

# RENEWAL NOTICE:

If the Volume and Issue Code 31/1 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 in June, 1981 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

\* \* \* \* \*

### Letter to the Editor:

I have enjoyed the snapshots and photos, the flashbacks to "yester-year" and also the letters from the membership. It goes without saying that I enjoy the Bulletin and I am very happy to be a member. The aspirations of those quoted are my thoughts entirely.

As I am a latecomer to your membership (about ten years) I would like to have your earlier publications. I am enclosing my check for which I would appreciate some of the earliest copies on hand.

I, too, am glad that you have been able to "hang in there" and I hope that you always do. I do not believe that this thing is going away and no matter what it is all about, it has to be worth the effort. It is worth much much more to me than what I put into it. I am trying to get myself squared away so that I can contribute more.

To the future of the APRO Bulletin—and those who make it possible.

Sincerely,

(Signed) Louise Deadman,  
ARKANSAS

# the apro bulletin

VOL. 30

TUCSON, ARIZONA

NO. 11

## CLOSE ENCOUNTER IN COLORADO

*Investigated by B. V. Wilson*



*Photo of pond over which object hovered. See details, Column Two. Fence stands 20 feet from house.*

### THE NOVA MESS

*By Coral E. Lorenzen*

As a long-time viewer and "fan" of PBS (Public Broadcasting System) television, my confidence in the reliability and objectivity of the subject matter of that "educational" network was soundly shaken when I viewed "The Case for the UFOs" as presented by NOVA and aired in Tucson, Arizona during the week of October 10, 1982.

To be absolutely fair, I should point out that NOVA is produced by WGBH of Boston, Massachusetts, and, unfortunately, the case selection was made by Kendrick Frazier, editor of "The Skeptical Inquirer," which is published by the "Committee for the Scientific Investigation of Claims of the Paranormal" (CSICP). Two of the "stars" of the NOVA program were Philip Klass and James Oberg, both outspoken UFO detractors and members of CSICP. Klass is also well known in the UFO field for his misrepresentation and juggling of facts to make them fit his preconceived notions.

To do a thorough critique of "The Case for the UFOs" would require considerably more space than we have available here, but I'll hit the "high spots" — at least those glaring errors which cannot go unchallenged by APRO.

*(See NOVA, Page Two)*

A one-witness sighting in El Paso County, Colorado on August 30, 1982, may turn out to be one of the more important cases to have occurred in the U.S. in some time, considering the number of effects apparently directly connected with the object seen.

At 2 a.m., Elizabeth Conway was awakened by what she later described as a ticking sound. Getting out of bed, she saw a bright orange glow through the screen door. She then saw a large, orange ball descending at an angle toward a pond about 100 yards from the house.

Mrs. Conway went out onto the balcony which abuts her bedroom and watched the object, which she said was almost the same size as the nearly full moon and in the same quadrant of the sky. The object was below the moon, however.

The object then touched down on the pond and stayed for approximately one minute, during which time the ticking sound continued. From her description, Mr. Wilson deduced that the sound resembled that of an electric motor giving off sparks. When the object left, it took off at an angle of about 45 degrees, and the ticking sound stopped.

Mr. Conway, who was asleep in the same room, is a heavy sleeper and she did not attempt to wake him. She estimated the entire sighting had a duration of about 2 minutes.

The next morning Mrs. Conway had a rash on her forearms which had not been there before, but it was nearly gone on the next day when interviewed by Mr. Wilson (August 31st).

Animal reaction to the object is a possibility which must be considered. During the object's presence, the horses in the Conway paddock were running about as though frightened. Further investigation by Mr. Wilson revealed that neighbors located about ½ mile from the Conway residence had been wakened by their dogs who were barking furiously and their horses who were running about the corral as though disturbed. Another neighbor also reported their dogs barking for no apparent reason. Neither neighbor observed the object, however.

The object had demonstrated a wobbly motion when descending to the pond.

