

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN

The A.P.R.O. Bulletin is the official copyrighted publication of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization Inc. (A.P.R.O.), 3910 E. Kleindale Rd., Tucson, Arizona 85716, and is issued every other month to members and subscribers. The Aerial Phenomena Research Organization Inc., a non-profit corporation established under the laws of the State of Arizona and a federally recognized scientific and educational tax-exempt organization, is dedicated to the eventual solution of the phenomenon of unidentified flying objects. Inquiries pertaining to membership and subscription may be made to the above address.

TUCSON, ARIZONA — NOVEMBER-DECEMBER, 1969

AAAS SYMPOSIUM ON UFOs

Missouri Sightings

Ted Phillips, APRO's Field Investigator in Western Missouri has amassed a very impressive number of UFO reports for his state, two of which are presented here. In both instances, the principal witnesses do not want their names published. In the near future we hope to present Mr. Phillips' study of Missouri sightings based on his own extensive files which will serve to indicate that there has been considerable activity in that state as well as indicating what can be accomplished by an investigator who takes the time and does a thorough job. Two of Mr. Phillips more interesting cases:

Mr. and Mrs. X were returning to Marshall from Columbia, Missouri on the 26th of September 1969 on Interstate 70 and had just passed the last Boonville Exit when Mr. X spotted a fairly bright reddish light some five degrees above the horizon and straight ahead of them. Mr. X at first thought it to be a tower light as it did not seem to move but continued to watch as it did not flash as tower lights ordinarily do. The Xs were traveling toward the light at approximately 65 miles per hour and it seemed to be moving toward them in level flight directly over the median. After observing for about a minute it became apparent to the couple that it was not an aircraft or any familiar object and Mr. X pulled off the highway and he and his wife watched as the object passed slowly overhead. There was no sound heard and despite traffic on the highway, an aircraft would have easily been heard. The object presented the appearance of a cigar with a blunt nose which glowed bright red as if a white light were being projected through red plastic. There were no other lights on the object and as it passed overhead a bright area was visible on the rear section which appeared to be an exhaust of some sort, as there seemed to be sparks or particles reflecting the exhaust glow

(See Missouri — Page Five)

Landing and Occupants in Canada

The January 5, 1970 issue of the *Victoria Daily Times* of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada headlined an article dealing with an alleged landing near a hospital in Nanaimo in the early morning hours of the 1st of January 1970. Mrs. Doreen Kendall, Registered Nurse of Nanaimo reported to authorities and the press that she had seen a bright, circular object of approximately 50 feet in diameter at 5 a.m. on New Year's Day. Her story is as follows:

She was checking on a patient whom she feared might have been too warm, and when she pulled back a curtain by the bed she found herself looking at the glowing cockpit of a stationary object which was hovering in the air opposite the children's ward of the Cowichin District Hospital which was located on the floor above. She said it was slightly tipped toward her, about 40 feet from the window and approximately 60 feet above the ground. Inside, she claimed, were two figures clothed in tight-fitting clothing which appeared to be made of some kind of soft material. Both had "strikingly good physiques," she said, and one stood before a chrome-colored instrument panel while the second figure stood behind. The latter appeared shorter or was standing in a recessed spot. She could see two stools in their vicinity.

The craft itself was "silvery, metallic" and had what Mrs. Kendall called a "necklace of lights" around the middle. The object gave off no sound and she soon realized that her first impression that the object was a helicopter was wrong. A few moments after Mrs. Kendall pushed the curtain aside, the second man, whom she felt had sensed that he was being watched, turned and looked directly at Mrs. Kendall. His face was covered by a darkish-looking fabric which completely obscured his facial features. He touched the pilot with his hand which

(See Landing — Page Five)

By DR. JOHN S. DERR

Dr. Derr, an APRO Field Investigator, is a Research Associate in the Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Massachusetts Institute of Technology (M.I.T.).

At its annual meeting in Boston, Massachusetts (December 26-31), the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) held a two-day controversial symposium on the scientific merits of the UFO problem. The symposium, held in the Sheraton-Plaza Hotel, was arranged by a special AAAS committee composed of Dr. Thornton Page, astronomer, of Wesleyan University and NASA, chairman; Dr. Philip Morrison, Professor of Physics, M.I.T.; Dr. Walter Orr Roberts, President of University Corporation for Atmospheric Research; and Dr. Carl Sagan, Associate Professor of Astronomy at Cornell University. With several exceptions, the speakers were generally not hostile to the extraterrestrial hypotheses (ETH), the idea that UFOs are intelligently controlled vehicles from beyond the Earth.

The session was introduced by Dr. Roberts, retiring President of AAAS, on December 26. He noted the great public concern aroused by UFO sightings, and suggested that this alone was reason enough for scientists to address themselves to the problem.

The first paper was given by Dr. Page, who stressed that the symposium was meant to be educational. He noted that the *Condon Report* was a scientific approach to the problem, whereas the popular literature was generally pseudo-scientific and speculative, and that as a result the *Condon Report* would be very important in this meeting. At Wesleyan, Professor Page offered an elective science course on UFOs. His lectures included a review of reports, basic astronomy, atmospheric physics, astrophysics, and the possibility of life on other planets. The literature listed on the AFOSR bibliography was classified in groups

(See AAAS — Page Three)

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN

Published by

THE AERIAL PHENOMENA
RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

3910 E. Kleindale Road
Tucson, Arizona 85716

Phone: 602-793-1825 and 602-326-0059

Copyright 1969

Coral E. Lorenzen, Editor

Norman Duke, Richard Beal, Artists

A.P.R.O. STAFF

International Director L. J. Lorenzen
Assistant Director Richard Greenwell
Secretary Coral Lorenzen

