seems to be a preoccupation with killing one another on Planet 3, yet the planet's natives have a morbid preoccupation with corpses, making a ritual of death and the preservation of the carcass for storage. This would be a rather strange group of paradoxes to an alien mind. And these are only a few! The above mentioned existing conditions would not be difficult to learn about if the visitors merely monitored the network television and radio broadcasts.

So we get down to the meat of the problem: C. G. Jung pointed out in his book, "A Modern Myth of Things Seen in the Sky" that when an inferior race and a superior race make contact, the inferior race inevitably suffers. We do not have far to look for an excellent example. The Africans were colonized and exploited — and along with the exploitation came social contact. It didn't take long for the Africans to realize that their

(See Why?—Page 7)

Why . . .

(Continued from Page 6)

white masters were profiting from the sweat of their bodies and the products of their own land, and they yearned for the vestiges of civilization—washing machines, electric lights, automobiles and such trappings, and eventually freedom and everything that went with it.

During this period, the white man benefited, the African suffered. When "freedom" and "civilization" came, however, the African was not emotionally, technologically or intellectually prepared for the responsibility of freedom, and so he still suffers. While leaders are frequently changed as a result of military coup or changing political desires, the populace is left in a state of bewilderment and perpetual waiting—waiting for things to settle down so they can get to the serious business of progress.

In some instances in recent years where isolated tribes of stone age people have been found, scientists have had the opportunity to oversee exploration, etc., and it has always been felt by them that the tribe under study should not be disturbed, and their reasons are the same as Jung's—they are not ready.

A social contact between the advanced races from space and man would be quite comparable to the contact between natives of Africa and the white men who colonized them. What could we expect of our visitors if they made a friendly contact? Before the intellectually curious would have a chance to inquire about philosophical and religious inclinations, the militarists would be busy with "conferences," "conclaves," etc., and doing their best to learn information which would be useful in a military sense. Doubtless religious leaders, if given an opportunity to meet and communicate, would be eager to sew the seeds of their own beliefs and act as missionaries. There is no guarantee, people being what they are, that there would be any real use in such a contact, whether from the point of view of the visitors or the point of view of men, unless it could be an honest, peaceful and mutually beneficial contact to exchange knowledge, and just knowledge.

Most researchers tend to be rather short-sighted about the UFO. They seem to want to prove the existence of these other-world entities, just to be able to say they are right, but they absolutely refuse to face the obvious, and that is what contact with these entities would ultimately mean.

We do not advocate lack of contact, but feel that some of the issues brought forth in the November 1963 editorial,

"The Reason," should be given a good deal of thought, in the interest of fairness, and that in the interest of fairness considerable more thought should be given to what contact would mean to the human race?

It seems logical to ask what right we have to delve into the UAO mystery, publicize our findings, try to convince others, when we ourselves cannot seem to face some of the very large issues involved.

One of the issues among UAO researchers is the nature of the occupants. Many respectable, reliable human beings (albeit not "qualified" scientists) have reported humanoids going into, coming out of and in the vicinity of the objects when on the ground. But many of us say, "there is no proof." There is just as much proof of the existence of the occupants, and the description of same, as there is of the existence of the UAO themselves. Some of the best evidence we civilian researchers have come up with has been ignored or disqualified by authorities on the basis of "misconception" so we can argue that if the individuals who observed humanoid UAO occupants are not credited with reasonable observation and interpretation, neither can we believe the purported observers of UAO, no matter who they are.

Whether or not the occupants are humanoid or not is not too large a consideration. Those who seem to hold out for non-human occupants but who advocate public knowledge of the existence of UAO, don't seem to realize that they could be pushing real hysteria onto the public. If the occupants of the UAO are not human, but public knowledge of the existence of space ships in our atmosphere becomes a reality, then we can look forward to real fear. It seems that some of us have no sense of responsibility where the question of public enlightenment is concerned, and it appears to be rather a question of egotism rather than scientific research for the sake of knowledge.

