



(c) crown copyright

DR CLARKE'S LETTERS AND INFORMATION REQUESTED

1st Letter – 21 June 2000

Requested access to files from 1969 to date. Files currently closed under 30 year rule.

Letter answered on 25 July 2000. Request refused under Exemption 9 (voluminous & vexatious request) and Exemption 12 (privacy of an individual) of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information.

2nd Letter – 1 August 2000

Narrowed request to following:

1. Sequence of files following DEFE 31/19 – 1968-1981

Section 40 identified DIS files;

55/40/9/1 Pt 3 (1968-1971) UFO Policy – File destroyed 8 August 1984

55/108/15 Pt 4 (1971-1996) UFO Policy – File held by DIS

2. UFO sighting reports to the MOD during January 1974 (Possibly Air 20/12556)

Section 40 identified;

AIR 2/18873 (1973-74) UFO Reports – File for release to PRO 2005 (currently with Records 1)

AF/584 (January 1974) UFO Reports – File with Records 1

There are 250 pages on these files and 150 would need to be sanitised. **Section 40 has provided an estimate of cost.**

3. BJ 5/311 UFO Meteorological Aspects (1968-70)

File due to be opened to the public at the PRO on 1 January 2001. Dr Clarke said in his letter dated 10 October 2000 that as the file will be available un-sanitised in the PRO in January 2001 he will wait. He has withdrawn his request for this file.

4. DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21

Records advise these files are retained in Department in accordance with Section 3(4) Public Records Act.

3rd Letter – 11 August 2000

5. BJ 5/311 Meteorological Aspects 1968-70

As 3. Above.

6. AIR 2/18564 UFO Reports: West Freugh 1957

File covers 1957-71, due for release to PRO 2002 but currently with Records 1. Consists of 75 pages, 25 need to be sanitised. Section 40 has provided an estimate of cost.

7. AF/3459/75 UFOs: Policy and Policy Statements 1970

File currently with Records 1. Consists of 115 pages, 5 need to be sanitised. Section 40 has provided an estimate of cost.

8. D/Sec(AS)/12/1 (5 parts dealing with policy D/Sec(AS)64/1 issues)

**D/Sec(AS) 12/1 Pt A- UFO Policy (1985) -Currently held at Hayes
D/Sec(AS) 64/1 Pt A- UFO Policy (1996) -Held by DAS 4a(Sec)-CONFIDENTAL
D/Sec(AS) 64/1 Pt B –UFO Policy -Held by DAS 4a(Sec)-SECRET
D/Sec(AS) 64/1 Pt C –UFO Policy -Held by DAS 4a(Sec)-CONFIDENTAL
D/Sec(AS) 64/1 Pt D –UFO Policy -Held by DAS 4a(Sec)-UNCLASSIFIED**

Advice needed from OMD 14. I think the only part of the Code we may be able to withhold this under is Exemption 2b (*Internal discussion and advice. Information whose disclosure would harm the frankness and candour of internal discussion, including: b. internal opinion, advice, recommendation, consultation and deliberation*).

9. D/Sec(AS) 64/5 Media Issues

This file is a DAS 4a (Sec) current file and consists of mainly newspaper cuttings and magazine articles. There are 197 pages. There are some notes written by DAS (Sec) staff on some of the cuttings and the file also contains 7 pages classified RESTRICTED which deals with a Daily Mail and Daily Express article on 24 April 1998. This article talks about RAF Fylingdales.

Advice needed from OMD 14 on whether if we release this file, can we sanitise the comments of DAS Staff and withhold the Restricted pages or do we have to release the whole file or nothing.

10. DS8/75/6 UFO TV Discussion (1976)

Currently held by Record 2. We need to check with Section 40 about release of this file as it is not mentioned in his letter.

11. AIR 20/12556 UFO Reports January 1974

See number 2 above.

1) we will acknowledge
2) propose to put together reply
+ need advise as follows
2nd Request for reply.

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
SEC (AS) 2
- 1 AUG 2000

Section 40

Dr David Clarke
Section 40

1 August, 2000

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your detailed letter of 25 July with reference to my request to view MOD files relating to 'unidentified flying objects.'

Firstly, I realise your staff have many other more pressing defence-related duties and I apologise if my request has added to that burden. I contacted the Freedom of Information office on 20 July inquiring as to what had become of my original request, simply because I was concerned that my letter had gone astray, or had been sent to the wrong department, as I had not at that stage received an acknowledgement. Almost immediately I received your acknowledgement in the post, and would like to make it clear that I have always been satisfied with the helpful and detailed responses received from the MOD's Secretariat (Air Staff) on the occasions I have contacted your department in the past.

With regards to my request to view files, I accept that my request for access to files covering the period 1969 to present was a little ambitious in terms of staff time. From your response, it appears that the main obstacle preventing the use of these files for research projects such as my own is the Exemption 9 in the Code of Practice which relates to Privacy of the individual. You say you receive up to 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters, but I wonder if you could specify how many of the individuals who contact the department in any one year have requested that their personal details should remain confidential for 30 years? From cursory viewing of the files which are available at the PRO relating to the period before 1969, I cannot recall finding one single request of this kind, and indeed many of the sightings and letters relate to events which are already in the "public domain", for example have already been reported in newspapers and other media.

advise
Section 40

While I would question the basis upon which my request has been refused, I do not wish to add to your administrative burden by asking for a review or involving my MP at this stage. I would be more happy to take up your offer of help to locate "a more limited amount of material" which might fall within the terms of your Code of Practice for Access to Government Information. I would be happy to guided by yourself as to what you feel would be a reasonable request for access to a "limited amount" of material.

could propose 1 year
3 files or perhaps more

is it a reasonable offer to make to him

Further to your offer, firstly I would like to point out that my research is not specifically concerned with the details of individual "UFO sightings" reported by

- not possible to offer any advice / comment on this point

Q. to be answered

Acum

individuals to the MOD. I am more interested in studying the evolution of how the old Air Ministry, and later the MOD, dealt with these kind of inquiries, how policy on this subject was formulated, and how that policy has been influenced by specific incidents, Government policy, Parliamentary questions, scientific opinion and the media.

Section 40

1

To this end, I have found the material in the Defence Intelligence Staff registered files particularly of interest. Of the two files currently available at the PRO, DEFE 31/118 (UFO policy 1953-63) and DEFE 31/119 (UFO Policy 1967) contain precisely the category of information I am seeking: for example internal memorandums, draft policy documents etc. There is little, if any, correspondence from the public contained within these files which fall within Exemption 12 (Privacy) or the exemptions relating to national security. Further to this detail, I would like to apply for access to the sequence of files which follow DEFE 31/119 and which presumably relate to UFO policy, between the years 1968 and 1981. This request relates to specific files, falling within a specified period of time, so you may feel it would be worthwhile employing a more focussed search to retrieve and scrutinise these papers on my behalf.

Section 40

DIS Files
SS/40/9/1 Pt 3
Destroyed
Pt 4 x 5 held by
DIS

* 2

In terms of Air Staff files relating to sighting/s reported by the general public, the one specific file I wish to view relates to UFO/unidentified aircraft sightings reported to the MOD during the month of January 1974. Following the file sequence at the PRO I suspect this file would be found at the reference Air 20/12556 (Air 20/12555 relates to December 1973).

could look
up this in
addition to
a year if
he chooses
to want
add year

Section 40

3

I would also like to apply for access to a file produced by the Meteorological Office for the MOD, reference BJ 5/311 titled "Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects" which relates to the period 1968-1970. This file is due to be opened at the PRO on 1 January 2001.

Section 40

4

From my research into historical files at the Public Record Office, I suspect there may also be memoranda and reports relating to UFOs in the 1950s hidden with the Defence Intelligence Files, class numbers DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21, and I have contacted the MOD Departmental Record Officer separately with a request for access to this material. DEFE 44 contains papers from as far back as 1946, but these remain classified because the file also contains material from 1991. I would like to request access to the block of files and memoranda which relate to the period 1946 to 1969, which should be available for scrutiny under the Freedom of Information Act.

Research ->

I hope you will feel it is possible to allow me to have access to at least some of the material specified in this letter, for use in what is a bona fide academic research programme. I would be happy to meet any reasonable costs incurred as a result of this application, and would be willing to sign any undertakings related to Data Protection or Official Secrets which you might feel appropriate. In addition, I will be happy to provide the MOD with a copy of my completed research paper, which I plan to publish via the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition at the University of Sheffield.

In making this request, I am simply responding to the Government's and the MOD's own stated manifesto pledge to "establish a general statutory right of access to official records and through culture change throughout the public sector" (MOD website). This laudable aim will only be seen to working in practise if reasonable requests for

any site
connected

access to non-sensitive material, a category I feel my request falls within, are successful. This touches upon the discussion I mentioned I had with the MOD/RAF Press Office in January this year, when I tried to follow up a story in the national Press which suggested that *all* files relating to UFOs were soon to be released to the PRO. I was told at that time by the duty Press Officer that the former minister Peter Kilfoyle had indeed expressed the opinion that there was no good reason for keeping files related to UFOs restricted for 30 years. He said release of UFO data was likely to be a priority following "a review of the files." There was, I was told, "a general move within the department to give out information that is not security sensitive and take away the myth of secrecy that surrounds this subject."