CONSULTANTS

Aeronautics Capt. William B. Nash, B.S.E.
Aeronautics Rayford R. Sanders, M.S.M.E.
Astronautics John F. Schuessler, B.S.M.E.
Astronomy Leo Vern Standeford, Ph.D.
Astrophysics Richard C. Henry, Ph.D.
Anatomy Kenneth V. Anderson, Ph.D.
Biology Robert S. Mellor, Ph.D.
Biochemistry Vladimir Stefanovich, Ph.D.
Chemistry Allen Utke, Ph.D.
Electronics Richard Gerdes, B.S.E.E.
Electronics-medical Alvin E. Brown, B.S.E.E.
Engineering James A. Harder, Ph.D.
Exobiology Frank B. Salisbury, Ph.D.
Geology Philip Seff, Ph.D.
Linguistics P. M. H. Edwards, Ph.D.
Mathematics G. K. Ginnings, Ed.D.
Medicine Benjamin Sawyer, M.D.
Metallurgy Robert Johnson, Ph.D.
Metallurgy Walter W. Walker, Ph.D.
Optics Roy Frieden, Ph.D.
Photography John Hopf
Physics Horace C. Dudley, Ph.D.
Physics Rene Hardy, Ph.D.
Physiology Harold Cahn, Ph.D.
Psychiatry Gerald Laufer, M.D.
Psychology R. Leo Sprinkle, Ph.D.
Religion Robert S. Ellwood, Ph.D.
Science Education A. Henry Swann, Ed.D.

REPRESENTATIVES

Argentina Guillermo Gainza Paz
Australia Peter E. Norris
Belgium Edgar Simons
Bolivia Fernando Hinojosa V.
Brazil Prof. Flavio Pereira
Britain Anthony Pace
Chile Pablo Petrowitsch
Colombia John Simhon
Costa Rica Rodolfo Acosta S.
Cuba Oscar Reyes
Dominican Republic Guarionex Flores L.
Finland Kalevi Hietanen
France Aime Michel
Germany Capt. William B. Nash
Greece George N. Balanos
Greenland Joseph March
Guatemala Eduardo Mendoza P.
Holland D. J. H. Dreux
Hong Kong Alex Pezarro
Ireland Martin Feeney
Italy Roberto Pinotti
Japan Jun' Ichi' Takahashi
Lebanon Menthir El Khat'ib
Malta Desmond R. Brinkworth
New Guinea Rev. N. C. G. Cruttwell
New Zealand Norman W. Alford
Norway Finn Einar Myhre
Peru Ermanno Maniero
Philippine Republic Col. Aderito A. de Leon
Puerto Rico Sebastian Robinu L.
Singapore Yip Mien Chun
Spain Antonio Rihera
Sweden K. Gosta Rehn
Switzerland Dr. Kurt Kauffman
Tasmania William K. Roberts
Trinidad Eurico Jardim
Uruguay Walter Fernandez L.
Venezuela Horacio Gonzales G.

The Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc. (APRO) investigates and evaluates UFO reports through its Field Investigators Network, in North America and its Representatives in other countries. APRO's official affiliate in Canada is the Canadian Aerial Phenomena Research Organization (CAPRO), Winnipeg, Manitoba, Director Brian Cannon.

Newswires, newspapers, radio and television stations may quote up to 250 words from this publication, provided that the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc. (or APRO), Tucson, Arizona, is given as the source. Written permission of the Editor must be obtained for quotes in excess of 250 words.

Changes of Address

Analyses of records have determined that a number of members have not renewed membership because they did not receive their Bulletins and they did not receive their Bulletins because they forgot to inform APRO of their change of address. Please, all members, inform this office immediately, once you know your new address. Field Investigators are requested to put "F. I." or the complete wording before their signature in their address changes and also to provide their new telephone numbers. The latter is important in keeping the Field Investigator records up to date should APRO have need to contact Field Investigators by telephone.

Membership Cards

Once again we remind members that the deadline for the manufacture of APRO's new, permanent, plastic-laminated membership cards *with photo* is March, 1970. At that time, all members who have not received these membership cards will receive similar cards *without photo*. In the future, only new members will receive membership cards with photo. If you wish your photo on your card, please send APRO the corresponding Membership Form and *two photos before March, 1970*.

"Science and the UFO" Available

We remind members that they may purchase the above-named publication from APRO at \$2.00 U.S. (\$2.50 Canada and Mexico — \$3.00 foreign) postpaid. The booklet is produced by the National Amateur Astronomers and covers the UFO panel discussion held in Denver on August 22, 1969. Participants were Drs. Harder, Hynek, McDonald, Salisbury, Saunders, and Sprinkle. Make checks payable to APRO.

Field Investigators Network

The proposed *Standard Procedures for APRO Field Investigators* manual was not produced before the end of 1969 as originally anticipated, mainly due to two reasons: 1) During 1970 APRO will be in a better financial position to produce a more comprehensive manual with a better format; 2) It has been decided to seek further advice from APRO Consultants and other sources in order to make the manual as complete as possible. Ex-

perts in astronomy, aeronautics, psychology and physics are being consulted. APRO members may submit ideas or suggestions if they wish. The manual is intended to cover methods of investigation and interviewing and evaluating witness' reliability and testimony.

The Field Investigators Network now has between 200 and 250 members, including engineers, scientists in various fields, pilots, administrators and law officers. A complete geographical and professional breakdown will be given early in 1970.

AIAA UFO Subcommittee Meeting

The UFO Subcommittee of the American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (AIAA), headed by Dr. Joachim P. Kuettner, will be holding a panel meeting on January 21 in New York City.