On the second of September, the Conway's son was returning from school and noted that the tall weeds growing in and around the pond had been flattened in a circle about 9 feet in diameter. Mr. Conway waded out to

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

Phone: 602-323-1825 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 December, 1982

\*\*\*\*\*

(Continued from Page One)

the edge of the pond and measured the depth of the pond which he found to be about 2 feet deep, and the diameter of the circle of flattened grass which was 9 feet across.

After considering all the evidence, Mr. Wilson estimated the actual diameter of the orange globe to be 12 feet in diameter.

The weather at the time of the sighting was very clear with a nearly full moon. Mrs. Conway did not notice the stars.

\*\*\*\*\*

## NOVA

(Continued from Page One)

Inasmuch as APRO was the only investigating organization involved in the Travis Walton case, we'll deal with it primarily. NOVA addressed itself to the Walton case in two respects. Psychologist Dr. Michael Persinger expounded on some kind of charge caused by a

strain in the earth's crust which struck Travis Walton (in the chest) with a resultant effect on an area in the *back of the brain*, thus causing Walton to hallucinate.

Persinger does not, however, explain how that charge caused Walton and 6 others to see a structured object, and how it caused him (Walton) to disappear for five days.

The other NOVA approach to the Walton case involved the testimony of polygraph operator John McCarthy who claimed Walton failed a polygraph test and therefore had lied. There was no mention of the fact that there is considerable question concerning the validity of McCarthy's test because of the poorly phrased test questions that he used, nor the fact that five other witnesses took another polygraph test *which they passed* and which established that they had seen an object over the clearing where Walton stood, that he was struck by a beam and that they had no knowledge of where Walton was during his 5-day absence. NOVA would have us believe, then, that Walton hallucinated and then lied about his hallucinations.

Our next bone of contention has to do with William Spaulding's appearance on the show. Those of you who are familiar with the Walton case will recall that Spaulding, Director of "Ground Saucer Watch" (if he still is—he changes his mind occasionally) and State Director of Arizona for MUFON (Mutual UFO Network) was responsible for bringing one "Dr." Lester Steward, a diploma-mill "drug expert," into prominence during the Walton investigation, to pronounce Walton a "drug abuser." The latter has been proved to be absolutely untrue, incidentally. Walton is and was a practicing Mormon and very health-conscious.

NOVA presented Spaulding as some kind of authority on UFO photos. Despite the fact that he has been touted as an expert on computer enhancement of UFO photos by MUFON and has spoken on that subject at MUFON's conferences, his credentials in that area of expertise are seriously in question—as much, in fact, as are his credentials as an engineer. The NOVA presentation identified Spaulding as an engineer, when, in fact, he is a trade-school drop-out.

The foregoing are just a few of many, many flaws in the NOVA "documentary." For instance, although three reels of tape were shot at Hynek's Center for UFO Studies, only that short piece in which Allen Hendry forth about the frequent misidentification of Venus as a UFO, was used.

Also particularly reprehensible was the discrediting of Dr. Bruce Maccabee, the physicist who did the only in-depth investigation, including photoanalysis, of the New Zealand UFO photos, by the use of the simple words, "a believer" (i.e., he believes UFOs deserve study).

We would like to thank Dr. Hynek and John Schuessler of VISIT for the information which they provided regarding the filming at CUFOS and the people

responsible for the NOVA production.

As I said at the beginning of this article, we must limit our review of the NOVA show because of space considerations. However, everything considered, we must truthfully state that the presentation was:

1. Sloppy.
2. Rigged.

\*\*\*\*\*

## THE 1965 CANBERRA AIRPORT MARINER IV NON-EVENT

On July 15, the AP wire service carried a startling report that has been subsequently elaborated upon in several UFO books. A glowing object was spotted hovering in daylight for 40 minutes over Canberra airport. Civil and RAAF traffic controllers and other officials said they were baffled. The object zoomed out of sight when an RAAF plane took off to identify it. Experts wondered whether it was coincidental that soon after, the nearby Tidbinbilla tracking station found it difficult to lock onto signals from Mariner IV (then orbiting Mars).