I hope we will be able to reach an agreement on access to the limited amount of files specified in this letter, and that this application will not be too onerous upon your department's time.

I am copying this reply to **Section 40** at OMD/AD, Room 617, Northumberland House, so that he is aware that I am happy with the expeditious and helpful way you have dealt with my inquiry.

Yours Sincerely,


Section 40

DW Clarke

1st Request for info.

Dr David Clarke

Section 40



Ministry of Defence
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

21 June 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,

Freedom of Information – Access to MOD files relating to aerial phenomena

I am undertaking post doctoral research into the socio-psychological aspects of belief in the aerial phenomena popularly known as ‘unidentified flying objects’, as an Honorary Research Fellow at the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition, University of Sheffield.

In particular, I am examining the role played by the mass media in the creation and transmission of beliefs and rumours about UFOs, and how these have been reflected in the Ministry of Defence’s public policy towards this subject from 1950 to the present.

While a certain amount of useful information can be obtained from the study of Press reports, the proceedings of Hansard and the records of private researchers, a study of this kind is reliant upon access to official records such as those available at the Public Record Office.

Currently access to records kept by the MOD relating to UFO phenomena, including those relating to the formulation of official policy, are covered by the Access to Public Records Act, 1967. This has meant that the vast majority of records relating to this subject are made available for public inspection when they are 30 years old. As a result, a number of MOD air files relating to UFO reports and policy issues relating to the period 1953-1969 have already been released and are available for study at the PRO.

However, at present records dating from 1969 to the present day remain closed under the terms of the 1967 Act. Despite this fact, during the past decade the MOD *have* released information relating to UFOs in response to individual requests from the public which, strictly speaking, continue to remain closed under the 30 year rule.

Under the definitions used by the Draft Freedom of Information Act (1999) all Government records – other than those created by the Security and Intelligence Services – should be available for public scrutiny unless it can be demonstrated their disclosure would *clearly cause harm* to “national security, defence and international relations...the internal discussion of Government policy [and/or] personal privacy.”

Since the 1950s, the UK Government’s public position has been that reports of ‘unidentified flying objects’ have *no* implications for defence or national security. As a result, there would appear to be no reason, other than protection of personal privacy, why records maintained on this subject should not be made available for study purposes such as the one I am proposing.

Indeed, in January this year I contacted the RAF Press Office who confirmed that the Ministry of Defence, in response to the published aims of the draft Freedom of Information Bill, were considering a proposal to allow access to UFO related files – currently closed under the 30 year rule – for what were described as “bona fide researchers.” This was on the proviso that any proposed future access did not compromise confidential personal data supplied to the MOD by members of the public and/or endanger national security.

A preliminary examination of the MOD air files on UFOs from 1953-1969 which are available at the PRO has demonstrated their value as a rich source of historical and social data relevant to my proposed study. For example, a Defence Intelligence briefing from 1966-67 released to the Public Record Office last year (DEFE 31/119) demonstrates how MOD staff were aware of the importance of these social and psychological factors, specifically the role played by the mass media, in the wax and wane of interest surrounding UFO reports..

These records have hitherto never been the subject of a properly funded academic research project. The value of such a study to the UK Government, in terms of the development of public policy in future, should also be taken into account when this request is considered. An independent study of this historical material might also help to dispel the popular myth of “secrecy” and “cover-up” which continues to surround the MOD’s public statements on the subject of UFOs.

I am currently in receipt of an award from the British Academy to study the creation and transmission of rumours in the context of popular beliefs which spread through Britain during the First World War, based upon records preserved at the Public Record Office. Later this year I intend to apply to another funding body for an additional award which would allow me to study the development of popular beliefs about UFOs and how these have been reflected by MOD policy from the 1950s to the present. As it stands, the proposed study would have to be based upon the MOD air files which are currently available, and relate to the period 1953-1969.

I wish to make a formal application via the Freedom of Information Unit of the MOD for access to MOD Air files relating to UFOs and UFO policy for the period 1969 to the present day. I would define access as having the opportunity to examine all relevant files relating to UFO reports and UFO policy, making notes and copies of relevant material where necessary. I appreciate a project of this kind could take time and would incur costs, but these could easily be incorporated into my application for a research award.


I would welcome to opportunity to discuss this proposal informally with a representative from the Ministry of the Defence and/or the Freedom of Information Unit and look forward to hearing from you,

Yours Faithfully,

Section 40



Dr D.W. Clarke



- Home
- Rendlesham
- MOD X-Files
- Who Are We?
- UFO Brigantia
- Coming Soon
- Sites

[MORE Flying Saucery](#)

WELCOME

The MOD
X-Files
[go>](#)

flyingsaucery.com exists to publish the research findings from veteran fortean researchers David Clarke and Andy Roberts.

The Rendlesham
Files
[go>](#)

"...A myth is not a fairy story. It is the presentation of facts belonging to one category in the idioms appropriate to another. To explode a myth is accordingly not to deny the facts but to re-allocate them."

No Kidding
This Time...My
Flying Saucer
Photo is
Genuine!
[go>](#)

Gilbert Royle (1900-1976) British philosopher

Since the early 1980s we have worked closely on a variety of Fortean subjects from UFOlogy to Earth Mysteries. The results of these researches have been published in several books, magazines, newspapers, booklets and TV programs (see bibliography) and more specifically via the pages of UFO Brigantia.

Since the late 1990s we have been delving deep into UFOlogy in the United Kingdom since WWII, re-investigating so called "classic cases", visiting the Public Record Office and other archival sources of information, tracing and interviewing key witnesses and Ministry of Defence employees at all levels of UFO research and investigation.



The results of this research will be published in our next book, titled, **Out of the Shadows: UFOs, the Establishment & the official Cover-up**, due from Piatkus in May 2002.


In addition, flyingsaucery.com will act as an outlet for the dissemination of our on-going research, along with commentary on what is taking place in UK UFOlogy today. We will also occasionally be revealing significant breakthroughs in research.

The first of these is the much sought after M.O.D. file on the Rendlesham forest incident of 1980, that has been described by some as "Britain's Roswell" - [CLICK HERE](#) - brought to you first by us.

World Exclusive:
After half a century



of denials we can reveal the contents of the British Governments top secret "Flying Saucer Study" - the origin of the UFO 'cover-up'.



Another Flying Saucery first, is the presentation of our research that reveals the truth behind two classic British UFO photographs taken by Alex Bitch and Stephen Darbishire. [Read it](#) and weep.


If you want your belief in alien visitation stroked or need seating plans for the 6.15 from Zeta Reticulli flyingsaucery.com is going to disappoint you. However if you want the best in comprehensive, up to the minute exploration in the murky depths of contemporary and historical UFOlogy then welcome aboard.

Dave and Andy would be delighted to hear from you if you have any comments or criticisms of the material you'll find here.

We can be contacted at: info@flyingsaucery.com

flyingsaucery.com is designed and maintained by [Mike Wootten](#)

© 2001 Andy Roberts and Dave Clarke



WHO ARE WE?



INTERESTS

Dave and Andy are working on a number of other UFO and fortean projects and would be interested in any information you may have on the following:

Flying Saucers & Unidentified Flying Objects

- British contactees 1947-70/George Adamski in the UK
- UFOlogy in the 1950s
- 'Death' rays and related phenomena
- Phantom airship sightings of the late 19th/early 20th centuries
- Foo Fighters
- Ghost aircraft/phantom helicopters
- Alleged crashed saucers in the UK
- The Berwyn Mountain 'UFO crash'
- Aerial Phenomena Enquiry Network (APEN)

Earth Mysteries/Forteana

- The Big Grey Man of Ben McDhui (and other mountain panics)
- Pagan survivals in the UK
- Celtic stone heads and other "Cursed" objects
- Spring-heeled Jack
- Spooklights and Earthlights

BIOGRAPHY

ANDY ROBERTS

Is the author of

- Catflaps: Anomalous Big Cats in the North, Brigantia Books 1986/CFZ 2001
- Phantoms of the Sky (with David Clarke), Robert Hale 1989/90
- Earthlights Revelation (contributing author), Blandford 1991
- Ghosts & Legends of Yorkshire, Jarrold 1992
- Twilight of the Celtic Gods (with David Clarke) Blandford, 1996/97
- The UFOs That Never Were (with Jenny Randles & David Clarke - Feb. 2000)

In addition Andy has contributed chapters to the following compilations:

- UFOs 1947-87, Fortean Times, 1987
- Phenomenon, Macdonald & Co., 1988
- Fortean Studies 3, John Brown Publishing, 1996
- Fortean Studies 5, John Brown Publishing 1999

TV & Radio:

Andy has contributed to many local and national TV and radio shows. He worked as a consultant on and appeared in:

- The Isle Is Full Of Noises, Everyman, BBC1, Broadcast 1/11/92
- and
- Down To Earth, Fourwinds for Discovery channel, also shown on Channel 4
- Origin Unknown, Granada, Broadcast Jan/Feb 1999
- The Haunted Valley Granada, Broadcast, November 2000

Major Magazine Articles:

Andy edited the seminal UFO magazine, UFO Brigantia, for 25 issues and also edits the sporadic scandal-rag The Armchair UFologist.

