

UFO RESEARCH NEWSLETTER

A MONTHLY REPORT ON UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Vol. II, No. 2

May - June 1972

WORLDWIDE RASH OF DRAMATIC SIGHTINGS REPORTED BY N.C. INVESTIGATOR

A worldwide rash of dramatic sightings over the past eight months have been reported by George D. Fawcett (607 North Main St., Mt. Airy, N.C. 27030), an independent investigator who has been studying the subject for years. In a recent press release, Fawcett described UFOs that emitted occupants, light beams and a sound; objects that were chased by Air Force (AF) planes and tracked on radar, paced cars and a plane, caused animals to react and even to be injured; UFOs that caused electro-magnetic (E-M) effects, frightened witnesses and left behind physical evidence. There were even a couple of photo cases.

- September 28, 1971. Near Niteroi, Brazil. UFOs buzzed two automobiles, causing their engines to stop. The motorists were treated for shock.

- October 1, 1971. 7:50 p.m. Sao Cristovao, Brazil. Witness took two photographs of a red UFO emitting "light beams." Dozens of others were reportedly watching.

- October 16, 1971. Saint John River, New Brunswick, Canada. Twenty-three people saw an object land on a small island.

- Early November, 1971. Near the Mojave Desert, Calif. Three hunters from Santa Ana were badly frightened by a UFO "about the size of a car" that landed. An occupant emerged and the hunters fled. Five round holes were found at the landing site.

- December 10, 1971. Montrose, Australia. A businessman photographed a bright disc as it maneuvered in the sky.

1972 a Banner Year So Far

- January 1, 1972. Nedre Lerfoss, Norway. A technician saw a flying cigar that stopped, hovered and emitted a "low sound" and gave off blue flames. It had portholes near its middle.

- Early January, 1972. Daytime. Strongsville, Ohio. A student took a picture of a domed disc as it hovered and maneuvered for nearly 30 minutes.

- January 21, 1972. Balls Ferry, Calif. A bright UFO was seen by five witnesses. It maneuvered overhead. A tall occupant with lumps on its body "like pouches in a flight suit" was seen. The frightened observers ran to the nearest police station. The police chief investigated and said he doubted a hoax.

- February 2, 1972. Near Davis-Monthan AF Base, Tucson, Ariz. Three A7 combat aircraft chased an oval-shaped object. Base personnel tracked the UFO on radar.

- February 8, 1972. Near Eden and Stoneville, N.C., UFOs reportedly circled the WLOE radio station, chased and paced cars. They also caused violent animal reactions. At 11 p.m. that same day, an Argentinean Airlines crew heading toward Buenos Aires from Catamarca saw a multi-colored object pace their aircraft for about five minutes. Ground observers also saw it. Also on the 8th, a UFO frightened a motorist in Charlotte, N.C. The triangular-shaped object had pulsating, multi-colored lights revolving on its lower edge and caused dogs to bark.

(Continued on page 2)

UFO Research Newsletter, Vol. II, No. 2. Published monthly by UFO Research Associates (UFOR), P.O. Box 34252, Washington, D.C. 20034
 Editor: Gordon I.R. Lore, Jr.
 Business Manager: Martha D. Hall
 Annual subscription rates: \$7.00 (U.S., Canada and Mexico); \$8.00 (foreign, surface rate); \$11.00 (foreign, air mail). Single copies: \$.60 (U.S., Canada and Mexico); \$.80 (foreign).

UFOs MAIN PART OF UNIVERSITY COURSE

UFOs appear to be the main part of a course called "Unusual Physical Phenomena," being taught by Dr. Leroy Dubeck at Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa. According to the April 29, 1972, edition of the Philadelphia *Inquirer*, it is part of a series of courses offered by the school's physics department "to expand horizons of study."

"When it comes to flying saucers, I'm strictly neutral," Dubeck explained. "On

our list of assigned readings are two books, The Condon Report on UFOs, and John G. Fuller's *Aliens in the Skies*, giving students the two opposed points of view on UFOs."

The works are used as textbooks, Dr. Dubeck stated, but the students are encouraged to read other material on the subject and they will discuss their opinions in class and in term papers. Other phenomena covered in the course include ball lightning, tornadoes, lasers and magnetism.

