

## RENEWAL NOTICE:

If the Volume and Issue Code 30/11 appears to the right of your address on this Bulletin cover, your *renewal* is *due*. Your computer scan card has been removed from the active file and you will receive no further issues after this one until you remit your renewal fee. (U.S.: \$15.00, Canada and Mexico, \$16.00, Overseas Surface Mail, \$18.00 and Overseas Airmail \$21.00).

A second notice will be sent but these are expensive to process and mail, so save APRO the added expense and *remit your dues now!*

\* \* \* \* \*

### UFOhio SYMPOSIUM PAPERS

Papers which were presented at the APRO UFOhio Symposium are available from APRO Headquarters based on the following price schedule. Prices reflect copying costs at \$.10 per page plus postage. Please order by number, title and author.

1. "Old Magic and New"-Robert F. Creegan, Ph.D. ....\$2.25
2. "The Roswell Investigation, Update and Conclusions"-William L. Moore ....\$3.50
3. "The Interrupted Journey Continued"-Betty Hill .....\$2.25
4. "UFO Activity and Human Consciousness"-R. Leo Sprinkle, Ph.D. ....\$2.75
5. "The Night Surgeons"-Peter A. Jordan .....\$3.00
6. "E.T.H.-Completing The Jigsaw"-L.J. Lorenzen .....\$2.00
7. "UFO-The Cosmic Watergate"-Stanton T. Friedman .....\$2.75
8. "Sociological Aspects of UFO Research" -Peter Van Arsdale, Ph. D. ....\$3.50

\* \* \* \* \*

## AN APOLOGY

We have been approached by Mike Tully, an attorney representing Allen Benz, regarding an item entitled "clarification" which appeared on the mailing cover of Volume 29, Issues 7 and 8 of the *APRO BULLETIN*. It is the contention of Mr. Benz's attorney that the item in question is libelous in nature and requires a retraction.

Specifically, Mr. Benz contends that my characterization of certain acts as an attempt to "convert APRO's assets to their control" is tantamount to accusing someone of trying to steal the Corporation's (APRO's) money.

It was not my intent to libel Mr. Benz and I do not believe that I did. However, the APRO membership would not be well served by extensive litigation, so I withdraw the offensive remarks and apologize to Mr. Benz for any misunderstanding resulting therefrom.

(Signed)  
L.J. Lorenzen  
Director, APRO

# the apro bulletin

VOL. 30

TUCSON, ARIZONA

NO. 9

## THE DEMISE OF FRANCE'S G.E.P.A.N

### CORRECTION

(*"A lie travels round the world while truth is putting on her boots."*—Charles Haddington Spurgeon, "Truth and Falsehood")

A mail-out promoting the "Summit" meeting of UFO groups in Toronto, Canada in July, read, in part:

"People who have indicated an interest in participating in the 1982 Summit Conference, etc...."

Listed at the top of the last page were: "Mr. and Mrs. L.J. Lorenzen, Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, 3910 E. Kleindale Rd., Tucson, Arizona",

That was *not true!* In fact the *opposite* was the case. Neither Mr. or Mrs. Lorenzen were interested in participating in the so-called "Summit" conference, nor did we indicate any interest.

Two people attended the conference who are APRO affiliated. One was Mr. William Moore, a member of APRO's Board of Directors. He *was not* representing APRO; he was there on his own behalf, as a writer. Richard Heiden, Assistant Editor of the APRO Bulletin attended the conference and, like Moore, *observed*, but did not participate on behalf of APRO, no matter what was printed or said before, during or after the fact.

We cannot apologize for the misrepresentation of our "interest" for we had no part in it.

The mail-out came from MUFON, the "Summit" was hosted by MUFON, so we can only assume that Walt Andrus is responsible for misrepresenting the truth.

In the future, if you don't hear "it" from a duly authorized representative of APRO, or read "it" in the Bulletin — forget "it".

For APRO's position on a "United" UFO Field in North America, see the article in this issue on the "Demise of the G.E.P.A.N."

\*\*\*\*\*

### NOTICE

*Please check your Bulletin cover. It contains much important information and announcements.*

In May of this year APRO received a letter and an article from Jean Gille, PhD, mourning the "Wreck" of France's G.E.P.A.N. (Groupement pour Etudier les Phenomenes Aerospaciaux Nonidentifies — Unidentified Aerospace Phenomena Study Group). The general gist of Mr. Gille's article was published in "Specula", Journal of the American Association of Meta-Science, Volume 5, Number 1, Jan-Mar, 1982.