In addition Andy has written for numerous publications including: The Dalesman, , Fortean Times, UFO Times, The Guardian, Yorkshire Post, Bradford Telegraph & Argus, Magonia, Northern Earth

His article, Rocking the Alien, dealing with pop music's fascination with UFOs was the cover feature article for the July 1996 issue of Fortean Times and was also printed in the G2 section of The Guardian

He can be contacted at: andy.roberts@flyingsaucery.com

DAVID CLARKE

Ph.D in English Cultural Tradition and Language, University of Sheffield (1999)
Thesis subject was the cult of the human head in Celtic mythology, British tradition and folklore.

BA (Hons) dual honours Archaeology and Medieval History at Sheffield University (graduated 1990).

As a UFOlogist, I was a founder member of the Independent UFO Network (IUN) in 1987 and of the UFO Investigator's Network (UFOIN) in 1999. I have also served as a Council member of the British UFO Research Association (BUFORA) in the late 1980s.

As a journalist, I have worked for ten years on local newspapers including the Rotherham Advertiser and Sheffield Star and now work freelance as a journalist and full time as an author.

I hold a Honorary Research Fellowship in the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition and Language, University of Sheffield, where I teach Traditions of Supernatural Belief, a 2nd and 3rd year undergraduate option in the School of English.

My specialist areas of research interest are:

- contemporary legend and belief: specifically 'space age' folklore (conspiracy theories, 'flying saucer' and UFO beliefs);
- rumour transmission and rumour-panics within a supernatural context;
- the interface between archaeology, oral tradition and belief;
- custom and belief, specifically in the context of northern England and the Peak District

Books:

Phantoms of the Sky: UFOs - A Modern Myth? (with Andy Roberts), London: Robert Hale, 1990.

Ghosts and Legends of the Peak District, Norwich: Jarrold Publishing, 1991.

Strange South Yorkshire: Myth, Magic and Memory in the valley of the Don, Wilmslow: Sigma Press, 1994.

A Guide to Britain's Pagan Heritage, London: Robert Hale, 1995.

Twilight of the Celtic Gods: An exploration of Britain's hidden pagan traditions, London: Blandford Press, 1996.

The UFOs that Never Were, London (with Jenny Randles and Andy Roberts), Allison & Busby, 1999.

Supernatural Peak District, London: Robert Hale, 2000.

Contributor to:

Fortean Times, Fortean Studies, Folklore Journal, Peak and Pennine Magazine, UFO Magazine, UFO Brigantia, Third Stone, International UFO Reporter.

UFOs 1947-87 (Fortean Times)

Phenomenon (edited by John Spencer & Hilary Evans)

Earthlights Revelation (Paul Devereux)

Fortean Studies 3 (John Brown Publishing)

Fortean Studies 6 (John Brown Publishing)

Series contributor to:

LWT 'Strange But True' (2 series); BBC Mysteries; BBC Close Up North; Granada TV 'Origin Unknown,' Channel 4 Equinox, Four Winds Production, XYTV; Granad TV "The Haunted Valley" (November 2000)

David can be contacted via email on dave.clarke@flyingsaucery.com

FLYING SAUCERY

UFOLOGY: DELICIOUS HOT, DISGUSTING COLD

THE MOD X-FILES

- Home
- Readthisam
- MOD X-Files
- Who Are We?
- UFO Brigades
- Coming Soon
- Links

- ☛ The MOD Documents
- ☛ Appendix
- ☛ Commentary

WORLD EXCLUSIVE: BRITAIN'S SECRET UFO X-FILES REVEALED

For fifty years UFOlogists have been searching for evidence of a secret study by the Ministry of Defence into the 'flying saucer' mystery.

Now we can Exclusively reveal the existence of a UFO study group created by British intelligence in 1950 and the contents of their final report - classified for half a century.

This was the first and only official UFO study by the British Government that has formed the basis for all policy on the subject up to present.

In 1955 and again in 1962 the MOD assured Major Patrick Wall MP in answer to Parliamentary Question that there 'had been no formal inquiry.' He was lied to.

For in 1952 the Secretary of State for Air referred to 'a full intelligence study' of the saucers in a reply to Prime Minister Winston Churchill's request to know 'the truth.'



During the research for our book 'Out of the Shadows' we discovered the final surviving copy of the report by the 'Flying Saucer Working Party' - DSI/JTIC Report No 7 Unidentified Flying Objects.

As one of the authors, RAF Wing Commander Myles Formby, told us: "the report was never published but was circulated at the highest level and was used as a 'yardstick' for future action."


Questions or media enquiries should be directed to: dave.clarke@flyingsaucery.com

Documents reproduced courtesy of Crown Copyright

© 2001 Andy Roberts and Dave Clarke



THE MOD X-FILES
Commentary



- Home
- Randles.htm
- NOO X-Files
- Who Are We?
- UFO Brigantia
- Soaring Saucer
- Links

UFO BRIGANTIA

UFO Brigantia is back! We will be re-publishing classic articles from the U.K.'s. finest UFO magazine and frequently adding new material.

UFO Brigantia originated as a monthly UFO magazine in the early 1980s, edited by the enigmatic Paul Bennett. Initially it was the house journal of the West Yorkshire UFO Research Group (WYUFORG). Andy Roberts took over as editor in 1985, when the magazine went bi-monthly and eventually quarterly as the journal of the Independent UFO Network (IUN).

There has never been another magazine like UFO Brigantia. Mixing hard core investigative ufology with biting satire and sarcasm Brigantia left no stone unturned in its quest to represent ufology as it is rather than how some of its proponents would like it to be.

UFO Brigantia's list of columnists, contributors and interviewees was impressive and included most of the best known names of the 80s and 90s, both from American and European UFOlogy. These included Jenny Randles, Paul Devereux, David Clarke, Robert Moore, Ralph Noyes, Hilary Evans, John Keel, Budd Hopkins, Bill Moore, Jacques Vallee and Philip Mantle.

Since its demise in 1993 following the death of Stuart Smith and the temporary retirement from ufology of Roberts and Clarke, there have been numerous requests for UFO Brigantia to be revived.

Flyingsaucery.com will host new UFO Brigantia items as well as archival material and occasional rants from the Armchair Ufologist.

BRIGANTIA RESEARCH


No Kidding This Time...My Flying Saucer Photo is Genuine!

Full Report

BRIGANTIA DOWNLOADS

- [The Berwyn Mountain UFO Crash](#) Word doc
- [Howden Moor Summary](#) Word doc
- [The Howden Moor Incident](#) Word doc
- [UFO over North Sea](#) Word doc
- [Schweinfurt - A Mystery Solved?](#) Word doc
- [The Northumbrian UFO Crash of 1969](#) Word doc
- [My Flying Saucer Photo...](#) Word doc


more files to come...



COMING SOON

Out of the Shadows
UFOs, the Establishment & the official Cover-up

Out of the Shadows: UFOs, the Establishment & the official Cover-up is the new UFO book by David Clarke and Andy Roberts, published by Piatkus in 2002.



Out of the Shadows takes a fresh look at the subject of UFOs, focussing upon the British Ministry of Defence's investigations into the phenomena since 1940. Clarke and Roberts have spent two years researching the book and have uncovered hundreds of previously unseen MOD documents relating to UFO activity in the UK.

The book sets the MOD policy on UFOs alongside the beliefs and attitudes of the British UFO community and the wider media towards both the subject and allegations of an official 'cover up'.

Out of the Shadows is not a sceptical book, nor is it written for 'believers.' We see it as a social history of the flying saucer/UFO phenomenon in the UK. It objectively traces the development of official interest and investigations into UFOs and reaches some startling conclusions.

Among its many and varied contents, the book features:


- Important new material on WWII UFO sightings and investigations
- Hitherto unseen Ministry of Defence and RAF files on UFO reports by service personnel.
- Interviews with and comments with numerous individuals who have worked at the highest level of governmental UFO investigation
- The MOD file on the Rendlesham Forest UFO case of 1980
- New information on the Men In Black mystery
- The involvement of the Royal Family, aristocracy and politicians in UFO studies

FLYING SAUCERY
 UFOLOGY: DELICIOUS HOT,
 DISGUSTING COLD

THE RENDLESHAM FILES

- Home
- Rendlesham
- MOB X-Files
- Who Are We?
- UFO Bagatelle
- Coming Soon
- Links

- ← New Developments
- ← The Report
- ← The Documents
- ← Commentary
- ← Links



The Rendlesham Forest UFO case is, with the sole exception of the Roswell Incident, the most talked about UFO case in the world. Numerous books, articles and TV shows have been made about the Rendlesham Forest event and tens of thousands of hours of research has been conducted.

Many people have speculated on the depth and nature of involvement by the UK government in this case and the 'Holy Grail' of Rendlesham has been the 'official' Ministry of Defence file on the event. During the course of research for No Defence Significance? this file was located and obtained.

For the first time in the world you can now discover the UK government's secret files on the Rendlesham Forest UFO case. You may not agree with the UK governments' attitudes to the case - but you cannot ignore them.

Here we present David Clarke's commentary on the file, placing it in context, with links to selected documents.