Dramatic Sightings (Continued from page 1)

- February 10, 1972. Oak Harbor, Wash. A young motorist and his girl were frightened as a large, triangular UFO with a "window" skirted about 300 feet over the treetops.

- February 15, 1972. Newport, Ark. An object that looked "like a flying car" paced automobiles for 30 minutes. It gave off different colored lights and was seen by other observers at different locations.

- February 28, 1972. Near Larned, Kansas. A student's automobile was paced and circled by a UFO, which then stopped and hovered near a corral at a farmhouse. An investigation found a wire fence cut and burned spots on some of the cattle.

- April 3, 1972. 5:15 a.m. Mt. Airy, N.C. Residents saw a "chalky-white, pear-shaped UFO" in the northeast. It reportedly lit up the cross atop the First Baptist Church. Witnesses in Winston-Salem also apparently reported the same object.

HYNEK BOOK DUE SOON

The UFO Experience; A Scientific Inquiry, a long-awaited work by Dr. J. Allen Hynek, is slated for publication on May 31 by Henry Regnery Co., Chicago. It will contain over 70 "unknown" sighting reports of the 2,400 the author says have not been adequately explained, stated the Sedalia, Mo., *Democrat*, February 16, 1972. Hynek, for 21 years the chief UFO scientific consultant to the AF and head of the astronomy department at Northwestern University, believes that 20% of all sightings can be classified as UFOs or "unexplained."

The book could be a blockbuster that may considerably shake the UFO community. For a number of years, the respected astronomer himself has admitted, Hynek believed UFOs to be nonsense. For the past five or six years, however, he has done a 180° turn.

During a visit to Sedalia in mid-February, Hynek, in a *Democrat* interview, charged the AF "with cover-up tactics" in its handling of the now defunct Project Blue Book. Top secret labels stamped on reports caused AF officials to underestimate important sightings, he added. All cases not immediately identified were put into two secondary categories -- probables or possibles. At the



Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Northwestern University
(Courtesy: Henry Regnery Co.)

end of each year, the "unknowns" that could possibly be explained were listed as "definites." This, he said, permitted the AF to claim many more identified reports than actually existed.

Top Secret Confusion

Top secret military operations added to the confusion of properly identifying reports, Hynek hinted. The AF was also worried about protecting defense secrets.

Hynek indicated he first began to seriously study the subject when he was approached by a government official in 1948 and was asked to become involved at the federal level. At the time he was an astronomer at Ohio State University's McMillan Institute.

"I was in a position a little bit like the innocent bystander

that got shot," he quipped. Even while the AF was negating good reports, Hynek said, public and scientific interest was steadily growing.

"When I first started out," he said, "any scientific approach to the investigations of UFOs would have been scoffed at, but not any more."

Reputable Witnesses Fear Ridicule

At a recent press conference, Hynek further discussed his book and his ideas concerning the UFO subject, according to the April 23, 1972, edition of the St. Louis, Mo., *Globe-Democrat*.

"I am convinced that [UFO sightings] do happen," he stated. "All but 20% or so can be explained, but to discount those 20% would be to label thousands of people around the world as liars. Reputable people. Including scientists, who have sighted UFOs but refuse to be named for fear of ridicule."

The astronomer also believes that there is probably intelligent life in another solar system.

"They quite possibly could be suns, with their own solar systems," he said. "It's arrogant and ignorant to believe we are either the only life, or the highest intelligence. If the UFOs are actually visiting us, I believe they are from another solar system."

Hynek also contends that the UFO phenomenon may be too complicated for our present level of intelligence.

"We're simply not advanced enough to understand a concept beyond us," he explained.

Reports Remain "Constant"

The renowned scientist said that sighting reports have "remained constant" since the Condon report.

"I get at least a dozen reports a month," he remarked. "But you simply never read a line about them in urban daily newspapers. It's almost like a mutual agreement. I believe the AF refuses to accept the possibility that something or someone knows more about its business than it does. And I believe the government, at high levels, is frightened of creating a panic if it admitted there might be something to the sightings."

Hynek said the occupant reports could have great impact on the public and the reports containing physical evidence such as burned areas, E-M effects, etc., are "the scientist's grist." His book relates that occupants have been seen apparently collecting rocks, *a la* our moon astronauts.