John Keel, writing in *Saga* magazine, takes the story a dramatic step further. He writes: ". . . something went wrong! The signals from the . . . satellite were being jammed! The technicians at Tidbinbilla, sealed in their mammoth control room, frantically jabbed at switches (and made) a desperate check of all their equipment . . . A few miles away at Canberra airport . . . a glowing metallic object . . . was hovering . . . overhead . . . Once it was gone, the signals from Mariner IV began to pour into the tracking station."

On close inspection, however, the story falls apart. The object was seen from 10:50 a.m. to 11:15 or 11:30 (accounts vary). Tidbinbilla locked onto Mariner IV, as it emerged from behind Mars, about 11:35 a.m. Thus, contrary to Keel's account, the two events were not exactly coincident — although Mariner was indeed slightly late in emerging (and the initial fix was only partial) — but an imperfect understanding of the effect of the Mars gravity on Mariner's orbit is the most likely cause of the trouble.

\*\*\*\*\*

## ROCK GROUP ABDUCTED?

Officials of a Canada-wide UFO investigation group say a St. Catharines man, and possibly other members of his rock group, may have been abducted by a UFO, then returned to Earth. The name of the man and the rock group have not been released.

Joe Muskat, director of the Canadian UFO Research Network (CUFORN), said the man may have been implanted with a device to monitor his thoughts and taken onto the alien craft three times. He also said there was a possibility of a connection between these incidents and repeated sightings of strange orange lights over Niagara-on-the-Lake.

The report of the abductions was made at a CUFORN symposium in Toronto. It is believed that the St. Catharines man was put under hypnosis more than once to learn the facts of the story. However, full details of the incidents have not yet been released.

(Editor's Note: The UFO field has become so publicity-oriented that the coincidence of such an alleged incident and a UFO "Symposium" taxes the credibility of both).

\*\*\*\*\*

## AUSTRALIAN A. F. UFO REPORT FILES

By *BILL CHALKER*  
*APRO Representative for Australia*  
(Conclusion)

Such "impossibilities" are all too familiar to observers of RAAF UFO investigations. For example, at 6:10 pm, on October 10, 1960, the Reverend Lionel Browning and his wife observed a strange spectacle from the window of their rectory, at Cressy in Tasmania.

From a curtain of rain over Ben Lomond mountain in the east, "a grey, cigar-shaped object" emerged. It was described as having "about four vertical bands along the side of the object. At the bow end of the ship was a rod jutting out with what seemed like a small propeller or some radar device on the end." After about a minute the object stopped its steady movement and hovered, apparently between 400 to 500 feet above the Panshanger Estate.

The Rev. Mr. Browning indicates that then "out of the clouds above and behind the ship, five or six small discs came shooting at terrific speed. They came towards the ship like flat stones skipping along the water. The smaller objects stationed themselves beside their mothership within a half mile radius." These smaller objects were described as "flying saucers about 30 feet (10 metres) in diameter with a flat underside and a rounded dome on top . . . After several seconds the ship, accompanied by the saucers, reversed the way it came. The ship did not manoeuvre to return because the rod end was the last section of the ship to be covered in the rain cloud."

Another person, Mrs. D. Bransden, also saw the spectacle, describing it as like "a lot of little ships

flocking around a bigger one." The total duration of the incident was about two minutes.

Wing Commander G.L. Waller of the RAAF interviewed the Brownings, and in a letter to the late Dr. James McDonald indicated that the couple "impressed me as being mature, stable, and mentally alert individuals who had no cause or desire to see objects in the sky other than objects of definite form and substance." These comments by the investigating officer are all the more astonishing when compared to the Air Force Intelligence statement on the sighting released a few days later. It dismissed the observation as "a phenomenon (caused by) a moon rise associated with meteorological conditions at the time." In fact the intelligence report stated, "The presence of 'scud' type clouds, moving in varying directions due to turbulence in and around a rain squall near which the objects were sighted, and the position of the moon or its reflections, produced the impression of flying objects."

Mr. Browning and the late Dr. McDonald place the sighting into a more correct perspective. The former indicated at no time during the 90 minute Air Force Intelligence interview was he asked about clouds. Mr. Browning added: "At no time was there cloud or scud when I saw the objects. The mountain was not the backdrop to what I saw. The rain cleared in front of us although it was still raining near the mountains. I saw the objects in the sky where there was no rain and the rain near the mountains provided the backdrop . . ."