At press time we do not have information concerning the topics to be covered. The meeting will commence at about 2 p.m. and will last for approximately three hours. Dr. J. Allen Hynek and Dr. James E. McDonald will be presenting brief papers but the names of the other panelists are not known at this time.

The AIAA's Committee on Atmospheric Environment and Committee on Space and Atmospheric Physics established the UFO Subcommittee during 1968 stating that "the (UFO) controversy cannot be resolved without further study in a quantitative scientific manner" and that "it deserves the attention of the engineering and scientific community." Dr. Kuettner, Chairman of the Subcommittee, is Director of Advanced Research Projects, Research Laboratories, Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA), at Boulder, Colorado.

Details of the Subcommittee meeting on January 21 will be published in the January-February Bulletin.

Current Press Coverage of UFOs

In the course of correspondence with APRO members concerning the possibility of a press embargo on UFO news, the following very astute comments were written by a member who is also a newsman:

"As for a press embargo on UFO news, the hard probability is that

(See Press — Page Three)

AAAS —*(Continued from Page One)*

ranging from conservative science to the highly speculative. The books in the list generally appeared at the extremes, while pamphlets and articles were usually in between. Invited lectures in the course were given by Professors Hynek and Menzel. His motivation for giving the course was the belief that all citizens should be given enough science education to understand current problems and to recognize common atmospheric phenomena.

Dr. Franklin Roach, visiting Professor of Astronomy at the University of Hawaii, noted with approval that our space program has helped us depart from our homocentric view of the Universe. Many more people now realize the possibility of life on other worlds and recognize how little we know about space. Dr. Roach, a former member of the Condon Committee, noted the possibility of Jupiter-like planets roaming in interstellar space, not orbiting any star, and which would be habitable. These hypothetical bodies are called Liliputian planets. His studies showed that we might observe one passing near our Solar System in the relatively short time (astronomically speaking) of the next million years. He also conducted a random survey of a large portion of the sky, and found two unidentified, second magnitude stars — but no UFOs.

Dr. William K. Hartmann of the University of Arizona's Lunar and Planetary Laboratory, made it clear that he thought all UFO reports were the result of natural phenomena, misidentified common objects, or hoaxes. He reported that the Colorado Project requested lists of the best photographic cases, and that virtually all of these fell apart on examination. He therefore concluded that all UFOs would be identifiable if only we knew more of the circumstances of each sighting. He said that society was primed in 1947 to accept UFO reports and ready to perpetrate hoaxes. He took the fact that the first Sputnik launch caused seven times more UFO reports to mean that the publicity caused the reports. In other words, he felt that UFO reports were a sociological problem. Based on his experience with the Condon Committee, of which he was a member, he concluded that there were no cases good enough to prove that something extraordinary is going on. Finally, he challenged all investigators to produce just one case that can be proved conclusively to be so extraordinary that Congress and

the public would demand a thorough investigation. (For the nature of physical proof, see the summary of Professor Morrison's talk below.)

Dr. Robert Hall, Head of the Department of Sociology at the University of Illinois, declared that the UFO problem is a behavioral phenomenon of distinct importance. He felt that UFO reports result from multiple causes, two of which are given here. (1) The majority of reports are not vehicles. People are stimulated when they see ambiguous events. To explain their sense perceptions, they escalate hypotheses, i.e., try one, reject it, try another, etc. In this process, each person is working from his own "system of beliefs" and cognitive structure, so different witnesses will give different accounts of the same incident. It is the nature of humans to rationalize what they see in terms of their past experience to give the event personal meaning. In the hard core cases, however, witnesses say that they don't know what it was, but insist on their stories that what they saw was not identifiable in terms of their personal beliefs and experiences. Thus, when reasonable men report extraordinary events and are ridiculed for it, that is all the more reason for them to be believed! (2) A high level of anxiety combined with observation of an anomalous event which appears threatening can cause mass hysteria. Such events usually last only a short time, say one week, and he gave three examples. However, Dr. Hall felt that most UFO reports were not a result of hysterical contagion because (a) most reporters feel no threat and do not think the UFOs are saviors, (b) UFO reports are spread worldwide and of long duration, (c) most reporters are not familiar with other UFO reports, and (d) some UFOs are observed for long periods of time, extensive detail is perceived, and multiple witnesses agree to the essential features.

Dr. Hall also gave some general criticisms of the way UFO reports are handled. For example, some UFO buffs interpret what a witness says when they should be just reporting facts; on the other hand, some skeptical scientists insult the observational abilities of reliable witnesses. He felt that legal criteria for the credibility of witnesses should be applied to UFO reports, and that unwillingness to make a report or to be identified personally generally make a witness reliable. Skeptical scientists will ridicule the weakest reports to maintain their preconceived beliefs, while ignoring

the best evidence. They may also use illogical arguments when they are otherwise usually logical, and he cited Dr. Hartmann's arguments as illogical. A good example of many of these sociological phenomena was that of the French Academy of Sciences being unwilling to accept the reality of meteorites. Finally, he decried the "buck passing" that goes on between physical and behavioral scientists, each saying that UFOs are a problem for the other discipline.

Dr. Douglass Price-Williams, Head of the Psychology Department at Rice University, gave a progress report on statistical work now being done. He noted the necessity of separating observation from interpretation in the existing reports. After filtering out the reports of natural phenomena and the known hoaxes, the question arises as to how to treat the residue. Dr. Condon says that if 80% are explained, then all can be explained, but this is not logical. Information should be extracted from the residue of reports, regardless of whether one thinks the information is sociologically or physically scientific. He felt that the data should be analyzed in much greater detail than has been done so far, including the circumstances of observation. This he is doing now.