It might seem to some readers that we are in favor of humanoids simply because they would be easier to accept, but that is not true. The fact of the matter is simply that based on the laws of chance, the possibility or even probability of humanoid space travelers is great, and also humanoid UAO occupants have been observed. The possibility of space travelers being very much different from the homo sapiens is small, and no "space monsters" have been seen—at least not in or around landed UAO.

Some of us who feel there is not enough evidence to support a humanoid space traveler theory, are not merely

being contrary. The memories of "old-timers" in APRO recall the first reports of "little men" in 1954, and the general disbelief that arose among researchers who had had a stomachful of "space brothers" from the crackpots and screwballs which infest this field. We feel it was a natural thing. However, when the initial distaste and shock wore off, reason and logic should have taken over but for some people it didn't, for they did not want to admit they had been wrong. So this disbelief has continued, and in most cases, the "disbelievers" in humanoid UAO occupants want merely to force recognition of the existence of space ships, and let the responsibility for revealing the nature of the occupants, fall on someone else. This may be only a subconscious motivation, but it seems to be the only logical way to explain the strange behavior of some of us. If they can say, "well, at least I was right about the space ships," they won't feel they'll be held responsible for a little thing like the nature of the pilots.

When we talk about the reason that no contact has been made, we can fairly well deduce the reason, but if we are going to be responsible individuals and remain in this field of research, we must face up to possibilities, probabilities and facts.

1933 Sighting Reported

Mr. X (he declines to be identified) disclosing a sighting which purportedly took place on a warm summer morning in 1933, tells the following story:

On his way to Nazareth from Lehigh-ton, Pa., at about 2:30 a.m., he was driving his 1925 roadster at a lonely spot between Chrystville and Morrestown when a tire went flat. While jacking up the car he saw a faint violet light in the field on his right. He said it was not bright but the hue made him curious. He walked about 200 feet toward the light, and on the grass laid a ball-shaped object about 10 feet in diameter and about 6 feet high. There was no moon but there was some starlight. Light was also coming from a slit in the object which proved to be a circular opening which, on close examination, proved to be slightly ajar.

The opening was about 1 foot in diameter and when Mr. X pushed it, it swung open. He said it was constructed like a bank vault door with "sealing steps" on its edges and at the opening. There seemed to be no one around so he put his head inside and looked around. The violet light seemed to come from the ceiling or top of the inside,

(See 1933—Page 8)

1933 . . .*(Continued from Page 7)*

and because of its color he had difficulty seeing.

The inside of the object was full of dials and tubing with a kind of "console" in the center. He detected no windows. The room or chamber was six feet wide, four feet high and had a dome.

Mr. X said the chamber had no beds, seats, etc., but he did notice the "striated" effect of the walls—similar to marble. The room smelled like ammonia and was very cold. Shapes of several small things had strange curves, he said, unlike anything he had ever seen before.

X then walked around the object, saw no creature or person, and noticed the apparent lack of windows. The outside surface was slick, felt like metal and was very cold to the touch. After an estimated 10 minutes of examination of the thing, X returned to his car, fixed the flat and went home.

X was 18 at the time, and through the years did some thinking about it and currently makes this observation:

He had never heard of flying saucers at the time and hadn't the remotest idea of what it was at the time. Looking back, however, he feels he saw something "not of this earth and perhaps not even of our planetary system."

While observing the object he saw nor heard no living thing and the silence was "deadly." He says, however, he could have been observed. He feels, from the size of the ship and the odor, the occupant could have been reptilian in nature.

It is always tempting to cogitate the possibilities and there is this alternate theory: The object was remote-controlled to transport various types of life to this planet for experimental purposes. It would be interesting to find out if any strang reptilian "monster" was seen in that general area around the summer of 1933. This account was printed in the Sunday Call-Chronicle, Allentown, Pa., February 16, 1964, and was kindly forwarded by G. Fawcett of Easton, Pa.