Dr. McDonald was a senior physicist at the Institute of Atmospheric Physics and a professor in the Department of Meteorology, University of Arizona, and during a 1967 visit to Australia he conducted a detailed retrospective investigation of the Cressy sighting. He made the following succinct comments:

"Such an 'explanation' has a curiously familiar ring to anyone who has studied large numbers of USAF 'explanations' of UFO sightings. One can quickly establish that the moon was full on the date of the Cressy sighting . . . (that it would have been obscured not only by rain clouds and Ben Lomond but would also have been in a different direction, a few degrees north of east, rather than ESE, the direction in question — BC). From my own viewpoint as one interested in atmospheric optics and unusual refractive and reflective anomalies, the official suggestion that 'scud' subject to turbulent motions could (had the moon not been wholly obscured by rain and mountain) be optically distorted into anything remotely resembling the phenomena reported by the Brownings seems entirely out of question.

"In asserting such a meteorological explanation as was issued by the RAAF intelligence office, little evidence of scientific knowledge was exhibited, unless that office felt that the essential features of the Brownings' account had to be simply disregarded as unreliable. Yet the interrogating RAAF officer, Wg Cdr Waller, evidently had no such inclination to disregard

these witnesses' description of their observations, nor do I."

A wave of sightings endured in the Cressy area for several weeks which more or less culminated on November 13, 1960, with yet another daylight observation. In an incident not reported to the press, a woman and her daughter, returning home at 4:20 pm, saw a dull grey cigar-shaped object hovering at about 100 metres and apparently about one kilometre away. A droning sound was heard.

The object had an orange light on one end and two protrusions sticking up at the other. As the observers tried to approach for a better view, the UFO moved out of sight. However, a farmer saw the same object moving away from the area in which the woman and her daughter observed it. The object moved across the Western Tiers, went up the valley near Connorville and was lost to view.

There is an amazing hitherto unknown aspect of the Cressy affair. On November 15, 1960, some 50 kilometres north of Cressy, a United States Air Force JB57 aircraft, operating out of East Scale RAAF base encountered a UFO.

I found the USAF pilot's statement in RAAF UFO files:

"Approximately 1040 LCL while flying on a mission track 15 miles north of Launceston. My navigator \_\_\_\_\_ called out an aircraft approaching to our left and slightly lower.

"Our altitude at this time was 40,000 feet, TAS of 350 knots, heading of 340 degrees.

"I spotted the object and immediately commented to \_\_\_\_\_ (the navigator) that it was not an aircraft, but looked more like a balloon. We judged its altitude to be approximately 35,000 feet, heading 140 degrees and its speed extremely high.

"From a previous experience I would say its closing rate would have been in excess of 800 knots. We observed this object for five or seven seconds before it disappeared under the left wing.

"Since it was unusual in appearance, I immediately banked to the left for another look, but neither of us could locate it.

"The colour of the object was nearly translucent somewhat like that of a 'poached egg'. There were no sharp edges but rather fuzzy and undefined. The size was approximately 70 feet in diameter and it did not appear to have any depth."

The idea that the government through the auspices of the RAAF has covered up startling information has been a significant part of the UFO scene over the years. The cover-up theory has also been a perennial ingredient of public interest in the subject. However, material I had the opportunity of examining amongst the RAAF UFO files seems to suggest that such thinking may be inappropriate.

For example, here are quotes from two separate

internal minute papers. The first was part of a submission by the Directorate of Public Relations within the Department of Air (now part of Defence), to the Directorate of Air Force Intelligence, which argued in 1966, for a liberalisation of RAAF UFO policy:

"...by continuing with the old policy of playing our UFO cards close to the chest, we only foster the incorrect (but nevertheless widely held) belief that we have much vital information to hide . . ."

The other Minute Paper, again written in 1966 comments upon the then current RAAF UFO files:

"It would...also appear that there is some need for rationalisation of our files on this subject. There are at least four different files which contain a confusion of policy, reported sightings and requests for information. Three of these files are classified, two of which are secret although there appears to be nothing in the files consistent with this classification . . ."