The history of G.E.P.A.N. is quite involved, but most recent developments are interesting enough to justify more than a passing mention. It was created on March 1, 1977 by C.N.E.S. (Centre Nationale d'Etudes Spatiales) — the French equivalent of the U.S. National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

Mr. Gille first made contact with GEPAN at a "Preparatory Meeting for UFO Phenomena-Dedicated Private Investigations Commissions" on September 12, 1978. The meeting had been organized by Claude Poher, an engineer and cousin of the former Chairman of the French Senate.

During 7 hours of lecturing, the audience was impressed, over and over again, with the scientific ability of GEPAN (compared to their own humble shortcomings) and the fact that only reports received and investigated by the Gendarmerie would be handled. The Gendarmerie, by the way, is government-controlled.

Also during this time, Gille learned that the permanent members of the staff of the GEPAN would only be able to devote 10% of their time to the investigation, sorting and screening of reports. (If this sounds familiar, dig out the history of the "Condon Committee"). After this "indoctrination" session, an organizational diagram was shown (where have you seen one of *those* in UFO research?) and at the conclusion of the meeting Mr. Poher resigned as the chief of the organization.

To make a long story short, Alain Esterle was named successor to Poher a short time later. Nothing changed.

We now go to Flying Saucer Review, Volume 28, No. 1, 1982, which contains, on Page 2, an article by M. Fernand Lagarde, esteemed editor of the excellent French Journal, "Lumieres dans la Nuit". The article first appeared in French in that Journal in the May-June 1982 issue.

M. Lagarde points out that, like the Condon Committee, (although he doesn't mention it) GEPAN's

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN  
 Copyright © 1982 by the  
 AERIAL PHENOMENA  
 RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, INC.  
 3910 E. Kleindale Road  
 Tucson, Arizona 85712

Phone: 602-623-1825 and 602-323-7363  
 Coral E. Lorenzen, Editor  
 Richard Heiden, Ass't Editor  
 Brian James, Lance P. Johnson,  
 Robert Gonzales, Artists

## A.P.R.O. STAFF

International Director ..... L.J. Lorenzen  
 Secretary-Treasurer ..... Coral E. Lorenzen  
 Membership Secretary ..... Madeleine H. Cooper

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 85712, and is issued every 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.

## A.P.R.O. MEMBERSHIP including BULLETIN:

United States ..... \$15.00/yr.  
 Canada & Mexico ..... \$16.00/yr.  
 (Canadian Currency will be accepted)  
 All other Countries ..... \$18.00/yr.  
 Air Mail Overseas ..... \$21.00/yr.

## SUBSCRIPTION to BULLETIN only; SAME AS ABOVE.

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

Published October, 1982

\*\*\*\*\*

(Continued from Page One)

"cooperation" was one-way, from UFO organization to GEPAN, period.

We here at APRO have been observing the UFO field around the world for longer than any other group. We have made some observations which, if we were to delineate them here, would signal our adversaries concerning just how much we know, and what we suspect. Lagarde's article is full of his frustration and disappointment. The old "bait and switch" play started here in the United States. We think it is time for the "concealers" to begin a new phase of the operation calculated to stifle UFO knowledge, so we will now wait to see what their next move will be.

In the case of GEPAN, we can't help but wonder if Claude Poyer, who was respected and admired by UFO researchers throughout France, could have been a sacrificial lamb. Or a Judas goat? Which? And do we, in the U.S. have a counterpart?

As the Great Bard wrote: "Ay, there's the rub!"

\*\*\*\*\*

## LETTER TO THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN

I wish to thank Mrs. Lorenzen for coming to my defense with regard to a very disparaging review of my book, "PROJECT IDENTIFICATION: The First Scientific Field Study of UFO Phenomena," published by Prentice-Hall, Inc. In her written defense (A.P.R.O. Bulletin, Vol. 30, No. 6), she analyzed my claim that I had seen 37 UFOs from my yard in Cape Girardeau over a seven-year period. In particular, I am responding to her statement that "...it would be interesting and most informative to know how many (UFOs) were called to his attention by others who knew of his interest." The answer is simple. None! I cannot recall seeing a single UFO from my yard as the result of a telephone alert that a UFO was in my vicinity—and I've had a plethora of those calls. All of my 37 sightings from the yard occurred either when I was on watch with equipment set up, or when I happened to be in the yard and saw a UFO by accident.

I enjoy reading the A.P.R.O. Bulletin.