Questions or media enquiries should be directed to: dave.clarke@flyingsaucery.com

Documents reproduced courtesy of Crown Copyright

© 2001 Andy Roberts and Dave Clarke

FLYING SAUCERY

UFOLOGY: DELICIOUS HOT, DISGUSTING COLD

THE RENDLESHAM FILES - NEWS

- Home
- Rendlesham
- MOD X-Files
- Who Are We?
- UFO Evidence
- Coming Soon
- Links

[← back](#)

Five documents relating to the alleged UFO Landing at RAF Woodbridge in 1980 are no longer a secret following a landmark decision by the MOD's Director of Information Exploitation.

The decision marks a further breakthrough in our understanding of the events in Rendlesham Forest.

Five documents were with-held from the original file under exemptions to the code, 2 under Exemption 1 (national security) and 3 under Exemption 2 (internal discussion and advice to ministers less than 30 years old).

We immediately lodged an appeal against the decision and an internal review has now been completed. A senior MOD official has now released the two documents that were with-held on the grounds of national security.

The new documents contain no evidence that a cover-up of a UFO landing ever existed. They simply illustrate how claims of a cover-up arise from secrecy for the sake of secrecy, part of an established tradition in Britain.

What they reveal is that the RAF were making checks on radar records for 29 December 1980, following information supplied by Lt Col Charles Halt in his memo to the MOD.

As we now know the actual date of Halt's sighting in Rendlesham Forest was the night of 27/28 December 1980. This implies incompetence and complacency on behalf of the MOD, who did not see fit to make further inquiries into the details they had been supplied by Halt.

To see the MOD judgement, and copies of the newly released documents, click on the links below...

[MOD Judgement](#)

[Document 1](#)

[Document 2](#)

Documents reproduced courtesy of Crown Copyright

[← back](#)

© 2001 Andy Roberts and Dave Clarke

BRITAIN'S SECRET 'X-FILES' REVEALED

David Clarke and Andy Roberts

The Ministry of Defence has always denied involvement in any official study of the UFO phenomenon. But files recently discovered in Government archives reveal how in 1950 the MOD set up a secret committee of scientists and intelligence experts to investigate sightings of 'flying saucers'. The report they produced for Winston Churchill's Government remained secret for 50 years and even today certain sections remain classified because of their intelligence content.

During research for our forthcoming book on the British Establishment and UFOs early in 2001 copies of the historic report produced by the British Flying Saucer Working Party in 1951 were provided by a MOD source.



Winston Churchill

The full story of the Working Party and the stories of the high ranking MOD and RAF officers were involved in the first and only official British study of the UFO phenomenon will be revealed in our book: *OUT OF THE SHADOWS*, published by Piatkus in 2002. What follows is a summary of the context in which the report was produced and why its discovery is a major event in the history of UFOlogy.

At the dawn of the 21st century it is claimed that sightings of UFOs have become so few and far between that one of the oldest groups of civilian enthusiasts, the British Flying Saucer Bureau, have announced they are closing down. While recent opinion polls show 50 percent of the public believe we have been visited by aliens, the Ministry of Defence have always denied they had ever taken the subject seriously.

Fifty years ago, at the height of the Cold War, the situation was radically different. Sightings of 'flying saucers' made newspaper headlines every day on both sides of the Atlantic. The now defunct London Sunday Dispatch even described the subject as "bigger than the Atom Bomb Wars." By the summer of 1950 with war in Korea and the successful testing of the first Russian atomic bomb adding to growing international tensions, the Western powers were growing increasingly worried by the 'flying saucer' mystery.

Across the world, nervous fingers hovered above the buttons that could trigger a devastating nuclear exchange. Those entrusted with weapons of mass destruction had only seconds to decide if an unidentified 'blip' tracked by radar was a Russian bomber, guided missile, or simply a "phantom." Whether they existed or not UFOs, quite clearly, had the potential to trigger a Third World War.

Solving the UFO problem became a priority for the top brains in the American CIA and their British counterpart, the MOD's Directorate of Scientific Intelligence (DSI). It was the Defence Intelligence staff that were responsible for assessing any threat posed by UFOs. The DSI advised the Joint Intelligence Committee who ultimately answered to the Prime Minister. Throughout the 1950s the Ministry of Defence tried to calm public fears by debunking 'flying saucer' sightings as meteorites or weather balloons, but behind closed doors they had already launched their own secret study, drawing upon the expertise of the greatest scientific and military minds of the day.

Documents discovered hidden in the archives of the Ministry of Defence, reveal how a team dedicated to the study of flying saucers was set up in October 1950 working closely alongside the CIA who were involved in their own top secret study. The very existence of any "official" study of UFOs had been long denied by the MOD. Even when the minutes of this non-existent committee came to light in 1997, the report it produced could not be found. The document, we were repeatedly assured, was "absent" from the catalogue at the Public Record Office. Staff concluded it "had not survived the passage of time." The report constitutes the "Holy Grail" to those who have always believed that the Ministry of Defence were involved in a cover-up of UFO evidence. It is also an important jigsaw puzzle piece in the history of the Cold War.

The papers reveal that the "Flying Saucer" study was the brainchild of one of Churchill's most trusted scientific advisors, Sir Henry Tizard, best known for his role in the development of Britain's pre-World War Two radar defences that proved so decisive during the Battle of Britain. Tizard felt the saucer sightings could not be simply dismissed as delusions, and demanded an investigation of the subject following a pro-saucer newspaper campaign backed by one of the most respected figures of the day, Lord Louis Mountbatten. Mountbatten and a number of other highly placed officials - including Battle of Britain mastermind Air Chief Marshall Hugh Dowding - had privately concluded that flying saucers were advanced craft from outer space.

The Flying Saucer Working Party had five members, representing the elite Technical Intelligence branches of the Air Ministry, Admiralty, War Office and Ministry of Defence. It held its first meeting in October of 1950 in a room at the former Hotel Metropole in Northumberland Avenue, just yards away from Trafalgar Square. As a result, personnel serving with the RAF and Royal Navy were asked to submit sighting reports for investigation.

After eight months of sifting through hundreds of X-Files from as far afield as New Zealand, the committee concluded that only three originated from trustworthy sources and were worthy further study. In June 1950 a pilot on patrol from RAF Tangmere in Sussex sighted a "bright circular metallic object" which sped past his Meteor jet fighter at 20,000 feet. As he was undergoing a debriefing by squadron intelligence it emerged that four RAF controllers at an air defence radar station near Eastbourne had, at the same time, tracked an "unusual response" that vanished from their screens, moving at terrific speed.

The Documents

Appendix

Commentary

* [Page 1](#)

* [Page 2](#)



The Rendlesham MoD file: Some Preliminary Thoughts

Jenny Randles

The release of this file to David Clarke in May 2001 is of considerable interest, given the prominence of the Rendlesham Forest case in UFO thinking. But it also has great significance in terms of other modern British incidents - for we might now hope to get better official information on them without having to wait 30 years and find re-investigation badly compromised.

This recognition may be more important long term than the release of the files on a case that was already of diminishing import in terms of scientific UFO evidence - as obvious from 'The UFOs that Never Were' written two years before this file was released.

However, Rendlesham has held - and will still hold - a vice-like grip on most UFOlogists because it offers them the lure of being 'the big one' - a single case that could change the world. And so any information that helps to illuminate the path towards resolution is to be welcomed.

Yet, of course, whilst this file does not add much to any resolution of the case itself, and, it will always be arguable whether it even reflects the sum total of official knowledge on both sides of the Atlantic (with some no doubt suspecting hidden files may yet lurk somewhere unannounced) it is of great value. This is especially because of the picture that it paints about the approach of the MoD's public visage to UFO investigation.

There are no great surprises in the image that it portrays. But there is great interest because we now have clear, on the record, data from the MoD that all sensible people should accept as being truthful - at least within the purview of those compiling the reports.

Indeed - I would submit - these records would not be untruthful. They may not be complete (indeed the MoD have admitted to withholding some files) but they will be honest. The MoD simply would not lie on open record. It would be too potentially destructive for any government caught doing so.

Ralph Noyes - himself a senior figure in the MoD who dealt with UFOs and who ran DS 8 at one point in his career - taught me from our various discussions that if the powers that be do not want to say something then they do not lie. They just don't say it. If they do say it then you can confidently assume that it is basically true.

As such it is proper that we consider this MoD file not as offering untruths but as providing genuine pointers towards what happened.

Here is a summary of the key things that seem to emerge from the new information and my thoughts about them - based as yet on only a study of the summary. I will probably add more when I examine the full report.

1: The dating of the Events

There is no question in my mind - and has not been since one of the three original witnesses (John Burroughs) told me this in 1989 - but these two events occurred in Rendlesham Forest in the early hours of 26 December and overnight on 27/28 December.

There were other minor sightings at other times (many caused by airmen who were aware of the gossip from around base and so went skywatching in the forest determined to see 'the UFOs' for themselves). But the Rendlesham legend revolves around these two nights.

If anyone clings to any other possibility they are wrong to do so.

For a decade the above simple truth was not thought to be true. Even when the Woodbridge police claimed a different date for the initial sighting in late 1983 and when I found a very early note by Brenda Butler which confirmed that her source (the still mysterious airman Steve Roberts) had initially told her that it occurred on 26 December (but then changed this claim to the following day) we were reluctant to accept it because the weight of other evidence argued against.