One mainstay of the civilian "cover-up" argument, namely the controversial and famous Drury UFO film (see box), instead supports the idea that there may not be a cover-up at all. The Drury film became all the more controversial when it was learnt that the UFO section of the film was no longer available and that the RAAF were denying any knowledge of its whereabouts.



*Bill Chalker*  
APRO Representative, Australia

Here is the report of Tom Drury's making of his film, as it appeared in the South Pacific Post of September 2, 1953.

#### WHAT TOM DRURY SAW

*The Deputy Director of Civil Aviation, Mr. Tom Drury, last Sunday photographed a probable guided missile over Port Moresby.*

*Mr. Drury said he saw the missile flying over Nappa*

*Nappa at midday. He reported it to the police and to the Regional Director of Civil Aviation, Mr. John Arthur.*

*"It could only be a guided missile, because nothing else would fit the description of what I saw," he said.*

*The British Government last month announced that guided missiles which flew at 2000 miles per hour and could follow any target at almost any distance were being tested at the Woomera Rocket Range.]*

*Mr. Drury said he was taking pictures at his house at midday on Sunday when he saw the first signs of the missile.*

*"There were no clouds in the sky and while I was taking photographs a small cloud formed for no apparent reason. I was curious about the cloud so I watched it. I had never seen a cloud form up by itself like that. I watched the cloud for a few minutes. Then a silver object came out of the cloud. I could see the flash of it in the sun. It flew on a north-west course. I couldn't believe it, so I looked down at the ground and then back at the object. It left a trail of vapour and I picked it up easily by following the vapour trails. I called to my wife and asked her if she could see anything in the sky. She looked up, and then she, too, saw it.*

*"She pointed excitedly and said 'Oh yes. There it is'. The children could also see it. I got the telescopic lens of my camera and took shots of it. Then we watched it flying across the sky for a few more minutes. I've never seen anything fly that high before, nor fly so fast. It kept on course then climbed at about 45 degrees and disappeared."*

*Mr. Drury said he was waiting for the shots he took of the missile to be developed.*

*"The only explanation I can give is that the object was a guided missile," he said. "It must have flown in circles and the vapour trails formed the cloud I saw. When it left the cloud, the trails and the object itself were quite clear. The object must have been very big to have been visible at that height. When a Spitfire aircraft left vapour trails during the war you could see the trails but seldom saw the Spitfire."*

RAAF files, examined by Bill Chalker, specifically rule out a missile-firing from Woomera as an explanation.

An RAAF document written in 1966 and entitled "Summary of the effort made to rediscover present whereabouts of the allegedly 'excised' frames of Mr. T. Drury's famous 1953 movie film of the Port Moresby 'UFO sighting'," concluded:

*"The upshot is that the 'excised' frames either still exist in DAFI archives, have been destroyed or (perish the thought) have been lost."*

However, Mr. A.B. McFarlane, then Secretary of the Department of Air, responded to a civilian enquiry, which prompted the above search, in the following way:

*". . . neither the . . . file particularly concerned with*

the subject nor the copies of the film (which were held within that file) now exist, they were destroyed together some time ago in accordance with the due processes of the Department's archival activities . . .

" . . . It can only be said that all information still extant reflecting the movement 13 years ago of folios on this subject indicates that the record of the evaluation (of the Drury film) was destroyed with the Department copies of the photographs . . ."

I was therefore considerably surprised to find in a 1973 RAAF file a small envelope identified as "Drury film prints and negatives". Contained within were five negatives of photographs of individual frames from the original film. I subsequently received copies of these and while the image quality is disappointingly poor, the circumstances which led to the negatives being present in the 1973 file were quite illuminating.

A civilian enquiry had prompted yet another file search. File holdings including those in 1966 (already mentioned) and 1955 were further scrutinised and it was determined that DAFI had in 1955 sold prints of the 1953 UFO pictures "at 4/9 a pop". One recipient of this offer was one Fred Stone (a pioneer Australian civilian UFO researcher). The RAAF in 1973 managed to persuade Mr. Stone to loan them the five prints they had originally supplied him, so that copies could be made. This explains the negatives found in the 1973 file — third generation copies of individual frames of the original, which apparently had 94 frames in total.