"I would hope that my book, which is really just a primer or standard reference work on UFOs, would reopen the inquiry, by scientists and not AF captains," he said. "And that sightings no longer be treated with ridicule. People have been afraid to speak for too long. I wish I had a dollar for every AF pilot who claimed to have trailed a UFO and filmed it only to have the film confiscated and never seen or heard of again. And I think of all the reputable people, colleagues of mine included, who told me stories -- but bound me to keep them in confidence. No one wants to be called a crackpot, or to have a community, academic or social, label him a nut."

UFOR has just received an advance copy of Hynek's book and will review it in our next issue.

SIGHTING CAPSULES

The following sighting reports have also come to UFOR's attention:

● April 16, 1972. Evening. Witnesses in several sections of the country reported a bright star-like object with antennas, stated the April 17, 1972, edition of the *Columbus (Ohio) Dispatch*. (Probable explanation: Venus).

● April 14, 1972. Evening. Tallahassee, Fla. Mr. and Mrs. Roland Charron and others. Observers reported two large, bright, stationary lights, according to the April 15, 1972, edition of the *Tallahassee Democrat*. One of the UFOs "gave off a trail of light." Later, "two huge, bright red lights that looked like moons" also appeared overhead. Then "blue and gray lights" put in an appearance. One witness said she saw "something big and orange" that turned into "a blue mist."

● April 3, 1972. About 5 a.m. Near Black Oak, W. Va. Several witnesses observed a glowing UFO with lights for about an hour before it vanished, leaving a cloud of smoke, said the Princeton, W. Va., *Times*, April 6, 1972.

● March 28, 1972. Approximately 8 p.m. Near Barstow, Calif. Mrs. Jane Holehan said she saw a balloon-like object with a rope dangling from it "floating aimlessly," stated the San Bernardino, Calif., *Sun*, April 8, 1972. The UFO was shaped "like a huge turnip," the witness said, and had a blue-white light at the top. It reversed its direction and "merged quickly into the sky, but the blue-white wedge of light remained and gradually became more faint." (Possible explanation: balloon).

● March 22, 1972. Around 9:30 p.m. Knoxville, Tenn. Officer Jerry Taylor and others saw a round object with large lights which hovered and maneuvered, according to the March 23, 1972, edition of the *Knoxville Journal*. Officer Taylor

said he heard a sound like propellers whirling while the craft hovered. (Possible explanation: helicopter).

• Around March 20, 1972. Evening. Castle Rock, Colo. Witnesses saw a strange object, stated the March 22, 1972, edition of the Ft. Wayne, Ind., *Newa Sentinel*. One observer said it was about 50 feet long and had flashing lights. (Possible explanation: a mother admitted her sons sent aloft a hoax balloon, though this could hardly explain the length of the object, as described by the witness above).

ENQUIRER ENLISTS UFOR'S AID

The *National Enquirer* has asked UFOR for any assistance which might aid its distinguished UFO reward panel (see *UFO Research Newsletter*, Vol. I, No. 12, p. 7, and Vol. II, No. 1, p. 6) "in its appraisals" of sighting reports. The newspaper, with a whopping circulation of 2.6 million, is offering \$50,000 to any individual -- not organization, club or group -- who can prove to the panel's satisfaction that UFOs are really extraterrestrial craft. An additional \$5,000 will be given to the person offering the best scientific evidence. Members of the panel are Dr. J. Allen Hynek (see page 2), Dr. Robert F. Creegan, Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle, Dr. Frank Salisbury and Dr. James Harder.

"We are awaiting word of a possible meeting of the panelists," stated Dr. Creegan in a letter to UFOR. "Meanwhile, additional questions are being asked by mail of some of the people who have submitted documents. Also, there is correspondence among the panelists as to what cases should be investigated, even while involving some investment of the *Enquirer's* money and of our time. Some are easily investigated, but others would involve travel to remote jungles, etc., and might or might not pay off in terms of some scientifically worthwhile proof."

Paper Should Publish Good Reports

While we frankly told the panel that there was slim chance that anyone would collect the \$50,000 reward, we also urged the *Enquirer* to publish the best reports elicited from the public either during or following the panel's tenure, which expires on January 1, 1973. The paper, by doing this, could both render a public service and, possibly, stir up public interest -- possibly to a point where more much-needed scientific inquiries are made, though probably only a major UFO flap could do this now.