Primarily this meant Colonel Halt's insistence about his memo, compiled (we assumed) from witness statements but in reality from his memory alone. This was so positive that the dates were 27 December and 29/30 December. And he was backed by other witnesses (such as Larry Warren) then willing to go on public record.

This reliance upon false information was a serious problem for the investigation. It compromised not only efforts to obtain information from the authorities (Brenda Butler and Dot Street asked Woodbridge police to comment within weeks of the sighting but asked them about the wrong night and so were never told about the police suggestion that the lighthouse was visible from the forest as the might otherwise have been).

It also meant that we dismissed more readily than we would otherwise have done Ian Ridpath's theory that the initial light in the sky was a bright meteor. One of these was visible on the night of 26 December and could have triggered a misperception. Yet, officially, the sighting did not happen on that night. It happened on the next night when there was no meteor. So, of course, we tended to be skeptical of this idea in the early years.

The MoD file shows that the authorities were equally thrown off the track by this fundamental error. They had the wrong dates to check out and so any study was pretty meaningless. It was not even realised by the MoD as quickly as it was by UFOlogy since Halt and the British squadron leader Donald Moreland stood by the dates (as you might expect them to do) and so the MoD, again naturally, believed trained military personnel and their contemporary records.

It cannot be underestimated here what a simple error did to this case.

It is hard to appreciate why this cock-up happened, if the events were significant. Halt could have studied the signed witness statements and the correct date was in the base log book (the blotter). So why wrong dates were imposed onto the case and then allowed to stand firm for so many years is always going to be a contentious issue.

I dare say some skeptics might contend that it was preferable for UFOlogists and witnesses to rid the spectre of explanation by standing by a false date. But I was really glad to have the dates sorted out in 1989 and it started the slow process towards resolution. UFOlogists are, in the main, here to solve cases and not to perpetuate mysteries. And - do not forget - it was one of the original witnesses who clarified the correct dates for me - without hesitation - so this hardly suggests that there was a plot to obscure the damaging truth.

No the problem with the dates - seriously misleading as it was - occurred through an apparent mistake rather than any devious plotting.

This was the first cock up to inspire beliefs about a conspiracy - many of which persist to this day. But it was not the last and it is a great shame that the error was not spotted earlier because this case may have unravalled long before it did - since the correct dates are the key to finding answers.

UFOlogy long did not have these dates. And nor, we now know, did the MoD. Both paid the price for being innocently misled - until the story had become a legend amidst its own phenomenon.

This is an object lesson to all people involved in UFO study - including the MoD. Check and
<http://www.flyingsaucery.com/Rendlesham/comjen1.htm>

double check basic information. One simple error can have a knock on effect and literally wreak years of havoc.

I should add that this is not a unique circumstance. A similar error occurs in an Irish military file released (via IUFOPRA) in late 1997. This described a mid air encounter between an Irish transport plane and a UFO at 1.10 am on 31 March 1993. The same event was witnessed over the southwest of England by numerous people and was followed up by BUFORA within hours. I was acting as Director of Investigations and it was, without question, the result of a misperception of the burn up from a Cosmos satellite.

However, the official Irish military file on the case contains a second sighting backing up the transport plane incident. This was by a Captain Cotter at Newcastle, County Dublin. From his account there cannot be any serious doubt that he saw the same thing as witnesses across the British Isles. Yet he clearly dates his sighting as 1.10 am on 28 March - three days to the minute too early - and this was seemingly accepted by the authorities because he was a credible, military witness and had signed his statement within hours.

You would not expect a military officer (here based with the Naval Support Squadron) to misrecall a sighting so soon afterwards and get the date wrong by three days. But here, if you decline to accept that this is what he did, you must assume that something remarkable recurred in identical circumstances 72 hours apart.

Far more probable is that he got this date wrong and so we face the consequence of knowing that if you were to make assumptions based on that error - as many did with Rendlesham - you risk misjudging the entire case.

Dates clearly are vital and we now must always be aware of how they can mislead us.

next 

Registered File Disposal Form

MOD Form 262F
(Revised 9/01)

FILE TITLE: (Main Heading - Secondary Heading - Tertiary Heading etc) UFOS - PERSISTENT CORRESPONDENCE DR O CLANCE	Reference: (Prefix and Number): D/DAS(CSEC)/64/3/11 Part: A
--	--

PROTECTIVE MARKING (including caveats & descriptors): **v/c**

Date of last enclosure: **12/3/2001** Date closed:

PART 1. DISPOSAL SCHEDULE RECOMMENDATION
(To be completed when the file is closed)

Destroy after _____ years

Forward to INFO(EXP)-R after _____ years

No recommendation

FOR DEFENCE INFO(EXP)-R USE ONLY

<input type="text"/> Date of 1st review	<input type="text"/> Date of 2nd review	<input type="text"/> Forward Destruction Date
Reviewer's Signature: _____	Reviewer's Signature: _____	

PART 2. BRANCH REVIEW
(To be fully completed at time of file closure)
(Delete as appropriate)

a. Of no further administrative value and not worthy of permanent preservation. DESTROY IMMEDIATELY (Remember that TOP SECRET and Codeword material cannot be destroyed locally and must be forwarded to INFO(EXP)-R.

b. (i) To be retained until the end of the year **2010** for the following reason(s):

LEGAL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DEFENCE POLICY + OPERATIONS <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CONTRACTUAL <input type="checkbox"/>	ORIGINAL COMMITTEE PAPERS <input type="checkbox"/>
FINANCE/AUDIT <input type="checkbox"/>	MAJOR EQUIPMENT PROJECT <input type="checkbox"/> [_____]
DIRECTORATE POLICY <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	OTHER (Specify) <input type="checkbox"/>

PPQ = 100

(Continued overleaf)

(ii) Key enclosures which support the recommendation are:

(iii) At the end of the specified retention period the file is to be:

Destroyed

Considered by DR for permanent preservation

c. Of no further administrative value but worthy of consideration by INFO(EXP)-R for permanent preservation.

PART 3. BRANCH REVIEWING OFFICER (not below C2/equivalent)

Signature: **Section 40** _____

Name: _____
(Block Capitals)

Grade/Rank: **B2** Date: **14/9/05**

Branch Title and Full Address:

DAS ISO
LEVEL 5, ZONE 1
MAIN BUILDING
WHITEHALL
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Tel No: _____

PART 4 DESTRUCTION CERTIFICATE

It is certified that the specified file has been destroyed.

Signature: _____

Name: _____
(Block Capitals)

Grade/Rank: _____ Date: _____

Witnessed by (TOP SECRET* and SECRET only)

Signature: _____

Name: _____
(Block Capitals)

Grade/Rank: _____ Date: _____

*(FOR DR USE ONLY)

75
Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Room 8243
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

12 March 2001

Your reference: D/DAS(Sec)/64/3/11

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your letter of 9 March 2001 and for the information relating to the three UFO policy files.

Once again I am grateful that you have been able to locate and review these files on my behalf. Accordingly, I am enclosing with this letter a crossed cheque for £20 made out to 'MOD Accounting Officer' in advance payment for photocopying and postage as agreed. If the cost of the work exceeds this amount please let me know.

In the meantime, I look forward to hearing from you with regards to the issues raised in my letter of 7 February.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



From: Section 40
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

74

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40

Dr D Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS(Sec)/64/3/11
9 March 2001

Dear Dr Clarke

We have been sent the three files mentioned in my letter of 2 February that contain, broadly speaking, policy material on the subject of 'UFOs'.

The files are:

AF/419 - BBC2 Man Alive Programme - UFOs
AF/S4F(Air)/422 - UFOs - Radio Oxford Programme
S4F(Air)U/506 - Statistical Analysis of UFOs

These files have now been reviewed and are ready for photocopying and a very small amount of sanitising. The review, involving reading all the documents on the files, has taken us some 4 hours and has been conducted free of charge under the Code of Practice. Photocopying and sanitising the papers is estimated at 2 minutes per whole document - in practice some will take a little less time and those consisting of a number of pages, rather longer. We estimate that this work will take some one and a quarter hours. At a charge of £15.00 per hour, the total cost is likely to be £20.00. Would you let us know that you are content to meet this charge and we shall send you the material as soon as possible.

With regard to your letter of 7 February, that raised a number of issues, I hope to be able to write to you very shortly.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

Loose Minute

73/1

D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8

For info. only.

1 March 2001

Section 40
12.3.01.

Head Air Historical Branch

Copy to:
DAS 4a1 (Sec)

ENQUIRY FROM DR DAVID CLARKE

Reference: **Section 40** email exchange 12 & 15 February 2001


1. We recently exchanged email on the subject of Forms 541s (their non-survival). The enquirer, Dr Clarke, has now written seeking information about the Neatishead GCI (attached).
2. You will note that Dr Clarke has been advised "by a senior MOD source" that such a record "would not have been destroyed and that even if this had been the case, a record would have been made.." Clearly the MOD source is not familiar with MOD regulations relating to the retention periods of destruction certificates. However, I would welcome your comments about the fate of this type of record.
3. The query re Air Ministry DDI (Tech) records needs no comment (it's a well established line of enquiry from the "ufo" fraternity). Unless, of course, information has recently come to light about a secret cache of such material!