I was able to confirm in 1982, with Mr. Tom Drury, that he had still not seen his "UFO film" and had only received a print of the film but without any UFO shots. I arranged with the RAAF for them to send Mr. Drury a copy of the prints in the 1973 file, albeit poor quality reproductions.

The actual film itself remains undiscovered and perhaps awaits like some modern "holy grail" to be yet rediscovered. Perhaps the film itself is not all that remarkable, but my search so far has indicated that it did go to the United States Air Force, where it was examined by the Naval Photographic Interpretation Centre, Maryland, then apparently under the auspices of the CIA. "USAF Project Grudge and Bluebook Reports 1-12", declassified in the mid 1960s, list the Port Moresby affair with an evaluation of "Insufficient data".

So it would seem that something other than a sophisticated cover-up program was occurring. However, there does remain a small collection of reports from sources outside the RAAF that have yet to be reconciled. They are at the very least provocative stories. So far no satisfactory accounting for these alleged events has occurred (they do not appear in the RAAF files) and it would seem that until that does take place, the perennial cover-up claims will probably endure.

For example, it is alleged that at about 3:25 am, May 28, 1965, a DC6 aircraft flying out over Bougainville

Reef, contacted Townsville Ground Control, indicating that it was being "buzzed" by a UFO. The aircraft crew described the UFO as round and oblate, with exhaust gases being observed. The object paced the aircraft for about 10 to 15 minutes. The pilot took photographs and had the crew confirm the encounter.

Arriving in Port Moresby, it was alleged that the pilot was greeted with a message, not to develop the film in Papua New Guinea, but to return to Australia with it. The account states that the pilot was met in Brisbane and flown to Canberra. It was alleged that the film was confiscated and the pilot cautioned to remain silent on the incident. Further it was indicated that the chief of DCA came to Townsville and took possession of the 12 hour tapes from the DCA Control Tower, which held the conversation between the Tower air traffic controller and the DC6 pilot.

In another example, a United States Air Force Sergeant with top secret clearance (name known to me), together with other personnel, viewed a CIA UFO movie screening at a Texas Air Force Base around 1967. The highlight was allegedly an extraordinary film taken from an RAAF converted aircraft while on photomapping work in Central Australia apparently about 1965. The aircraft encountered four UFOs and a short film was taken.

The film showed "a huge, hovering, windowed craft" with three small UFOs attached to it "as a kind of tail". A door on the largest object opened — two vertical panels and two horizontally aligned ones sliding apart — and the three small UFOs zipped inside. The panels closed, the large object canted at an angle, and in seconds disappeared. The filmed image of the UFO was allegedly extraordinarily large and clear, filling the entire movie screen.

Such accounts surely deserve the closest scrutiny to determine their validity. In the meantime, however, my review of the available RAAF UFO files indicates that while the majority of reports are misidentifications of prosaic phenomena, there are a lot of reports which describe intriguing events. These events merit further close study, for among them, the stuff of provocative scientific paydirt may yet lie in wait. The quality of these accounts suggests that it may be folly to ignore them.

\*\*\*\*\*

## LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Recently NOVA, a science-related series on PBS television, ran a program titled "The Case of the UFOs" that was as fine a piece of propaganda as I have seen in a long time. Based upon the presentation, the viewer was invited to make a judgment as to the existence of UFOs.

Several scientist-UFO experts gave their opinions regarding the UFO phenomenon. Not one had ever seen a UFO.

These scientists seek a natural explanation for the UFO phenomena. As an example of how far they will "reach," one claimed a correlation between earthquake activity and lights in the sky. An earthquake-mechanism creates lights, he said. But such correlations are illusory. For instance, a correlation exists between an increase in worldwide UFO activity and the nearness to Earth of the planet Mars in its orbit around the sun. Yet NASA has no evidence that UFOs are on Mars.