Dr. Harley Rutledge  
 Chairman, Physics Department  
 Southeast Missouri State University  
 Cape Girardeau, Missouri 63701


\*\*\*\*\*

## "GLOBE" UFO IN NEW MEXICO

Tom Rush, 27, and two friends, were fishing on Blue Water Lake on June 9th, 1982, when Mr. Rush, who was sitting in the rear of the boat and facing southeast, observed a bright ring of light which moved in a flat or shallow arc and disappeared behind a mountain range. He attempted to point out the object to his companions, but by the time they looked in the direction in which he was pointing, the object was gone. Also, they were somewhat blinded by the lantern, which was sitting between them.

Rush estimates the total time of observation as about four seconds. After the object had disappeared behind the mountains, a bright flash of light lit up the rear side of the mountain range and the thought occurred to him that the object may have crashed. However, he heard no sound, either during or after the sighting.


The trio had just left their campsite on the shore and were one third of the way across the lake when the sighting occurred. Rush said: "The inner ring was a definite



Object in Flight

round shape, while the outer edge of the ring of light was illuminated—i.e., a bright, white light. I didn't hear any explosion or crash after it disappeared behind the mountain. I just saw a flash. It was a brilliant flash that lit up the back side of the mountains. I could see the whole horizon (sky line) of the mountain range. I thought at first it could be lightning, but there were no clouds, and the sky was clear. It flashed a split second after it disappeared. At the time I thought it had crashed."

Mr. Rush cooperated fully with Field Investigator Cliff Booth, who is an excellent artist, in recreating the sighting on paper (see accompanying drawings). He (Rush) also rode his dirt bike all over the hills and mountains in the area trying to locate corroborating witnesses. The only corroboration came from two young Navajo goat herders who were inside their shelter at the time of the sighting when they heard a sound like "two rocks crashing together".



Flash Behind Mountain

Rush estimated the speed of the object at 70 miles per hour, the altitude at 250-260 feet, diameter of the ring 50 feet, and the distance from his location at three miles.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE CASH-LANDRUM CASE ANALYSIS

By Coral E. Lorenzen

As a result of my article (Volume 30, Issue #6, Page 2 and 3), in the APRO Bulletin, APRO received a telephone call from a Lt. Col. Sarran, of the Army Inspector General's office on June 25, at 1:30 p.m., and, second, a letter from John Schuessler on July 2, dated June 25.

The general thrust of Col. Sarran's call was an attempt to gain information which he thought we might have which would "assist" him in his investigation. He verified APRO's information that the only Chinook helicopters in service are operated by the Army and the Marines, and the only Chinooks within operating range of Houston where the Cash-Landrum incident took place, are 24 in number and stationed at Ft. Hood.

Sarran further informed us that he had been informed of my article by John Schuessler, Deputy Director of MUFON. He suggested the possibility that the flight of the 22 choppers reported by Cash, Landrum and Landrum might have been an "Iran-type rescue exercise" (The failed Iran "rescue" took place in April, 1980, fully 8 months before the Cash-Landrum incident), or they might have been related to Gulf of Mexico oil rig operations, where Chinooks are apparently used to service the off-shore oil installations.

Let's examine what we know about the "Chinooks", which Mrs. Cash and Mrs. Landrum allegedly identified from photos they were shown, as the aircraft they observed flying in the area of the bright craft ("UFO").

The "Chinook" (Boeing CH-47) has a load capacity of 33-34 fully armed (with pack) men with pilot and co-pilot or 24 litter casualty cases in addition to pilot and co-pilot. Its range is about 220 miles, although it has been "beefed up" somewhat, can be refueled in mid-air, can lift and transport two tons internally or 8 tons externally and has a Pershing missile system capability. It is a "work-horse".

The Chinook is a gas-gulper, not particularly speedy, not highly maneuverable, designed to carry large loads for short distances, and definitely not the sort of vehicle which would be deployed for pursuit or reconnaissance of an alien craft.

The Chinooks at Ft. Hood are a part of the Rapid Deployment Force there. It seems realistic, therefore,

that they were rapidly deployed for an Army "exercise" on December 29, 1980, which went awry.

I have had knowledge of a classified Army Regulation which deals with the investigation of UFOs since 1956. How long it had been in existence before that date, we don't know. However, in view of that information, in addition to other facts, it is my opinion that it is not at all unexpected that, after investigating UFOs for 35 years (since 1947 and probably longer) the U.S. Army has under development and test an aircraft (however crude) which simulates the "UFO".

What, after all, is going on at the Los Alamos Laboratories in New Mexico, among others? That installation is Army, and is the location of studies and experimentation relating to nuclear fission. Do we actually think they are just improving on our nuclear strike capability?