Revolving Lights in Wyoming

Employees of the Husky Oil Co., and Cody, Wyoming police observed an unidentified object over Cody for 6 hours on Sunday, September 22, 1963. The object was described as having a blue light at one end and a red light at the other. The lights appeared to rotate on an axis as the object moved across the sky in a SW direction. FAA Control Towers at Billings, Montana and Cheyenne, Wyoming, said there were no aircraft or balloons in the area which could account for the object.

Silver Cigar Over Texas Town

Baytown, Texas residents called police to report a "silver, cigar-shaped object" speeding through the skies followed by a fiery tail, on the 6th or 7th of March 1963. Ellington AFB reported that one caller said it "exploded in the air." Several people who called the Houston Press to report it, said they observed it over the Spring Branch area. FAA spokesmen said they had no knowledge of any airborne object which would even vaguely fit the description of the object given by callers. Although no definite time of day was given, the Houston Press, which printed a description of the incident, reported that it was still unidentified "shortly before noon."

One of the Airport Control Tower personnel told the Press that "If anything exploded we'd know about it. It sounds like a blimp to me—possibly some sort of jet engine that would give the fiery impression." Another said it "might be the Goodyear Tire Co. advertising blimp."

This case is an example of what we've been exploring occasionally in this bulletin regarding reports, how the explanations come about, etc. In this case, the Houston Press probably contacted any and everyone whom they felt could clear up the mystery of an object which, according to its description, was a mysterious and unidentified object.

They came up with the International Airport and the Federal Aviation Administration in that order. What Ellington AFB had to say is not known—but we can be sure that any comment they may have given would be non-committal . . . According to AFR 200-2, which outlines what a PIO *should* say about UFOs.

An eager beaver at Houston International Airport gave his opinion about the blimp—he had, of course, to ignore the description and explosion, but being possibly pre-dispositioned about unconventional things, he put the blame on the blimp insinuating that the observers didn't see an explosion. He forgot or overlooked the fact that if there was an explosion of a UFO he wouldn't necessarily know anything about it.

The FAA apparently told the truth and didn't speculate. And if we examine a few UFO reports in which the FAA is involved, we will find that they merely state the facts, and that's all. The misleading information such as the Airport Control Tower man's opinion in this instance, generally comes from an unofficial source.

Soundless Object at Casper, Wyoming

On 29 August, 1963, at about 8 p.m. Mrs. Gilbert Jacobs and Mrs. Con Hughes of Casper, Wyoming, were crossing the street from the Hughes home to the Jacobs home when they observed a huge orange light which appeared to be just a short distance beyond the roof of the Jacobs home. As the two women watched, the light went off and was replaced by a huge red light on one end of a strange, long object, and a green light on the other end. It started to move and passed directly above their heads. The women called Mrs. Jacobs 16-year-old son Gerry and they all watched the object with binoculars. It appeared to be long, much bigger than any plane they had seen and although they could not make out an outline (it was dark) they deduced, from the distance between the lights that it was very long. It made no sound and they watched it for from 3-4 minutes after which it accelerated to great speed and disappeared within a couple of seconds. Compare the details of this sighting with those of the Buffalo and Cody sightings in September 1963, which were explained away by a Mt. Palomar astronomer.

Australian Sightings Cause Sensation

We can thank Mrs. Judith Magee and Sylvia Sutton of the Victoria Flying Saucer Research Society in Australia for the following information on September 1963 sightings in their country as well as New Zealand.

On the 7th of September, astronomer Mr. C. W. J. Hargreaves of Point Chevalier, New Zealand, was using his 10½ inch telescope when he saw a pin point of reddish light appear in the east. It travelled quickly, low in the East, and disappeared in the northeast.

Twelve minutes later, it or a similar light appeared in the SW, crossed directly overhead and disappeared in the Northeast. It took one minute to cross the sky, Hargreaves said.

Exactly 12 minutes after the 2nd sighting another appearance was made—this time in the North. The light was traveling as fast as the second light, went directly overhead, disappeared in the South. Hargreaves said he was sure it was not a satellite. "What baffled me," he told the Manawatu Standard, "was the way it came over from 3 different directions."