Harvard psychiatrists Lester Grinspoon and Allan Persky wrote a very interesting psychoanalysis of the type of person who might generate a false report. The paper was delivered by Dr. Grinspoon, who noted that UFOs are a mixed bag of phenomena. If a psychologically weak observer sees a UFO, his experience and knowledge of science are likely to fail to provide an explanation, so he may revert to magic to explain his perception. Unfortunately, the troubled times we live in make a great many people just somewhat disturbed, and this population is more likely to believe in Extraterrestrial Intelligence (ETI) and to observe UFOs. By a complicated chain of reasoning, psychiatry explains the disc-type UFO as a breast image which descends, fills the observer's needs, and then rises and departs. Likewise, the cigar-type UFO is interpreted as a phallic symbol, as seen by a psychologically weak observer. The authors also theorized that the affective heat generated among scientists studying UFOs may be due to unconscious conflicts within the individuals involved, including concerns of death and immortality.

(See AAAS — Page Four)

AAAS —

(Continued from Page Three)

The second day's session (December 27) began with Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Head of the Astronomy Department at Northwestern University, who emphasized that what he said covered only what was *reported* to him, and that his paper at this meeting would not be speculative. He charged that we as scientists were being unscientific if we did not respect the UFO phenomenon as something which needed to be examined. For example, he cited the Kirtland AFB sighting and Blue Book's explanation of it as showing unscientific and illogical method. In other cases, Blue Book was satisfied that a label of "unidentified" was actually an identification, i.e., the project had identified a sighting as unidentified! For every official report, there are probably dozens of unreported sightings, because a person generally reports seeing a UFO only because of a strong sense of duty or of curiosity. To those who charge him with unscientific method, Dr. Hynek replied that all he has ever advocated is that UFOs are worthy of scientific study. In spite of Dr. Condon's conclusions, the body of the *Condon Report* is good support for scientific study.

In summary, Dr. Hynek noted the following facts: (a) UFO reports exist, (b) many reports are identifiable, and (c) some are not identifiable, are very strange, and are reported by reliable people. Therefore, we must be curious, capable of being astonished, and willing to investigate.

Dr. James E. McDonald, Professor of Atmospheric Physics at the University of Arizona, charged that we in science are in default for not dealing with UFO reports in a scientific way. It is our fault principally, not that of the U. S. Air Force, even though Blue Book was superficial and incompetent. The Wright-Patterson files have been available, but it is astonishing that so much evidence has been swept under the rug, simply by scientists' ignoring it. The *Condon Report* is not thorough or adequate, and the conclusion is incorrect and not based on the evidence cited within it. It includes very few of the best historical cases, and does not even include all of the cases which the Committee investigated. In Dr. McDonald's evaluation, 32 of the 89 cases in the report are not explained, and most of the explained cases are uninteresting. He then spent a good deal of time recounting his personal investigation of four combined radar

and visual sightings. The first two, the U.S.A.F. RB47 case in Autumn, 1957, in which the object was seen and tracked on an ECM radar monitor, and the Lakenheath, England, case in August, 1956, in which ground and airborne visual and radar confirmation disclosed targets at supersonic and subsonic speeds, and merging targets, are both unexplained. There has been no scientific investigation, but the cases demand investigation and explanation. The second two cases, Haneda AFB (Japan) on August 5, 1952, and Kirtland AFB, November 4, 1957, were both investigated by the Condon Committee, but their explanations are clearly wrong, probably because they never interviewed the observers. Dr. McDonald concluded that the most likely hypothesis to explain these particular cases was extraterrestrial surveillance.

Dr. Donald H. Menzel, Professor of Astronomy at Harvard University, reportedly had a bad cold, so his paper was read by Dr. Roberts. Dr. Menzel's paper stated that UFOs came into existence as a myth, and the ETH is advanced because no other explanation is available. He therefore considers Hynek and McDonald's views to be highly subjective. Based on his extensive experience in the Navy, he considers anomalous propagation the answer to the Washington National Airport sightings. (After all, he quipped, "It is not surprising to find bubbles of hot air over Washington!"). This particular case was caused by partial trapping, which is difficult to predict based on other weather information. He claims that McDonald's interpretation of this case ignores the facts. Other sightings which he considers explained are pilot Harris' sighting at the Salt Lake City Airport — a sundog — and Eastern Airlines pilots Chiles and Whitted's — a meteor. He then accused McDonald of unscientific methods, and claimed that his interviews have no scientific value. He claims to have solved most of the cases the Air Force sent him, after Hynek had labeled them unidentified. He is much more skeptical than Hynek as to the reliability of witnesses. The question of existence of life elsewhere in the Universe is irrelevant to the problem of identifying UFOs, and UFO sightings certainly have not proved ETI. He endorses the *Condon Report* and its scientific method, but considers other UFO groups as unscientific and therefore capable of doing considerable harm to science. He says that astrology is as scientific

as "ufology," and so all government support should be withdrawn.

Dr. R. M. L. Baker of Computer Sciences Corporation prefers the term "anomalous observational phenomena" (AOP), and discussed only observations. He showed and analyzed four motion pictures, known as Montana 1950, Utah 1952, Illinois 1967, and Hawaii 1958. On all films, the objects in question are seen as blobs and do not give much useful information, but he did classify all of them provisionally or probably as AOP. He concluded that amateur photography was not satisfactory for scientific analysis. We need new, good data. Most of his remarks may be found in his papers published in 1968 in the *Journal of the Astronautical Sciences*.