One after another, writers on the subject of UFOs have made the pronouncement that the government which discovers the secret of the propulsion of the UFOs would "rule the world".

Well, they haven't discovered the secret of the UFO (propulsion, that is) but they're all trying, and the U.S. has apparently come up with the next best thing — a brightly lit aircraft utilizing a new propulsion concept, a side-effect of which is highly damaging radiation.

Now, to Schuessler's letter: He chided me for having information which, if known to him, would help Mrs. Cash and Mrs. Landrum and Colby. He devoted a whole paragraph to a description of his position at NASA. He accused me of trying to "goad" him into releasing more information on the case. Actually, he had, in writing, promised APRO added information, including medical reports, as early as April, 1981.

After an attention-hungry (Tucson) APRO member (who had been "hanging around the office" in Office Manager Chris Panter's words) had intercepted Mrs. Landrum's initial call on February 2, 1981, and her taped report on February 6 and sold it to Weekly World News, Mr. Lorenzen learned of the report via the APRO office Phone log and had the information forwarded to John Schuessler for investigation. At the time, Mr. Lorenzen was under the impression that Schuessler would do an impartial and objective job.

At about that time there was an incursion of certain elements bent on a "take-over" of APRO at Headquarters level, and this was discussed with Mr. Schuessler via telephone. Thereafter, all information on the Cash-Landrum case stopped. Mr. Lorenzen's most recent request — specifically for back-up witnesses and medical reports, elicited only some clippings which had nothing to do with the case. There was no turn-down on the medical reports — not even a mention until Schuessler's June 25 letter in which he characterized the medical reports as highly "personal" information.

This is an important point, for although Schuessler and MUFON have been loudly pronouncing the physical trauma suffered by the principals in the Cash-Landrum

affair as "radiation sickness", they have not offered any evidence to support this assertion. I contend that it cannot be supported without the supporting data of definitive blood tests.

Does the reader realize that no radiation tests at the site were conducted? At least, not to our knowledge. Despite the fact that Schuessler claims he was consulted regularly by the Doctor on the case (because of his reputation as a local UFO aficionado) even before APRO notified him of the case, there is no public record of the medical tests undertaken. Apparently no soil samples at the site were taken, either.

We must ask, then, how "radiation sickness" can be the considered diagnosis when there is not sufficient foundation laid? Incidentally, the road on which the C-L incident took place has since been re-paved!

Now — back to the basic incident. The tape which Mrs. C. and Mrs. L. made and sent to APRO (and was sent on to Weekly World News by Bill English without authorization) clearly indicates that neither of the women is technically or scientifically oriented. (The twin-rotor helicopters are characterized by Mrs. Cash as having two "dealies" on top).

We will be dealing with this incident in more depth in up-coming issues of the Bulletin. However, for now, Schuessler and his crowd would have us believe:

1. The two women and the boy saw a UFO.
2. That the UFO was accompanied by 20+ helicopters which have limited range, are unwieldy and not very speedy.
3. (This is the new information). Some of the same type of helicopters revisited the scene hours later. (Looking for casualties and/or hardware?)

Now — what do we know about UFOs?

1. They can hover dead still in the air.
2. They can speed up from a dead stop to thousands of miles per hour in seconds.
3. They do not frequent heavily populated areas, especially in low-level, prolonged flight.
4. The only relatively verifiable incidents involving UFOs and radiation are (a) A Canadian case which took place in an isolated area. The man involved came upon the UFO and made a close approach quite by accident (his presence was not immediately noticeable). (b) A Colombian case in which a man approached a UFO and fired a gun at it. A Beam erupted from the object, striking him in the chest. He died shortly thereafter of symptoms indicating radiation poisoning. However, no autopsy was performed.
5. The UFOs are highly evolved technologically exotic machines; they are nearly infallible.
6. Past performance indicates that surveillance and pursuit of UFOs by military vehicles has been accomplished with high speed aircraft.

(To be Continued)

# ASTRONOMICAL DATA

by Lee Emery

This data applies to those areas located from approximately 30° north latitude to 50° north latitude, including most points in the USA, Canada, Europe, Central Asia, and Japan. All times given are approximate and may vary up to 30 minutes either way, depending on the observer's location in relation to his local time meridian. Also, add 1 hour for the beginning of the month, and subtract 1 hour for the end of the month.

NOTE: Times are given in *Standard Time*, add 1 hour for Daylight Savings.