UFOR did offer a few initial suggestions: (1) Field investigations should be made as much as possible, particularly to determine the reliability, honesty and reputation of witnesses; (2) multi-witness reports should receive special attention; (3) precise measurements and great detail ought to be stressed in reports -- even trained pilots, engineers and astronomers can oftentimes greatly under- or overestimate sizes and distances; (4) special "physical" cases ought to receive special attention, i.e., occupant reports, E-M cases, physiological effects, animal reactions, physical evidence, landings, etc.; (5) psychological examinations might be given, if the field is narrowed down to a few candidates for the big prize; and (6) serious individuals and organizations interested in the UFO phenomena ought to continue to be contacted.

Anyone interested in submitting evidence should do so to the following address: UFO Reward, The *National Enquirer*, 600 South East Coast Avenue, Lantana, Fla. 33460.

Enclosed is an information sheet with a coupon for subscribing to *UFO Research Newsletter*. We ask that you pass it along to anyone who may be interested in subscribing. Thank you.

ADDITIONAL FACTS ON THE DELPHOS CASE

Additional facts concerning the UFO sighting at about 7 p.m., November 2, 1971, 1-3/4 miles northeast of Delphos, Kansas, have been received by UFOR (see *UFO Research Newsletter*, Vol. I, No. 11, p. 1).

Ronald Johnson, 15, was doing his evening chores. He approached the back side of the barn on his parents' farm when he heard a rumbling sound. About 50 yards away he saw a UFO, "really bright, like a welder." Ronald estimated its diameter at eight feet and guessed it to be 10 feet tall.

The object then rose rapidly, emitting a whistling noise and a sound like an automobile, and disappeared. The UFO was apparently in a shrub area just prior to take-off.

Ronald called to his parents, who also watched the "thing" in the sky. As the UFO left, it toppled a dead Chinese elm tree near a small stock shed.

An investigation by Ronald and the sheriff's office showed a phosphorescent ring on the ground about 15 feet across. There are several other trees in the area that still glow in the dark (at the time of the newspaper reports); according to the witness. Another tree not only glows, but has twigs and branches broken off. So far, we have received no reports of any analyses that may have been made.

(The above information was gleaned from the November 5 and 7, 1971, editions of the *Salina (Kansas) Journal* and the November 11, 1971, edition of the *Plainville (Kansas) Times*).

A DISSENTING VIEW OF THE CONDON REPORT

By Dr. James E. McDonald

[Part 10 of a series. Before his death in June, 1971, Dr. McDonald was senior physicist, The Institute of Atmospheric Physics, University of Arizona, Tucson, Ariz. Following are excerpts from a prepared statement of a talk given February 12, 1969, to the DuPont chapter of the Scientific Research Society of America, Wilmington, Del. Note: The University of Colorado UFO Project report (Condon report) was released in January, 1969. Dr. McDonald, who was deeply involved with the ill-fated project presented his views on the report before various organizations and governmental groups throughout the country]

The Condon Report's negative conclusions and recommendations with respect to scientific study of UFOs are now a matter of public record. I dispute those conclusions, challenging and criticizing them on the following principal grounds:

- 1) The Report analyses only about 90 cases, a tiny fraction of the significant and scientifically puzzling UFO reports now on record.
- 2) It omits consideration of some of the most puzzling cases on record...
- 3) Many of those cases which the Report does consider are of such trivially insignificant nature that they should have been ignored on the grounds that they are unrelated to the Project's prime mission, namely, seeking explanations of the kinds of truly baffling cases that have created the AF problem that led to establishment of the Colorado UFO Project.
- 4) Specious argumentation, and argumentation of scientifically very weak nature, abound in the Report's case-analyses. And, while broadly charging bias on the part of those who have taken the UFO problem seriously in the past, the Report exhibits degrees of bias in the opposite direction that deserve the sharpest of criticism.

Possible "Misrepresentation" Charged

- 5) To anyone intimately familiar with relevant report-details, some of the cases considered in the Report exhibit disturbingly incomplete presentation of

relevant evidence; in a few instances, such defects seem little short of misrepresentation of case-information. However, I believe that the latter instances bespeak bias, not intent to deceive.

6) Despite all of the above, those who prepared the Report ended up with about a dozen (*i.e.*, about 15 percent) of their cases in the *Unexplained* category... [Editor's note: Actually, the percentage of unexplained cases in the report was closer to 30, as Dr. McDonald himself later discovered].