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 DAS 4 (SEC)
 12 MAR 2001
 FILE _____

Section 40
 [Redacted]

D Info(Exp)R1

Section 40
 [Redacted]



Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

**Deputy Departmental Record Office
Ministry of Defence
3-5 Great Scotland Yard
London SW1A 2HW**

8 March 2001

Your ref: D INFO(EXP)R/3/7/8

Dear **Section 40**



Thank you for your letter of 27 February 2001 replying to my question with regards to the absence of Forms 541 from RAF records during 1956. Far from being disappointing, I found your reply helpful and the information you provided will allow me to channel my research into more fruitful avenues.

Whilst the information you provided explains the absence of daily records for Squadrons and RAF stations for the period I am researching, it does not account for the absence of records for the Neatishead GCI radar station relating to this period.

According to the testimony of the retired senior RAF Fighter Controller who was on duty during the night of August 13-14, 1956, he personally completed a detailed logbook record relating to the scramble and attempted interception of an unknown target detected by the USAF GCA radar at Lakenheath.

He informs me that a representative from Fighter Command at Stanmore visited shortly after these events and removed the Neatishead GCI station logbook for scrutiny by the Air Ministry. As the incident recorded by the logbook involved both a radar tracking and the 'scramble' of two aircraft from the Battle Flight, it would seem improbable that the GCI logbook would have been destroyed.

I am informed by a senior MOD source that records such as the GCI log relating to an event as important as this would not have been destroyed and even if this was the case, a record would have had to be made recording who ordered and authorised such destruction, and for what reason.

Despite extensive searches of the PRO records I have been unable to locate a file relating to Neatishead GCI covering the relevant period in 1956. Records do exist for Sector Operations Eastern Sector and the 271 Signals Unit, Neatishead, but these do not contain the GCI station records. As public records outside the 30 year rule these should be available for scrutiny at the Public Record Office.

Additionally, according to the information provided by the retired RAF Controller, a report on the incident I am researching was prepared for Air Ministry by the technical intelligence section DDI (Tech) during 1956-57. Records created by DDI (Tech) appear in the PRO files for the period 1940-45, but none appear to be available post-1945.

I would be grateful if you could provide any information regarding the survival, present location and public access arrangements in respect of 1) the GCI station logbook from RAF Neatishead radar for August 1956 and 2) files created by Air Ministry DDI (Tech) relating to the period 1952-58.

Your assistance is greatly appreciated and I look forward to hearing from you (SAE enclosed).

Yours faithfully,

Section 40



DAS4A(SEC)

From: Info(Exp)-Records1
Sent: 12 February 2001 12:17
To: Hd of AHB(RAF)
Cc: DAS4A(SEC)
Subject: ENQUIRY FROM DR DAVID CLARKE - FORM 541s

73
+1**Section 40**

Dr Clarke is an enthusiastic researcher into unexplained aerial phenomena.

He is researching an incident which occurred between 0010 hours and 0330 hours GMT on 14 August 1956, when an unidentified radar track was recorded by the GCI radar station at RAF Neatishead.

Apparently aircraft from 23 Sqn were scrambled from RAF Waterbeach to intercept this unidentified radar target. Dr Clarke has traced the pilots and navigators of both aircraft and have copies of their personal logbooks which confirm these dates and timings.

But in trying to confirm these details from records at Kew ie ORBs (AIR 27/2742, AIR 29/2631 and AIR 25/1555-6), he has drawn a blank.

He has been given to understand that the information he seeks would be on Form 541 (the appendices!). Some earlier 541s (1947) are located at Kew and contain the kind of information he seeks, but those for 1956 are not available.

He asks if those for the periods of interest survive, if so where are they and are they available to researchers?

Section 40

DAS4A(SEC)

From: Info(Exp)-Records1
Sent: 12 February 2001 12:17
To: Hd of AHB(RAF)
Cc: DAS4A(SEC)
Subject: ENQUIRY FROM DR DAVID CLARKE - FORM 541s

Section 40

Dr Clarke is an enthusiastic researcher into unexplained aerial phenomena.

He is researching an incident which occurred between 0010 hours and 0330 hours GMT on 14 August 1956, when an unidentified radar track was recorded by the GCI radar station at RAF Neatishead.

Apparently aircraft from 23 Sqn were scrambled from RAF Waterbeach to intercept this unidentified radar target. Dr Clarke has traced the pilots and navigators of both aircraft and have copies of their personal logbooks which confirm these dates and timings.

But in trying to confirm these details from records at Kew ie ORBs (AIR 27/2742, AIR 29/2631 and AIR 25/1555-6), he has drawn a blank.

He has been given to understand that the information he seeks would be on Form 541 (the appendices!). Some earlier 541s (1947) are located at Kew and contain the kind of information he seeks, but those for 1956 are not available.

He asks if those for the periods of interest survive, if so where are they and are they available to researchers?

Section 40

Ack 21

Discuss

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

72 16 Mar

Section 40

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Room 8241, Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

7 February 2001

DEFENCE
LONDON (SEC)
14-9 FEB 2001

Dear Section 40



Many thanks for your letter of 2 February and for the results of your review of UFO policy material from the period 1968-1981. I note your comments concerning the process by which 'policy' material was distributed across files created by the Secretariat, and the problems identifying this material within a range of subject files.

I was surprised to hear that 'a number of files' dealing with UFOs were likely to have been destroyed in 1990. It was my understanding that a policy decision had been taken during 1970, on instruction from an Under Secretary of State, to preserve all files relating to this subject. Has there been a subsequent change of policy, or does the preservation of files relate specifically to UFO reports, rather than UFO policy documents?

Despite the above, I was pleased to hear that you had identified three files containing policy material from the period specified in my request, including the file AF/419 relating to the 1972 BBC2 Man Alive Programme. I appreciate the effort you have made to locate these documents and to review them on my behalf, and I look forward to hearing the results in due course. I would of course wish to obtain copies of the documents concerned when this review is completed.

With regards to my request for access to more recent policy material I would like to take up your offer to search files if I was able to specify "a particular year, topic or incident." My research into the MOD's involvement in the UFO issue during the past half century would not be complete, or comprehensive, without making reference to the saga of the "Rendlesham Forest/RAF Woodbridge" incident which occurred between 26-30 December, 1980. You will no doubt be acquainted with the details of the alleged 'sightings' by US airmen and others at the RAF Woodbridge base, which has generated sensational newspaper articles, books and a number of letters from members of the public addressed to your Secretariat ever since that time. Last year the claims resurfaced yet again in a further book entitled 'You Can't Tell the People,' the subject of questions in the House of Lords as recently as last week.

My review of the MOD's public statements relating to the Rendlesham case since it first received national publicity in 1983 have led me to agree with your original position that the alleged events had "no defence significance." Having visited the forest and observed the optical effects created by the beam from the Orfordness

lighthouse, I am inclined to agree that a completely down-to-earth explanation is readily available. Wherever the truth may lie, my interest is in the process whereby the MOD reached their original decision, and how public statements on this issue have been interpreted by the media and others who wish to promote fantasy rather than reality. In order to understand the decisions taken, it would be necessary to have access to the briefings upon which your Secretariat must have relied in order to answer both Parliamentary and public questions on this matter.

In a reply to a question from Martin Redmond MP in the Commons, the former Defence Minister Nicholas Soames said the original report from RAF Woodbridge was "assessed by the staff in my Department responsible for air defence matters...[and] the judgement was that it contained nothing of defence significance" (24 July 1996, Written Answers). In a reply to an earlier question requesting a list of papers held relating to the case, Mr Soames said other than the report written by the USAF deputy base commander "the documents held by my Department are internal staffing papers and correspondence from members of the public relating to the alleged events" (10 June 1996, Written answers).

As this 'incident' has been the subject both of questions in the Commons and the Lords, not to mention the focus of numerous enquiries from the public and news media, it must have generated a considerable number of Parliamentary briefings and internal policy documents. In the Lords on 30 January 2001 Baroness Symons referred to "surviving departmental records [which satisfy us] that nothing of defence significance occurred on the nights in question." I would ask, therefore, if it would be possible to carry out a review of the file/s which relate to this incident in order to determine if these records could be released (in a sanitised form, if necessary) for use in my research. This would enable me to place the MOD's public policy relating to this incident into its correct context.

?
— MOD PR
Finally, to bring my study fully up to present I wish to ask if it would be possible to arrange a formal 'question and answer' session with a member of DAS(Sec) staff, or an appropriately briefed MOD PR officer to discuss UFO policy as it stands today. In my journalistic capacity, I have discussed this subject with Squadron Leader **Section 40** **Section 40** during his duty on the RAF Press Desk, on a number of occasions and always found my questions answered comprehensively and helpfully. The questions I ask will be of a general nature, and I could supply a summary in advance if this would be helpful. You will find that my approach to the UFO subject is generally in sympathy with that adopted by the MOD. In my opinion no objective historian who has researched the documentary evidence available at the Public Record Office could arrive at any other conclusion, but I believe that the issue deserves study in terms of what we can learn about a range of subjects from perceptual psychology to social history.

In the meantime, thank you for your assistance with my inquiries and I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40





Section 40

OMD14
 Ministry of Defence
 Room 617,
 Northumberland House
 Northumberland Avenue
 LONDON
 WC2N 5BP

Telephone: Section 40
 Fax: Section 40

Fax

To: Section 40

Fax: Section 40

Phone:

Pages: 1 (including this cover page)

Date: 12th January 2000

Re: Dr Clarke, Section 40 - UFO files.