## OCTOBER 1982

*Prominent Planets:* *Venus* can no longer be seen in either the morning or evening skies and will not become visible again until late December. *Mars* can still be seen low in the western sky after sunset. Around the beginning of the month, Mars passes close to the star *Antares*, an unusual sight since both objects shine with an orange-red light.

*Saturn* and *Jupiter* are both lost below the western horizon after sunset, and therefore, cannot be seen (except, possibly very early in the month).

*Brightest Stars:* *Vega* can be seen about 65° above the western horizon at 7 p.m. By midnight, it has moved to a point just above the NW horizon and sets in the NNW shortly after.

*Arcturus* may possibly be seen low in the western sky after sunset before setting about 7:30 p.m. *Capella* rises in the north about 6:30 p.m. By 9:00 p.m., it is located approximately 40° above the ENE horizon, and by midnight, it can be seen about 60° above the eastern horizon. By 3 a.m., it is almost directly overhead, and then moves slightly towards the west by sunrise.

*Aldebaran* rises in the east about 8:30 p.m., and by midnight is found approximately 50° above the eastern horizon. By 3 a.m., it is located about 60° above the southern horizon, and then moves to a point 45° above the western horizon by sunrise. Look for the distinctive *Pleiades* (a tight grouping of 7 stars) which is found just above Aldebaran for most of the night (more to the side by dawn).

*Betelgeuse* and *Rigel*, both part of the Orion Constellation, rise in the east about 10:30 p.m. By 3 a.m., they can be found 40°-50° above the southern horizon, and then move towards the SW by sunrise.

*Procyon* and *Sirius* (the brightest star) rise in the east about midnight. By 3 a.m., they are located 30°-45° above the SW horizon. By dawn, Procyon is found about 50° above the southern horizon, while Sirius is approximately 30° above the southern horizon. *Antares* can be seen very low in the western sky just after sunset. It sets shortly after.

*METEOR SHOWERS:* The early morning hours of October 10 mark the arrival of the *Draconids*, which could be an excellent shower peaking about 4 a.m. The quarter moon could hinder viewing. The *Orionids* arrive early on October 21. This also could be a good shower because it results from Halley's Comet which is getting closer to earth. The peak of activity should occur just after midnight with no moon to hinder viewing.

*Moon Phases:* Full Moon—Oct. 3  
Last Quarter—Oct. 9  
New Moon—Oct. 17  
First Quarter—Oct. 25

## NOVEMBER 1982

*Prominent Planets:* There are no prominent planets in the night sky this month.

*Brightest Stars:* Star positions remain basically unchanged, except rising and setting times are approximately 1 hour earlier in the first half of the month and 2 hours earlier towards the end of the month.

*Meteor Showers:* Two minor showers, the *Taurids* on November 5, and the *Andromedids* on November 14, occur this month, but neither is expected to be significant. The *Leonids*, on November 17, would be a good shower; however, it peaks during daylight hours which makes viewing virtually impossible.

*Moon Phases:* Full Moon—Nov. 1  
Last Quarter—Nov. 8  
New Moon—Nov. 15  
First Quarter—Nov. 23

\*\*\*\*\*

## Scientists In Support of UFOs

By Arthur Bray

(Conclusion)

Many scientists even act as scientific advisors and consultants to UFO research groups run by laymen. That is an indicator of their dedication to seeking the truth. Dr. Hynek tells us that there is, in addition, an "Invisible College" of scientists who "are intrigued by the UFO phenomenon and who, if provided with opportunity, time and facilities, are most willing to undertake its serious study. They represent an inter-

national group ready to accept the challenge of the UFO."<sup>19</sup>

You may have the belief that scientists never see UFOs. I refer you to a study carried out through a survey of a group of North American scientists conducted by Dr. Peter A. Sturrock of Stanford University.<sup>20</sup>

This survey established that 62 members of the 1356 who returned the questionnaire had "witnessed or obtained an instrumental record of an event which they could not identify and which they thought may be related to the UFO phenomenon". This clearly establishes that some scientists do indeed see UFOs. The same study further established that opinions correlate strongly with the time spent reading about the subject and that those scientists who have studied the subject are more willing to help in UFO research and are more likely to see a way to help.

There are two other countries from which very interesting reports of UFO studies have been made available. One is France, the other is Russia. Both reports have been made available in English through the Center for UFO Studies in Chicago, under the directorship of Dr. Allen Hynek. For over 30 years, Russia has officially debunked UFOs and there was and still is a curtain of secrecy over the subject.