Dr. Kenneth R. Hardy, chief of the Weather Radar Branch, Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories, Bedford, Massachusetts, discussed the capabilities of the high power radar at Wallops Island, Virginia. Three different wavelengths are used to study clear air turbulence (CAT), because different types of clouds, objects, and turbulence are detected as echoes of different intensities with the different units. In the slides he showed helical-shaped echoes from CAT, banded echoes from cloud layers, and various other echoes attributable to insects, birds, anomalous propagation, and scatter from a varying index of refraction. He showed a false echo pattern, in which anomalous propagation produced reflections from objects beyond the horizon in such a way as to stimulate an object approaching and departing from the radar site on a hyperbolic path at a speed of about 50 knots. He stressed that explanation of unknown echoes requires repeated observation and painstaking analysis.

The afternoon session was initiated by Dr. Carl Sagan, who proceeded to examine the ETH with order of magnitude arguments. Let us assume that UFOs are space travelling vehicles, and that one per year visits the Earth. He then discussed the Dolphin Equation, a relation involving the rate of birth of stars, the number of stars with planets, the number of planets on which life is possible, the number of those actually with life, the number of those on which life is intelligent, those whose intelligence has developed advanced technology, and those which are existing today. Let N = the number of extant technical civilizations, and L = the lifetime of these civilizations. If all the assumptions are valid,

(See AAAS — Page Five)

AAAS —*(Continued from Page Four)*

then $N = 0.1 \times L$. If we assume that $L = 10^7$, which he thinks is optimistic, and that there are 10^{10} interesting places to visit in the Universe, then one visit to each every year would require 10,000 launches per civilization per year, which seems impossibly high. In addition, if there are 10^6 civilizations extant, it seems unlikely that we would be the object of the special attention reported in the UFO sightings. Dr. Sagan then went on to discuss problems of interstellar transportation. To travel among the 10^{20} stars in the known Universe, ships would have to travel at nearly the speed of light. The mass of fuel required, even if it consisted of matter and anti-matter, would be prohibitive if it were all carried in the ship. An interstellar ram jet, which scoops up hydrogen and accelerates it out the back, is a possibility. All factors considered, he considers it premature to say that interstellar spaceflight is not possible. However, he believes radio communication to be a better approach to contacting other civilizations. His conclusion was that UFO data is inadequate, so we should keep an open mind. However, our best hope for contacting ETI is unmanned planetary exploration and radio communication.

Dr. Frank Drake, Head of Cornell University's Department of Astronomy, was scheduled to speak next on methods and reliability of data collection, but he was unable to attend and his paper was not presented.

Walter Sullivan, Science Editor of *The New York Times*, explained the reporter's attitude toward UFO reports. Generally, reporters try to write good stories without too many qualifying arguments, a fact which can limit the scientific accuracy of the report and leave it open to different interpretations. He thinks that interest has now shifted away from UFOs, but that we should not close our minds or stop watching the skies. He concludes that the ETH is improbable, but the UFO problem shows a human phenomenon which should be studied.

Professor Philip Morrison concluded the symposium with a general lecture on the nature of physical evidence. His main point was that, if we are to believe new hypotheses, we need multiple chains of evidence satisfying link-by-link tests. He noted that no single witness is credible by himself, giving as an example the contradictory testimony of expert witnesses in

trials. There are many problems with the observing mechanism of the human being, some of which he enumerated. (1) Human nature tends to make order out of chaotic situations. (2) We are inclined to gloss over a weak link which can destroy the whole chain of reasoning. (3) Groups of witnesses are not necessarily independent. (4) There will always be things we don't understand. (5) Classification of reports for obscure military reasons causes undue speculation that ETI is being hidden from the public. (6) People do not understand the institutional paranoia that makes policies and procedures often more important than facts and conclusions. Dr. Morrison concluded by saying that he does not support any substantial federal expenditure for UFO studies, but he does encourage link-by-link examination of any report to find out what has really happened.

Having heard all these papers, an unbiased member of the generally small audience might easily have been convinced that the hard-core UFO reports were caused by ETI and presented a problem which deserved considerably more attention from the scientific community. Participants seemed to feel that the symposium had accomplished its purpose, demonstrating the application of scientific methodology to a contemporary controversy, and acquainting scientists with the wide variety of facts and interpretations.

The AAAS will publish the symposium proceedings as a small booklet, which will appear in April or May, 1970.

(APRO will inform members how and when this booklet will be made available, and the cost of same, as soon as this information is obtained.)

Landing —*(Continued from Page One)*

was bare, flesh-toned and human-appearing. The pilot pulled back, forward and back again on a control lever "like the joystick of an old aircraft," and the whole craft tilted sideways so that Mrs. Kendall was furnished an excellent view of the interior in which the men were standing.

Mrs. Kendall told reporters that the dome of the object appeared to be lit from below rather than from the ceiling. She said she was not afraid and called out when the craft seemed to be leaving. Another nurse, Mrs. Freda Wilson of Duncan, another nurse on duty that night, arrived shortly and thereafter there followed five other

hospital employees who watched as the object circled slowly and finally disappeared into the north. The latter six did not view the occupants, however.

Mrs. Kendall had not been secretive about her experience, but it did not reach the attention of the *Daily Times* until a friend spoke of it to John Magor of Maple Bay, B. C., who edits and publishes the "Canadian UFO Report."

Other details which are interesting are the fact that the object seemed to almost touch the patio outside the hospital building and its diameter was comparable to that of about five of the hospital's windows. It was dark outside at the time of the sighting.

Later on that same day on unidentified object was sighted by a family at Mill Bay, 11 miles south of Duncan.

Other sightings have allegedly taken place in the same general area and one of APRO's Field Investigators has been notified of the Nanaimo incident and we expect a full report with considerably more detail before too long. Although our new policy is to give only scant details of press reports until a full investigation has been completed, it was felt that the initial details of the Nanaimo sighting were sufficiently interesting and the principal witness apparently of good reputation to justify a preliminary report.