Another example of "reaching" is one scientist's belief that UFO sightings result from the observation of swarms of insects that give off an electrical discharge while in the vicinity of an electrically-charged cloud, a natural phenomenon too.

As the NOVA program progressed, it deteriorated into a miasma of shop-worn, disparaging phrases such as "UFO believers," to the annoyance of the UFO believers, and "They feel the need to find an unusual explanation [because] science has taken the mystery out of life."

Having lived in the vicinity of the New Madrid fault for twenty years and having directed a long-term scientific field study of UFO phenomena, during which I observed some 150 UFO lights, I do not believe that any of these were produced by insects or earthquakes — nor were any of the seven craft I observed.

Contrary to the opinion of the UFO "experts," I can state unequivocally that real UFOs exist and that they are not a phenomenon of nature.

*Dr. Harley Rutledge, Director  
Project Identification  
Cape Girardeau, Missouri*

\*\*\*\*\*

## "SOCIETY FOR SCIENTIFIC EXPLORATION" FORMED

More than 100 scientists across the nation have recently joined to form the Society for Scientific Exploration. Peter Sturrock, a Stanford astrophysics professor who has become the society's first president, hopes the new group will provide a forum for scientists seriously interested in substantiating or disproving the existence of strange things like UFOs and the Loch Ness Monster.

Sturrock, who has been interested in UFOs for more than 10 years, said the problem is that an aura of disrepute surrounds the study of such subjects. Although many scientists are interested in investigating these subjects, they are often afraid they will be

ridiculed for lending any credence to the existence of these strange things. But unless the subjects are investigated no one will ever know whether or not they are explainable phenomena.

As Sturrock put it, "Whether or not the objects exist, reports do exist. If things are not there, why are people reporting them?" That is the question the society, formed in April after a 6 year gestation period, hopes to answer.

The Society for Scientific Exploration expects to provide a forum for discussing such topics by publishing a quarterly journal and holding annual group meetings. No subject will be too strange for the society, which includes serious believers and skeptics from the scientific community. Anything that is unexplainable or that runs counter to established knowledge will be open for discussion.

\*\*\*\*\*

## PRESS REPORTS

*By Doris and Joe Graziano*

*WISCONSIN, May 14, 1982 - Townsend* - Tom Powers, his son Tony, Guy Lindstrom and Barry Thomas were standing outside a gas station when suddenly there appeared a bright object hovering 3 to 4 feet above an old railroad right of way. A few people in cars at the station also saw the object.

Thinking that it might be a helium filled balloon, Powers told Tony to run across the highway and "catch that thing." By the time Tony crossed Rte. 32 the object had zoomed northward.

All four men agreed that the object was round, shiny and shaped like two pie pans or bowls glued together. Tony estimated it to be about 2½ feet across. Thomas said, "It looked about the size of a fairly big tire. It was extremely bright and metallic, like chrome. A couple times it raised a foot or so and then back to the 3 foot level." As it got just beyond the town garage, the object rose to treetop level and suddenly shot out of sight.

*TEXAS, June 19, 1982 - Simms* - Bobby Gray claims he and his family watched for 15 minutes as three starlike objects moved over their house at about 11 p.m. "They were traveling from west to east. At first, someone said it was a shooting star, but they were traveling too fast," said Gray. "At one time, there were three of them—kind of red—in a formation to the west. All of a sudden, they made a 90 degree turn to the north," he said.

Gray's two grandsons first spotted the objects in the back yard and ran in the house to tell him. A total of 7 members of the family watched the objects.

*TEXAS, July 1 (?), 1982 - Mena* - At around

11 p.m., a farmer witnessed an object that "hovered in an ungodly manner, twice as bright as the sun, above the hilltop behind the house." The unusual thing, according to the farmer, is that since the arrival and departure of the object not one of his hens has laid a single egg.

*OHIO, June 19, 1982 - Perry Township* - Almost 150 residents phoned authorities between 10:30 and 11:00 p.m. claiming a UFO was hovering over their neighborhood. A total of 50 similar calls were logged by the Stark County Sheriff's office and the State Highway Patrol post in nearby Massillon.