This report from the Institute of Space Research of the Soviet Academy of Sciences got out to the West through scientific channels. It clearly shows that there are scientists in the Soviet Union who are dissatisfied with the party line on UFOs. It concludes: "the question of the nature of the phenomena still should be considered open" and it goes on to recommend the setting up of special studies "as the Soviet and foreign data accumulated so far justifies setting up such studies."<sup>21</sup>

Dr. Hynek and Dr. Richard Haines interpret this report as saying "UFOs are real, if one does not place any specific interpretation on 'UFO'". They also say this is a complete reversal of the conclusions of the Condon Report, and "the UFO Phenomenon at one stroke becomes a legitimate subject for serious scientific attention." They also remind us that the psychologist Carl Jung wrote in the mid-50's: "I have formulated my position on the question of the reality of UFOs in the following sentence: 'Something is seen, but it is not known what.'"<sup>22</sup>

France has probably the best internal UFO investigative network of any country in the world, utilizing the full resources of the Gendarmerie, the military, and various government and civilian agencies, and the French National Space Agency, and access to the facilities of these organizations. The latter organization, the French equivalent of NASA, has specially trained and equipped field investigative teams and makes full use of its scientific laboratories to study physical effects of UFOs,<sup>23</sup> eg., soil samples, electro-

magnetic effects, and physiological effects on humans and animals.

The second report I referred to, issued by the Institute of Advanced Studies of National Defence of France in 1977, stated, "... there remain . . . a small number of 'Unidentified' cases, cases which to date cannot be explained by a known phenomenon or by a combination of known phenomena."<sup>25</sup>

In conclusion, many claim that *all* reports of strange things in the sky can be explained in conventional terms within a scientific context—that they are all IFOs rather than UFOs. My argument is that about 10% of all reports *cannot* be so explained and that this 10% represents something outside the present ability of science to explain. These are the UFOs—the Unidentified Flying Objects.

It is not only laymen such as myself who hold this view, as those of us who do are strongly supported by a *growing* base of professional scientists who support this viewpoint, despite the fact it cuts across the grain of the *publicly-expressed* official government opinion.

There are numerous theories as to what UFOs are but the consensus among these scientists is that whatever they are, they are real and objective and consist of something which science has as yet been unable to explain and are intelligently controlled. *What* they are and *where* they originate remain unknown.

Lay UFO researchers as well as the many scientists investigating UFOs are well aware that there is no evidence of intelligent life elsewhere in our solar system, and are quite familiar with all the arguments about the time required to travel from the nearest stars, which are standard arguments used against the theory that UFOs are of extraterrestrial origin.

The term "extraterrestrial", however, does not necessarily mean physical travel as we know it within the law of physics as *currently* known and understood. This is the view of a large number of scientists who disagree with what Dr. Millman claims.

The basis of my argument is that UFOs do exist, and a large number of competent scientists say so, but we do not know what they are.

If Dr. Millman still disagrees with all I have said tonight, (and everything I have said is well documented by scientists) he will have to say that the large number of scientists around the world who share my view, are incompetent.

(*Editor's Note:* APRO has first-hand knowledge of government-sponsored UFO Investigations in two other countries which have been on-going for at least 15 years. In view of this and the foregoing, it is safe to assume that at least 8 and perhaps 10 or more nations are seriously engaged in UFO research.)