Missouri —*(Continued from Page One)*

coming from the rear opening. Neither the sparks nor the glow trailed behind the object, and seemed to be contained inside the object itself (like a jet aircraft exhaust). The phenomenon of the "exhaust" area was observed after the object had passed overhead and was moving east. The main body of the object was not observed at any time. The sky was clear, the nose section appeared to be the apparent size of the full moon, and the entire length would have been about four times the diameter of the full moon. An orange held at arm's length would have covered the entire object, according to Mr. X. It was in sight about two minutes before it passed overhead and for about one minute thereafter, and was still visible when the Xs left the area, still moving toward the east and down the highway. He saw a highway patrolman and sure that he had also seen the object, he contacted the patrol office but no other reports had been made.

(See Missouri — Page Six)

The second incident took place on the 22nd of November 1969 and included four adults and four children, the latter of whom were comprised of two of the age of 14, one of the age of 12 and one aged 11. As in the foregoing report names cannot be used in this instance either. The observation was made from a farm located on a hill-top near Clarksburg, Missouri which is 30 miles west of Jefferson City and near Missouri Highway 50, about 32 miles west of Sedalia.

The object was first spotted by the four children who were outside the house. It was a bright light in the eastern sky and they ran to the house to report it. The adults inside looked outside and also saw it, whereupon they proceeded outside with the children and noted that it was hovering some 10 degrees above the north-northeastern horizon. No visible motion was noted during the observation. The observers all agreed that the apparition consisted of two yellow lights which they watched for 10-12 minutes until the object disappeared and during that time the lights did not dim or brighten until they disappeared. During the sighting three of the adults watched the object or lights through a four X rifle telescopic sight but could not see any additional details. There was a visible band of black between the lights which was visible both through the scope and with the naked eye. The moon was full and visible to the right and above the object and was located about 25 degrees above the horizon. The object, which was estimated to be at a distance of about a half mile, did not twinkle as a star might. The sun had set just before the object was viewed but the sky was still illuminated. Only the brighter stars were visible in the bright moonlight. The two lights appeared to be about the size of the apparent diameter of the moon and as the first quarter moon. After 10-12 minutes the lights suddenly dimmed and became progressively smaller as though the object was moving away from the observers at a high rate of speed. The observers watched the area for several minutes after the lights had disappeared but did not see them again. The nearest airport, which is 30 miles from the farm, was checked for a possible source of origin of the light but none was found. No vertical motion was noted, even as the object moved away.

Press —

(Continued from Page Two)

none is necessary. I certainly agree that one is suggested by the almost total absence of such news in the wire services, in newspapers and on the electronic media. In the first place there is absolutely no order or directive that I've heard of, from any quarter, that even hints of such an embargo. Perhaps one has been achieved in effect by common consent, but if so that common consent has been without any consultation or discussion whatever as far as I have been able to see, and this is a situation which I have watched with the greatest personal attention and interest from the very beginning. In other words, if I had been able to find the slightest excuse to start jumping up and down and screaming bloody murder in protest, I would have done so. I have found no such excuse.

"So what causes the lack of editorial interest? For one thing, there seems to be in general fewer domestic sightings. I realize this may only seem to be true, due of course to the fact that they often are not reported in the first place. I think probably more important is the fact that there seems to be nothing really new about the few sightings one hears about. Certainly nothing startlingly new if you judge these sightings against the background of thousands in the past 22 years. News space is precious, and when a continuing phenomenon takes on the coloration of business as usual, it ceases to be news, however mystifying and unexplained it may still remain.

"One has to consider here, parenthetically, that if UFO activity actually is directed by alien intelligence, one has to credit it with being smart enough to lie low at certain critical periods, and this could be such a critical period for reasons we can only imagine. How better to lie low than to maintain possibly essential activity on a level that will attract no additional attention and encourage the dubious collective intelligence of mankind to be lulled into a sense of false security? No new tricks, no new scares. It could be that simple.

"I think the UFO field's big trouble is that to the American people, the UFO is an Unpleasant Fact, of which the American public has all too many to digest these days. Pollution, overpopulation, metropolitan degeneracy, minority problems, the war in Vietnam, political corruption as symptomized by our tendency toward gov-

ernment by assassination, all these assail the poor devil trying to keep his peace of mind intact and his life salvageable from the ravages of inflation. UFOs are not only unpleasant because of their implications, they are unexplained. The average citizen's attitude is: "The hell with them."

"Meanwhile Apollos 11 and 12, together with imaginative movies like 2001, have done much to offer a purely superficial understanding of the problems of space to the average man, and this at least has been reassuring because he thinks he understands what he sees and is told about it. Even here, you will note the spectacular drop in public interest in Apollo 12 compared with that aroused by Apollo 11 when men first landed on the moon. People thought they understood what was going on in both missions and even so the second got public interest relatively speaking, comparable with that of a 1969 rerun of "Gone With The Wind" which was very big stuff 30 years earlier when it was new.

"In the back of everyone's mind, I suspect, is the fact that there have been only the barest hints of anything extraordinary about any of our space missions. Astronauts have seen a few things, but it never came to much as far as the average guy, even the really interested average guy, could tell. The whole thrust of the terrestrial space effort thus far has been, in effect, to supply not one shred of hard evidence to support the existence of UFOs. No one speaks of this. No one needs to. The message sinks deep into millions of subconscious minds, possible exactly as intended.