It was described as a large, red, luminous object flying low. Residents said the object skimmed slowly over the treetops in the area, hovering over the neighborhood for about 25 minutes. When police arrived the object picked up speed and shot off to the southeast. The Akron-Canton airport said nothing had been picked up on their radar.

*NEW YORK, June 24, 1982 - Newburgh* - Area residents who saw an unusual object with strange lights hovering over the Mt. Beacon Peak area say no one can convince them that what they saw was a plane or helicopter. State police said they had tracked the lights to Stormville Airport where a group of professional pilots were using small planes to practice close formation flying at night.

Mary McCarthy said she's convinced that what she saw was not planes or helicopters. "It made absolutely no noise," she said. McCarthy described the object as being in the shape of a V with bright red lights and some green lights. "It stopped in mid-air. When it stopped, it turned on really bright white lights," she said. There were several airplanes in the area at the time and McCarthy said when one of the planes came toward the object it disappeared over Mt. Beacon to the east.

Another Mt. Beacon Park resident said, "Planes aren't silent. They don't stop in mid-air. This thing stopped a couple of hundred feet in the air and there was no sound at all." The man said the neighborhood was quiet Thursday night and the sounds of other planes, even a high flying jet, could be heard. He had spent several years in the service and was also a member of the Civil Air Patrol and served as a ground observer. "I know planes. This was no plane," he said.

It was the third time this year that similar sightings were reported by large groups of people. Strangely enough, all of the incidents occurred on Thursday nights between 8:30 and 9:30 p.m.

*AUSTRALIA, March 28, 1982 - Esperance* - Two Esperance businesswomen claimed they were menaced by a UFO for an hour in the early morning. A policeman, two kangaroo shooters, a truck driver and other motorists also said they saw the object.

Maggie Yeend and Frances Collins said the object changed altitude and speed and swept from one side of

the road to the other as they drove along a lonely stretch of the South Coast Highway. At about 4:30 a.m., the object accelerated away to the size of a star before returning seconds later. The women said the craft was about the size of a small helicopter and shone alternately red and orange underneath, and turned green and misty when accelerating.

When they got to Esperance, the women woke Constable Bob Cordon. He saw the object, "six times the size of a star," hovering over Esperance Bay and took a sight bearing which positioned it 3 km off the coast. Another woman, Elspeth Benson, saw the object at about the same time from her kitchen window.

*CANADA, June 29, 1982 - Hampton, New Brunswick* - Mark Pinnington and Dennis Sennett were returning from a fishing trip during a thunderstorm when they spotted a "bright red ball" between 9:30 and 10:00 p.m. Dennis, who was driving, spotted a red glow first and slowed down for a better look. The red glow became brighter and brighter until it stood out in the sharp outline of a bright red ball. "In another 15 to 20 seconds it simply disappeared like someone shut a light off. It didn't move at all or get fainter; it simply disappeared," said Dennis. The men said it was difficult to tell how far away the red ball was and therefore more difficult to judge its size.

*ENGLAND, May 23, 1982 - Abridge* - Robert Fairall and Annette Cook were on a late-night country drive when they were tailed by a bright white light in the sky. They said the light followed them, hovering about 10 feet above the ground, as they tried to shake it off at high speeds on country lanes near Abridge.

"At first I thought the light was just a motorcycle, but then it caught up and traveled parallel to the car over the fields. It was bobbing up and down over hedges and cutting corners in the road. It followed us for about six minutes. When you looked at it, it was like looking into the sun," said Fairall.

The RAF, the Army and the Ministry of Defence all confirmed that no planes were supposed to be in the area area at the time. There was another report of a light on the same stretch of road in the early 1960s.

\*\*\*\*\*

#### HONDURAS VISITOR

APRO has had the pleasure of a visit from Mr. Antonio Borgan, President of the Sociedad Hondurena de Investigaciones of San Pedro Sula, Honduras. Mr. Robert Marsland, APRO's Deputy Director, met and visited with Mr. Borgan on Sunday, September 19th. We expect to continue a close relationship with Mr. Borgan who has indicated that he will forward information dealing with UFOs to APRO on a regular basis in the future.

\*\*\*\*\*

# 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