7) Irrelevant padding has thickened the report to a bulk that will discourage many scientists from studying it carefully. Detailed UFO report-analyses should have been the primary content of this Report, yet trivia and irrelevancies, or secondary material, are present in objectionably voluminous proportions.

8) The Report, it must be noted, does exhibit a few bright facets; but these are obscured by its high average defect-density.

9) In all, I believe that the contents of the Condon Report fall dismally to support the strong negative recommendations which Condon has presented in his own summary analysis. The strong endorsement by the National Academy of Sciences will, I believe, prove to be a painful embarrassment to the Academy, for it appears to be the epitome of superficial panel-evaluation by representatives of a scientific body that ought always to warrant the prestige its good name enjoys...

Rebuttal Will Be Slow

My own estimate is that absolutely no further general progress towards scientific clarification of the UFO problem will come until the inadequacies of the Condon Report are fully aired in as many ways as possible. I intend to devote all personal effort to that objective... So small a fraction of the scientific community is currently aware of the potential scientific importance of the UFO problem that this rebuttal will probably be slow in taking effect...

In the long run, it will, I believe, be chiefly the persistence of unexplained UFO reports from reliable witnesses that will insure truly adequate scientific confrontation. An unprecedented opportunity to lead that confrontation was given to Dr. Condon, and it has been almost completely wasted by producing a setback, not a step forward. The real nature of the UFO evidence, only superficially examined by the Condon Project, continues to impress me and a few others as implying a problem of extraordinarily important scientific content with the most profound implications in many areas, scientific and otherwise...

EARLY PHYSIOLOGICAL EFFECTS IN STARTLING REPORT

A "brilliant" light accompanied by a noise and an odor apparently caused radiation-like symptoms to an entire family near Maracaibo, Venezuela, on the evening of October 24, 1886, according to U.S. Consulate Warner Cowgill in the (probably) December, 1886, issue of *Scientific American*.

The family of nine was sleeping in their hut during the "rainy and tempestuous" night when they "were awakened by a loud humming noise and a vivid, dazzling light, which illuminated the interior of the house." There was also "a smokey appearance and a peculiar smell." Badly frightened, the occupants, believing the end of the world was at hand, dropped to their knees and prayed.

"Their devotions were almost immediately interrupted by violent vomitings," Cowgill wrote, "and extensive swellings commenced to appear in the upper part of their bodies, this being particularly noticeable about the face and lips."

The next morning the swelling had subsided, but the family had "large black blotches" on their bodies. Nine days later "the skin peeled off, and these blotches were transformed into virulent raw sores."

"The hair of the head fell off upon the side which happened to be underneath when the phenomenon occurred, the same side of the body being, in all nine

cases, the more seriously injured...", the consulate explained. "Another curious attendant circumstance is that the trees around the house showed no signs of injury until the ninth day, when they suddenly withered, almost simultaneously with the development of the sores upon the bodies of the occupants of the house. This is perhaps a mere coincidence, but it is remarkable that the same susceptibility to electrical effects, with the same time lapse, should be observed in both animal and vegetable organisms. I have visited the sufferers, who are now in one of the hospitals of this city; and although their appearance is truly horrible, yet it is hoped that in no case will the injuries prove fatal."

H.C. Oudley, professor of Radiation Physics at the University of Illinois' Medical Center, wrote APRO concerning the incident.

"[Cowgill's] reports coincide exactly as would be expected if persons (or trees) were exposed to a heavy dose of penetrating ionizing radiation; perhaps a mixture of microwaves, gamma and/or X-rays," Dr. Oudley stated in the letter dated December 9, 1970. "Observation of such biological effects due to X-rays and radium were not reported until about 1905. If you find that Warner Cowgill was indeed a consular official (1886), his letter becomes one of the most important early reports of direct contact of humans with UFOs."

UFOs PHOTOGRAPHED OVER SALT LAKE CITY



Strange Object Photographed Over Salt Lake City, Utah, March 8, 1972

(Courtesy: *Sun Chronicle*)

UFOs were photographed over Salt Lake City, Utah, in March, stated the March 23, 1972, edition of the Roy, Utah, *Sun Chronicle*. On the 5th, photos were taken on two separate occasions as the objects "posed leisurely" over the city. Then, on the 8th, another object drifted "silently over the downtown area" (see photo above).

UFOR will attempt to obtain more detailed information on these cases.