"But I think it all goes back to the UFOs being an Unpleasant Fact. We don't like Unpleasant Facts, so much so that we have acquired considerable skill—quite possibly as we were intended to—in closing our minds to them. Witness the assassinations, but there are dozens of other examples. The only reason we are beginning to face the Unpleasant Fact of the war in Vietnam is that its profits have become too costly in terms of the things that have to be neglected in order to keep it going. After all, even a warlord can't stay in business if the entire society that has been keeping him going begins to crumble beneath him.

"None of this is likely to be helpful, I fear, even assuming you haven't thought of it already. I don't know what the answer is for APRO. I know

(See Press — Page Seven)

Press —*(Continued from Page Six)*

only that APRO's job is not finished and cannot be until the UFO phenomenon is explained. You certainly need no reminder that he who chooses to pursue an Unpleasant Fact must condition himself to doing it pretty much alone. And he must accept a burden that grows relentlessly—which few can comprehend—as the task becomes more solitary, as the vital information continues to pile up and require the same meticulous handling, with ever widening ramifications and potential connections with other phenomena." Unquote.

We feel that the gentleman who wrote the above (and requests anonymity) made some very good points and we welcome such comments from other members although we cannot always guarantee that they will be published.

Close Observation in New Zealand

Mr. Norman Alford, APRO's Representative in New Zealand, has sent information on a close observation on October 30, 1969 at Hawk Bay in Te Wairoa. The witness was 33-year-old J. D. Cudby, a Security Officer at Waipukurau Aerodrome.

At 3:10 a.m. (local time) on the date in question, Mr. Cudby was on a routine inspection of the aerodrome and on entering a landing area he noticed that the sheep owned by the aerodrome authorities (about 500) were concentrated in a corner of their paddock, "as if they had been molested by dogs." However, he found no dogs in the area. Mr. Cudby then drove his Austin station wagon to the aerodrome clubhouse and hangar, stopped the vehicle, switched his lights off and let his six-year-old German shepherd dog out. As he was trying the locks on the clubhouse door, a normal procedure, he noticed three lights, green, red, green, reflected in the glass panel of the door. A moment before he had heard a sound like a train but took it to be coming from the nearby railroad.

As he saw the lights, Mr. Cudby also noticed that his dog began growling. Looking up, he observed a large "saucer-shaped" object slowly swinging from side to side. He estimated the object to be about 300 feet distant and about 50 feet above the ground. Its size was estimated at 60 feet long and about 12 feet thick. On the upper sur-

face of the object, the witness observed a green, a red and a green light coming from holes evenly spaced around what appeared to be a dome.

The witness became frightened and ran back to his vehicle and turned his spot-light, which was centrally mounted, on the object. His dog began running about the vehicle growling. Under the spot-light, the object looked like stainless steel, without rivets or joints. He was able to scan the object three times vertically and horizontally. Each scanning took about three seconds. The beams of light from the object brightened and the sound it was making increased to a "high pitch." The object then tilted to about 15° and climbed at that angle until it was lost from sight.

The witness immediately went to the area over which the object had hovered, about 300 feet away, and found that the ground was warm and dry. The surrounding area was extremely wet due to a heavy dew. It is believed that another person, a motorist, saw the object that night in the same vicinity and at the same time as he was driving by. Another person, who lives about a half mile away from the aerodrome, reported that his sheep were very disturbed that night, after he had been awakened by a loud noise. More information will be published as it is available.

Follow-Ups

The July-August issue of the Bulletin carried details of a sighting which took place near Tyneham in Dorset, England on the 19th of August 1969. The information was obtained from the London Daily Telegraph and the case was turned over to APRO's Field Investigator Mr. Anthony Pace who proceeded to inquire into the incident on our behalf. The only clue to the identity of the woman who had initially reported a UFO landing, had to be followed through the newspaper which printed the story and a letter from Mr. Pace was forwarded to her by the paper. Unfortunately, however, the lady has not responded to Mr. Pace's request for further information. The government Range where the sighting took place is not open to the public so that that avenue of inquiry was also closed. In the event that the investigation can be fruitfully pursued in the future further details will be carried in this column.

However, Mr. Pace contacted a member of a local UFO investigating group in Southwest Britain who replied that

they had investigated the holes found at Tyneham and the following is the information he furnished:

"The marks at the alleged landing site were nine in number. There was a central hole surrounded by four marks at four foot radius, and another set of four marks at 24 foot radius. The marks were almost symmetrical and each was six inches in diameter by three inches deep with a central narrow shaft about five inches deep."

At approximately the same time that the landing allegedly took place at Tyneham, a similar set of holes were found at Badbury. The following are excerpts from a report of F. E. Marshall to Mr. Pace.

The holes at Badbury were found by a man who had picnicked with his family at the spot on Thursday and returned Friday to pick up an article left behind by his daughter. He found the holes and reported them to Blandford police. Mr. Marshall comments that there had been a suggestion that the holes were a hoax, to which he says the following: "In view of what I found I doubt this. The clear cut incision of the holes, their configuration and the fact that each of the central five had a smaller hole at its centre going down another five inches, together with the fact that the impressions down the slope were deeper than those higher up, and the fact that Farrows' (one of the investigators) drawing of the pattern he found at Tyneham are so alike, lead me to favour the belief that the same vehicle was responsible."

Tyneham is a deserted village some 25 miles south of Badbury, the location of the first set of "rings" and holes. It is within the confines of a firing range used by the Army and the terrain exhibits many shell holes and warning signs. It is open to the public only during August.