Section 40

Dr Clarke: Thanks for faxing the DIS letter over to me. Having spoken with DOMD I'm happy that you treat your end of Dr Clarke's request as complete. However I've contacted DIS about the file they mention in their letter. I can't see a reason for refusing to release the information concerned. We'll chase them up on this. If they agree to release this info to Dr Clarke will I get them to forward it to you?

Section 40 As long as the files withheld by the RAF would reveal details of operational procedures then exemption 1a is okay. Any other information would have to be considered separately. Was there a possibility of releasing some info but not the whole document? If not, then I'm happy with the letter to go out as is.

Once again, I'm sorry about the delay in getting back to you.

Section 40

Dr. Clarke. DI anxious not to split file. DAS (Lee) leads on policy

File

71



From: Section 40
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8241, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

Section 40
020 7218 9000
Section 40

Dr D W Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS(Sec)64/3/1
Date
2 February 2001

Dear Dr Clarke,



Thank you for your letter of 15 January enclosing your cheque for £183.75 for the reviewing, sanitising and photocopying work done on your behalf. The cheque was sent to Defence Records with the request that a receipt be issued to you.

A review of material from the period 1968 to 1981 identified some eighty files. As a part of the work of the Secretariat is to handle correspondence from members of the public, policy discussion on how best to answer a particular letter has tended to be spread across the range of subject files rather than appearing exclusively in designated "Policy" files. Starting by isolating only those files with policy in the title we trawled through the Records area of the Department before conducting a search of files still with the Secretariat. The conclusion of that search was that it appeared that a number of files are likely to have been destroyed in 1990; a few 'UFO' files including policy volumes were among that number. I am sorry to have to give you this disappointing news.

We have, however, identified three files that contain some policy material. One of those was the AF/419 'UFOs' BBC2 Man Alive Programme' mentioned in your recent letter. I am now calling for those files to be returned to this building. The room in which they are kept has been closed to staff for some ten days for repair work but I am hoping that Records staff will have access next week so that they can send them to me. I am not sure how many documents those files might contain so I will not attempt to estimate how quickly we might review and photocopy relevant material. I shall however write again once the files have reached us.

In your letter of 15 January you also refer to more recent policy material. As I indicate above, policy discussion is spread over the series of 'UFO' subject files as well as being located on specific policy files but if you were able to indicate a particular year, topic or incident, we shall conduct a search.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

70

LOOSE MINUTE

D/DAS(Sec)/64/3/11 ←

23 January 2001

Info(Exp)-Records 1 - **Section 40**


CHEQUE FROM DR CLARKE FOR WORK UNDERTAKEN

1. Please find attached a cheque for £183.75 from Dr. Clarke for the material you kindly provided, plus a copy of his covering letter to **Section 40**.
2. I would be grateful if you could arrange for a receipt to be sent to Dr Clarke.

Section 40

DAS(Sec)4a1a

Section 40 MB8245



Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

**Ministry of Defence
Room 8243
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB**

15 January 2001

Your ref: D/DAS (Sec)64/3/1

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your letter of 5 January. The parcel containing copies of the files I requested arrived here at the end of last week, and in return I enclose a crossed cheque made out for the amount agreed. It would be helpful if you could let me have a receipt specifying the work done for use in my end of year accounts.

I wish to thank you and the staff who worked to process my request before the holiday. Your help is very much appreciated and the material you sent will be of great help as part my ongoing research, which will acknowledge the assistance the MOD have provided.

With regards to my request for copies of "additional UFO policy files 1968-81", I look forward to your response when this is convenient. Having reviewed the contents of the policy file AF/3459/75 I would certainly wish to see more recent policy documents, as these are directly relevant to my research into the UK Government's official position on this nebulous subject.

Further to the above, I wonder if you could include within the category "UFO policy files 1968-81" a copy of the file AF/419 "UFOs: BBC2 Man Alive Programme" which I believe dates from the year 1972. This TV programme is referred to in the 1970 file, and is of interest as it appears to have been the first time an MOD spokesperson appeared on British TV to answer questions on the UFO issue. I'm happy to leave to your discretion what other files are deemed to fall within the terms of my supplementary request. This will form the sum total of my request under the Code of Practice for Access to Government Information.

With regards to my question regarding the location of the missing file DSI/JTIC Report No 7. I'm satisfied that your staff have done everything reasonable to locate this document, but it is encouraging that you do not appear to completely rule out the possibility that it could have survived and may one day be found. In the meantime, I will

continue to pursue other lines of inquiry to locate the document and if successful will provide the MOD with a new copy for your records.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area, obscuring the name and any handwritten notes.

Dr D.W.Clarke



Lloyds TSB

30-97-51

Church Street Sheffield Branch
14 Church Street Sheffield South Yorkshire S1 1HP

Date 15 JANUARY
2001

Pay ACCOUNTING OFFICER^{OP} MOD

Bermrose 9506

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-THREE £ 183.75

POUNDS AND SEVENTY-FIVE PENCE ONLY

DR D CLARKE

Section 40

2NOV99 Lloyds TSB Bank plc


Cheque No.

Branch No.

Account No.

⑈000170⑈ 30⑈975⑈⑈

84814



Dr David Clarke

Section 40

69

Section 40

Ministry of Defence
Room 8243
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

15 January 2001

Your ref: D/DAS (Sec)64/3/1

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your letter of 5 January. The parcel containing copies of the files I requested arrived here at the end of last week, and in return I enclose a crossed cheque made out for the amount agreed. It would be helpful if you could let me have a receipt specifying the work done for use in my end of year accounts.

I wish to thank you and the staff who worked to process my request before the holiday. Your help is very much appreciated and the material you sent will be of great help as part my ongoing research, which will acknowledge the assistance the MOD have provided.

With regards to my request for copies of "additional UFO policy files 1968-81", I look forward to your response when this is convenient. Having reviewed the contents of the policy file AF/3459/75 I would certainly wish to see more recent policy documents, as these are directly relevant to my research into the UK Government's official position on this nebulous subject.

Further to the above, I wonder if you could include within the category "UFO policy files 1968-81" a copy of the file AF/419 "UFOs: BBC2 Man Alive Programme" which I believe dates from the year 1972. This TV programme is referred to in the 1970 file, and is of interest as it appears to have been the first time an MOD spokesperson appeared on British TV to answer questions on the UFO issue. I'm happy to leave to your discretion what other files are deemed to fall within the terms of my supplementary request. This will form the sum total of my request under the Code of Practice for Access to Government Information.

With regards to my question regarding the location of the missing file DSI/JTIC Report No 7. I'm satisfied that your staff have done everything reasonable to locate this document, but it is encouraging that you do not appear to completely rule out the possibility that it could have survived and may one day be found. In the meantime, I will

continue to pursue other lines of inquiry to locate the document and if successful will provide the MOD with a new copy for your records.

I look forward to hearing from you,

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

A large black rectangular redaction box covers the signature area. The text "Section 40" is printed in orange at the top left corner of this redacted area.

Dr D.W.Clarke



From: Section 40
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

68

Telephone (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

Section 40
020 7218 9000
Section 40

Dr D W Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS(Sec)64/3/1
Date
5 January 2001

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter of 2 January enquiring about progress photocopying the material you requested.

The task was finished on 21 December, the material reached this building between Christmas and New Year and is now being packed for posting to you. I am not sure how many days it may take to reach you and so, although I shall have a copy of this letter placed in the parcel, I am also sending a separate copy to keep you informed.

You will receive the contents of:

AIR 2/18564 (PRO reference)

AIR 2/18873 (PRO reference)

AF/584 (MOD reference)

AF/3459/75 (MOD reference)

A number of 'UFO' related documents on files DEFE 3119 and DEFE 44/1 have also been photocopied and accompany the material listed above.

The work has taken 16 hours and 15 minutes to complete and, as indicated in my letter of 6 October, the first 4 are free of charge. The remaining 12 hours and 15 minutes, at £15.00 an hour, result in a cost of £183.75. I would be grateful if you would let me have your crossed cheque, made payable to "Accounting Officer MOD", once all the material has reached you.

I apologise for the fact that I am still not able to reply to your request concerning the "additional policy files 1968-81". If, by the middle of next week a response early in January seems unlikely I shall let you know.

Finally, in your letter of 10 October, you asked about the possibility of a further search within MOD files for DSI/JTIC Report Number 7. Unfortunately, there are not the resources to undertake a full search of files stored in the MOD archives, which seems to be what you have in mind. However, Records staff have, in recent years, seen many files in the course of an

accelerated review of records closed for more than 30 years and reviewed DIS material more than 20 years old. As even this extensive work, along with more recent searches, has failed to locate Report Number 7 the opinion, that it has not survived the passage of time, appears very reasonable. Perhaps your other lines of inquiry have been more successful.