#### REFERENCES

1. Millman, Peter M., "Seven Maxims of UFOs," *Journal of the Royal Astronomical Society of*

- Canada, Toronto, August, 1975.
2. Letter from Dr. Peter M. Millman dated November 17, 1950.
  3. "Electronic Bloodhounds Track Down 'Sky Stones'," *Science Dimension*, National Research Council, Ottawa, May, 1952.
  4. Maccabee, Bruce, "Scientific Investigation of Unidentified Flying Objects: Part I", *The Journal of UFO Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 1, Center for UFO Studies, Chicago.
  5. Gillmor, Daniel S. (Ed) *Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects*, E. P. Dutton, New York, 1969, p. 407.
  6. Bray, Arthur, *The UFO Connection*, Jupiter Publishing, Ottawa, 1979.
  7. Gersten, Peter A., "What the Government Would Know about UFOs if they Read Their Own Documents", *1981 MUFON UFO Symposium Proceedings*, MUFON, 1981, p. 21.
  8. Memorandum to Director of Central Intelligence dated September 11, 1952 (formerly classified "secret").
  9. Gersten, op cit, p. 28.
  10. *Project Blue Book Special Report No. 14*, Air Technical Intelligence Center, Wright-Patterson AFB, Ohio, 1955.
  11. Maccabee, op cit, p. 90.
  12. Story, Ronald D. (Ed.), *The Encyclopedia of UFOs*, Doubleday, Garden City, 1980, p. 96.
  13. ibid p. 144.
  14. ibid
  15. ibid p. 164.
  16. ibid p. 180.
  17. ibid p. 222.
  18. McDonald, James E., *Unidentified Flying Objects: Greatest Scientific Problem of our Times*, Pittsburgh Sub-committee, NICAP, 1967, p. 32.
  19. Hynek, J. Allen, *The UFO Experience: A Scientific Inquiry*, Henry Regnery, Chicago, 1972, p. 166.
  20. Sturrock, P. A., *Report on a Survey of the Membership of the American Astronomical Society Concerning the UFO Problem*, SUIPR Report No. 681, January 1977, Institute of Plasma Research, Stanford University, Stanford, California.
  21. Gindilis, Nan'kov and Petrovskoya, *Observations on Anomalous Atmospheric Phenomena in the USSR: Statistical Analysis*, USSR Academy of Sciences, Institute of Space Research Report PR473, 1979. Center for UFO Studies, Chicago, 1980, pp. 42-43.
  22. Hynek, J. Allen and Haines, Richard F., "Implications of and Comments on 'Observations on Anomalous Atmospheric Phenomena in the USSR: Statistical Analysis'", *The Journal of UFO Studies*, vol. 2, Center for UFO Studies, Chicago, 1980, p. 100.
  23. Hynek, J. Allen, "GEPAN—France's Official UFO Agency", *International UFO Reporter*, vol. 5, no. 1, January, 1980, Center for UFO Studies, Chicago.
  24. *Report on Unidentified Aerial Phenomena*, Institute of Advanced Studies of National Defence (France) June 20, 1977. Center for UFO Studies, Chicago, 1980, p. 3.
  25. Hynek and Haines op cit, p. 101.

\*\*\*\*\*

## INTERNATIONAL SOCIETY OF CRYPTOZOOLOGY

The following is the opening paragraph from a brochure recently received at APRO Headquarters, relating to a newly formed society, which we feel will be of interest to at least some members:

"The purpose of the International Society of Cryptozoology is to serve as a focal point for the investigation, analysis, publication, and discussion of all matters related to animals of unexpected form or size, or unexpected occurrence in time or space. The Society will encourage the scientific examination of all evidence related to these matters." Unquote.

The ISOC (or ISC, which ever is preferred) has an impressive list of individuals serving on its Board of Directors, and Mr. Richard Greenwell, well-known researcher and former Assistant Director of APRO (1969-1973) is the Secretary and Treasurer.

Those who are interested in keeping abreast of matters mentioned above, may inquire about membership by responding to:

J. Richard Greenwell  
International Society of Cryptozoology  
P.O. Box 43070  
Tucson, Arizona 85733  
U.S.A.

\*\*\*\*\*

## UFO SIGHTED BY AIRPORT PERSONNEL IN NEW ZEALAND

January 26, 1982 - Christchurch - Four Air New Zealand cargo loaders, Lindsay Squire, Gerald Coward, Bob Mulholland and Stuart McConnell, saw a fast-moving orange light approach the Christchurch Airport from the southeast then continue to move around directly overhead for about 14 minutes. Mulholland had just looked at his watch at 4:49 a.m. as he

drove a forklift out of the cargo shed towards a waiting aircraft. Seeing the bright light approaching at speed, he signalled to his colleagues and they all stopped to watch.

The light was circular with a white center, a pulsating orange ring enclosing it, and made no sound. It moved back to the southeast, then westward, above the men again. At that point Squire went back into the cargo terminal and tried, unsuccessfully, to ring the control tower. While he was inside, the others watched the object disappear to the east over the Cashmere Hills.

The men were all experienced with night sightings of aircraft but said this was completely different. No aircraft were known to have been operating at the time of the sighting. The duty air traffic controller saw nothing from the control tower and the Meteorological Service has been unable to offer any explanation for the incident.

\* \* \* \* \*

## UFOs OVER DEVON, ENGLAND

On December 16, 1910, a mysterious tidal wave swept away the sea front at Ilfracombe and boats were washed up into the fields at nearby Watermouth Cove. A witness later said she had seen a great silver ball sweep down over the Bristol Channel, displacing the water on that part of the North Devon coast.