Air Force Ends UFO Responsibility

On December 17, 1969, the United States Air Force officially renounced all responsibility for UFO investigations on behalf of the Government by closing down its Aerial Phenomena Branch (Project Blue Book) at Wright Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio. The announcement came from the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Public Affairs) after the decision was made by Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Secretary of the Air Force, presumably after consultation with other Department of Defense

(See AF — Page Eight)

AF —

(Continued from Page Seven)

officials. No "leaks" of the coming announcement were apparent in Washington and even Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Blue Book's former Scientific Consultant, was unaware of the Air Force's intention during a visit to APRO shortly before the announcement.

Dr. Seamans' main reason for closing Blue Book, as stated in a memorandum issuing the order to Air Force Chief of Staff, General John D. Ryan, is that it "cannot be justified either on the ground of national security or in the interest of science." His decision was also based on the *Robertson Panel* report, the *Condon Report* and its review by the National Academy of Sciences (as stated in the last Bulletin, APRO was aware that the Air Force was studying the latter) and "Air Force experience investigating UFO reports during the past two decades."

Many observers found it curious that it took the Air Force an entire year to follow Dr. Condon's recommendation that Blue Book be closed and that this was done on the eve of the AAAS UFO Symposium in Boston. Mr. Lorenzen, APRO's Director, stated on television and to the press that the end of Blue Book, "eliminates a giant stumbling block which until now has hindered and crippled all attempts at objective inquiry into the problems inherent in reports of UFOs." Mr. Lorenzen also stated that the Air Force program "has been mainly concerned with developing self-serving propaganda, as with all military programs."

The general reaction noted at APRO has been one of relief. Many members and non-members, including scientists in various disciplines, have written expressing their support and urging APRO to continue scientific investigation into the UFO phenomenon now that the U.S. Government has terminated its responsibility in this field.

The Blue Book UFO files have been retired to Air Force Archives at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama and their inspection will probably only be authorized by Washington. There has been some concern, aired by Dr. Thornton Page at the AAAS Symposium, that the classified UFO files may be destroyed, or at least made unavailable to interested scientists. A decision whether or not to declassify and release these case reports is believed to be under consideration by the Department of Defense.

With the closure of Project Blue Book, which operated within the Air Force's elite Foreign Technology Division (formerly Air Technical Intelligence Center), the governments known to maintain token UFO study projects are Argentina (Research and Development Division, Air Force and Intelligence Service, Navy); Australia (Intelligence Department, Air Force); Britain (Ministry of Defense); Canada (Upper Atmosphere Research Section, National Research Council); Chile (Department of Meteorology, Air Force); Greece (National Meteor Service, Ministry of Defence); New Zealand (Meteorological Service, Air Force and Department of Scientific and Industrial Research); and Sweden (Research Institute of National Defense). Most of these UFO "projects" merely maintain statistical files on observations reported to the respective governments and few investigations are actually conducted. In most cases, funds for further investigations are not available from these governments and the UFO sections are run on a part time basis within some other department.

Press Reports

At first examination, press reports of UFO sightings during the last half of 1969 seem to be considerably fewer than the first six months of the year. However, a more careful examination of the files may determine that there is not much difference, at least as far as number of incidents is concerned. We present here a brief description of some of the more outstanding reports which have not as yet been investigated or assigned. If members at large find themselves in a position to investigate any of the incidents listed below, Headquarters will appreciate any added details.

Eighteen-year-old Pauline Oulette, a waitress at Allumette Island near Chapeau, Quebec reported to authorities and the press that on the morning of Wednesday, September 3, she crouched terrified in an upstairs corridor of a hotel on the island while a UFO allegedly hovered outside the window. She claimed that she and two others (Bob McLaughlin and John Stott) spotted the object from the parking lot. Stott said the object, a small light, made a whirring noise, was green and silver in color and had a three-foot-long antenna protruding from one side. McLaughlin described the main light as bright red and it flashed on and off at regular intervals.

The news reports of this incident

are somewhat nebulous and disjointed but Miss Oulette is quoted as saying that she went into the hotel at about 4:30 and saw the light again from her room. She said that ten minutes after she spotted it the second time a smaller object detached from the main one and came into the yard, traveling from window to window. Terrified, she said, she fled to the hall where she crouched waiting for daylight. The hotel proprietor's wife, Mrs. Alcide Dubeau was quoted as saying that Miss Oulette waked her before daylight. Mrs. Dubeau saw the light which she said was so far away that it looked like an unusually bright star. Any further information on this incident would be greatly appreciated.

On the first of October Jack Warkentin, a teacher at Green Acres School, at Brandon, Manitoba, Canada allegedly observed a UFO along with his wife. He claimed that he and his wife saw the object between 1 and 1:30 a.m. while walking near the school. The object was in the east and appeared to be a very bright white oval-shaped light. While they watched it, it started to move steadily and speedily into the west, flashing rapidly and lighting up a large portion of the sky. It passed directly overhead and behind the clouds but was not entirely hidden by the clouds and still lit up the sky around the clouds. The duration of the sighting was approximately 2½ minutes. The teacher said that his wife was so frightened by the spectacle that she went into the house shortly after they sighted it. No sound accompanied the phenomenon and he concluded that the object was traveling at very high altitude.

Clacton and Colchester, in Essex, England were visited by a "something" at 6:45 p.m. on the 15th of October 1969. Mr. P. R. Woodward of Clacton reported observing a brilliant white light at an estimated 4,000 feet altitude while driving from Colchester to Clacton. He watched the object for a bit, then stopped the car to watch the soundless object. As it drew closer he saw that it was four lights rather than one; two of which were brighter than the others. A reporter for the *Essex County Standard*, also claimed that he saw the lights while walking along Harwich Road in Colchester. They seemed to appear over Wivenhoe, then moved across Colchester. He dismissed them as airplane lights. No indication was made in the news item concerning where the objects were last seen.