On October 24, 1967, two Devon policemen, Cliff Waycott and Roger Willey, were on motor patrol and followed a bright cross in the sky for 45 minutes. Sometimes the object moved in an arc and at other times dipped as if to land. In fact, it did stop over a field but took off again when the officers stopped to investigate. A second cross then joined the first, and both were noiseless and very bright. A motorist and two local women also witnessed this event.

At noon on April 28 the following year, hundreds of people at Brixham saw a bright, cone-shaped object at about 15,000 feet. Brian Jenkins, a coast guard, said it was "the size of a street of houses, much too big for a meteorological balloon." The chief coast guard at Berry Head, Mr. H. Johnson, said it was very highly polished and reflected the sunlight. The Controller at RAF, Plymouth, said the object was tracked by radar.

\* \* \* \* \*

### LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

As APRO readers well know, mice have long been used as subjects in laboratory experiments.

The knowledge gained from these experiments often

may be used to determine the mechanism of damage in a member of the same species injured by an otherwise unknown cause. (For example, the effects of microwave radiation are especially easy to identify.)

Because of this fact, I hereby offer a reward of \$50.00 for copies of each published description of mice killed or injured as the alleged result of their proximity to a UFO.

Jan Eric Herr  
6250 Stanley Ave.  
San Diego, CA 92115  
U.S.A.

\*\*\*\*\*

## PRESS REPORTS

*By Doris and Joe Graziano*

*WYOMING - March 24, 1982 - Cheyenne -* Sue Huff and her family were driving along College Dr. around 9 p.m. when the sky to the south lit up with a purplish glow from the ground and then just as suddenly dimmed. "It was like a huge power surge," she said, "and it lasted about 10 to 15 seconds before the second and last surge."

Professor Harley Thronson of the University of Wyoming's Astronomy Department said he couldn't give an accurate answer as to what the glowing light could have been. A spokesman for the National Weather Service said the department has no idea what the glow could have been. And the Public Information Officer for Warren AFB discounted the possibility that the Air Force could have been testing, and added that no reports about the unusual light were recorded at the base.

*PARAGUAY - April 6 & 9, 1982 - San Juan Bautista de las Misiones -* On April 6th, several witnesses watched a silent, bright object with red and yellow lights hovering at about 150 meters in altitude. A car motor was reportedly stopped and when the object disappeared the motor started to work again. Three days later, a second object of the same description was seen in the same area.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ADDRESS CHANGES

Please send old and new zip codes  
with address changes!

# NOTE: Give a Gift Subscription with this Form!

Rec'd. _____
New _____
Renew _____
File _____

*Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc.*

(APRO)  
 3910 EAST KLEINDALE ROAD  
 (602) 323-1825  
 TUCSON, ARIZONA — 85712  
 U.S.A.

## MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION FORM

(please type or print)

Mr. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Mrs. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Name: Miss \_\_\_\_\_ Date of birth: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Address: \_\_\_\_\_ City, State \_\_\_\_\_ Zip: \_\_\_\_\_  
 Phone: (Area Code) \_\_\_\_\_ Home \_\_\_\_\_ Business Phone \_\_\_\_\_ Citizenship: \_\_\_\_\_  
 EDUCATIONAL BACKGROUND: If university degrees were obtained, please specify in what fields: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Does applicant have a proficiency in any language other than English? If so, please specify. \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

PROFESSIONAL BACKGROUND: Please state: 1) current professional activity; 2) name of employer; 3) special qualifications and/or practical experience of value to APRO.  
 1) \_\_\_\_\_  
 2) \_\_\_\_\_  
 3) \_\_\_\_\_

FIELDS OF INTEREST: Please state: 1) personal fields of interest in relation to UFOs; 2) Would applicant be willing to participate in special projects in these fields?  
 1) \_\_\_\_\_  
 2) \_\_\_\_\_

Has applicant ever seen a UFO? \_\_\_\_\_ How many times? \_\_\_\_\_  
 To which other UFO organizations does applicant belong, if any? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

Which are the 3 UFO books considered best by applicant? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

APRO membership in the U.S. is \$15.00 annually. Canada and Mexico are US \$16.00 annually. Membership in all other countries is US \$18.00 annually. Overseas Airmail is US \$21.00 annually. For a bank transfer of funds to APRO, please forward funds to 1st National Bank Account #2076-00426, Tucson, AZ, 85711. Please enclose remittance with this form. Members completing this form receive permanent membership cards.

APRO members receive twelve (12) issues per year of the *APRO Bulletin*. It contains pertinent information on UFO research, reports of observations, results of investigations, both in the U.S. and abroad, photos, articles, book reviews, etc. Back issues may be purchased by members.

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Applicant's Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
 Date