Yours sincerely,

RESTRICTED/UNCLASSIFIED
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

MOD Form 329 D

PART I

1532496
 Registered file number
3459/75
PART I
 Date opened
 13. 5. 70
 RE: RES FROM AFK 80/m.

1. ATTENTION IS DRAWN TO THE NOTES ON THE INSIDE FLAP
2. ENTER NOTES OF RELATED FILES ON PAGE 2 OF THIS JACKET

DIVISION
FOR REGISTRY USE ONLY

1115

SUBJECT

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - POLICY
 AND POLICY STATEMENTS

Referred to	DATE	Referred to	DATE	Referred to	DATE	Referred to	DATE
(AIR)	12. 8. 75						
<p>DO NOT BE PLACED THIS FILE</p>		<div style="border: 2px solid black; border-radius: 50%; padding: 20px; text-align: center;"> <p>MOD CS(RM)1 - 8 JAN 1999 SECOND REVIEW</p> <p>2001</p> </div>					
(R)	12. 8. 75						

FOR REGISTRY USE ONLY
 Date

DOWNGRADING

(to be completed as necessary, and in any event when the file goes out of current use)

- (i) This file may be downgraded to UNCLASSIFIED on
 (insert date)

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

A. Date, Time & Duration of Sighting
Description of Object
B. (No. of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness <i>and smell</i>)
Exact Position of Observer
C. Location, indoor/outdoor, stationary/moving
How Observed (Naked eye, D. binoculars, other optical device, still or movie)
Direction in which object first seen
E. (A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing)
F. Angle of Sight (Estimated heights are unreliable)
G. Distance (By reference to a known landmark)
Movements (Changes in E F & G H. may be of more use than estimates of course and speed)
J. Met Conditions during Observations (Moving clouds, haze, mist, etc)
Nearby Objects (Telephone lines, high voltage lines, reservoir, lake or dam, swamp or marsh, river, K. high buildings, tall chimneys, steeples, spires, TV or radio masts, airfields, generating plant, factories, pits or other sites with floodlights or night lighting)
L. To Whom Reported (Police, military, press etc)
M. Name & Address of Informant
N. Background of Informant that may be volunteered
O. Other Witnesses
P. Date, Time of Receipt

Q. Detailed Met Report.
(AFOR to Obtain)

R. ~~STCC~~ ADOC Assessment . UKKRO
(Check radars, ATCCs etc)

1. Aircraft.
2. Ranges.
3. Gliding .
4. Balloon.
5. Air Sea Rescue
Activities.

Date.....

.....
Squadron Leader
Duty Operations Officer
AFOR(RAF)

Copies to:

S4f(Air)
~~STCC~~ UKKRO
Ops(GE)2(RAF)
DI 55
DI-50C
Science 43
File AFOR/92/502

410

From: Mr J A Peduzie

E 17



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB
Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)
01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

Royal Holloway College
Egham Hill
Egham
Surrey
TW20 0EX

Your reference

Our reference

AF/CX 80/70

Date

30 July 1975

Dear

E 13

I apologise for the delay in answering your request for access to the Ministry of Defence files on Unidentified Flying Objects - the more so as I must send a disappointing reply.

We have given a good deal of thought to this proposal but I am forced to the conclusion that two difficulties stand in the way. Firstly, the correspondence between the Department and members of the public on this subject has always been treated as confidential, and the reports could not be made available unless every single piece of paper were edited to remove the identity of the observer, or his written permission were obtained to divulge the information he had provided. This in itself would be a formidable task and, while I have every confidence in your assurance that the anonymity of witnesses would be respected, I cannot evade responsibility for inadvertent disclosure.

More importantly, the files would have to be expurgated of Ministry of Defence commentaries. For obvious reasons, we have to satisfy ourselves that reports of UFOs have no implications for the defence of the country and our advisers naturally draw on classified information where this might be relevant to a specific report under discussion. Here again there is a chance that something might slip through and this is a risk I cannot afford to ignore.

I am very sorry I cannot be more helpful but I can assure you we have not treated your request lightly.

Yours sincerely

(E16)

LCOSE MINUTE

S4(Air) (Mr Peduzie)

Copy to:- DCS(RAF)

UFO RECORDS

Reference: AF/CX 80/70-dated 6 June 75. ^{-E15-}

1. DCS(RAF) has asked me to reply to your minute at reference.
2. The Royal Holloway College 'team' which comes in practice from RHC, King's College, London and National Physical Laboratory, seems to be a group of academics drawn together by an interest in UFOs. It would be difficult to distinguish it from any other group of academics which might be drawn together by a common interest, of which there could be many, and therefore I do not believe that it can be described as 'a major scientific organisation of high standing'. For this reason I suggest that the request be turned down.
3. I also have some reservations about the objective of the study. It is described as 'obtaining data concerning rare atmospheric events, such as "ball-lightning".....for use as material for a scientific conference on little-understood aerial phenomena'. Dr Christopher Evans is an applied psychologist who has written books on topics such as scientology, Subbud and other fringe activities, and who also appears frequently on TV and radio. It therefore appears that the study might range more widely than the brief description suggests. In any case you would require more information before it could be called 'strong scientific reason' for undertaking the work.
4. However, I believe that sooner or later somebody will break this confidentiality barrier, and the data will have to be sanitised. Have you considered asking the Air Historical Branch whether they could employ a consultant to do this?

see E21.

J. E. Harrison

11 June 75

J E A HARRISON
ACS(G)RAF

(15)

LOOSE MINUTE

AF/CX 80/70

PS/CS(RAF)

See 116.

UFO RECORDS

1. I attach a copy of a letter from Royal Holloway College, University of London, in which they seek access to our UFO records.
2. We are not infrequently asked by outside bodies or individuals for permission to examine our UFO reports. Up to now these have all been refused on the grounds that all correspondence between MOD and members of the public is regarded as confidential and could not be made available to public scrutiny unless the reports were edited to preserve the anonymity of the reporter or the observer's permission were obtained. It would also be necessary to examine all the records to ensure that no classified information used in the course of investigating reports was inadvertently released. The time and effort in this task would be formidable and up to now we have taken the general line that reports should remain closed until they became available under the Public Record Acts after 30 years.
3. Ministers have announced, however, that an applications for access would be considered on its merits if it came from a major scientific organisation of high standing which had strong reasons for examining our records. The question is whether this concession should be extended to the Royal Holloway College, who are well aware of the Ministerial undertaking. I do not think our files would help them - the MOD investigations go no further than the defence implications - but the raw material could I suppose have objective value.
4. I should be grateful for your views on the standing of the Royal Holloway College team as a "Major Scientific Organisation" and whether the relevance of the UFO reports to their enquiries can be construed as a "strong reason".
5. I am sure we can rely on your objective advice. My heart quails at the thought of the massive editing that might have to be done and, with our overtaxed resources, I would not wish to embark on it unless in your view it has a demonstrable scientific value.

6 Jun 75

J A Peduzie
J A PEDUZIE
S4(Air)



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HE

Telephone 01-218 (Direct Dialling)

01-218 9000 (Switchboard)

(E14)

Royal Holloway College
Egham Hill
Egham
Surrey
TW20 0EX

Your reference

Our reference

AE/7464/72, CX 8970

Date

28 May 1975

Dear [redacted]

I am writing to thank you for your recent letter about unidentified flying object reports: this is receiving attention and we will write to you again on this subject as soon as possible.

Yours faithfully

H E MACKLEY

Egham Hill
Egham
Surrey TW20 0L
Egham 6371

please reply to

Department S4f(Air)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Whitehall, London SW1

*Review
alternatives*

Dear Sirs

Further to [redacted] recent telephone conversation with Miss Jamieson of your Department, we are writing to request that we be permitted to have access to the Department's files on Unidentified Flying Object reports, in the hope that data might thereby be obtained concerning rare atmospheric events, such as "ball-lightning".

The data would be used as material for a scientific conference on little-understood aerial phenomena. Should you require further information, please let us know.

This request is made on the understanding that we would respect the Department's policy of witness anonymity. You may wish to impose further restrictions, although we would prefer to be unhampered by such so far as possible.

Thank you in anticipation of your consideration of this request.

ROYAL HOLLOWAY COLLEGE
(University of London)
Egham Hill, Egham
Surrey TW20 0EX

1975 April 10

Miss Jamieson
Dept S4f (Air)
Ministry of Defence

Dear Miss Jamieson

Further to our telephone conversation of today's date, I shall write as you suggested in about two weeks' time when I have had the opportunity to discuss the subject of the "UFD files" with my colleagues.

Meantime, many thanks for your help.

Yours sincerely

LOOSE MINUTE

(E11)

DI 55/40/9/1

Miss G J Jamieson
S4f(Air)
Room 8235 MB

UFO REPORTS

1. I have examined your UFO report 557/10/20 and have the following comments.
2. The time of the sighting is within 3 minutes of the time of "nautical twilight" for that day. The sky also seems to have been cloudy. In late October there could well have been a layer of ice crystals in the atmosphere which might have produced an halation effect from the sun's rays. The net result is the appearance of a "false sun" such as is frequently seen in Arctic regions when the sun is just below the horizon. It often appears "diamond shaped".
3. Thank you for referring to the change in procedures. I propose that, under these circumstances, we should no longer receive UFO reports routinely. Any reports which are difficult to categorise could perhaps be sent to DI 55b on a monthly basis, as has in fact been happening. We would also welcome receipt of your statistics at whatever period you prepare them.

a7 Jan 72

DR J WALTON
for ADI/DI 55

LOGSE MINUTE


AF/CX 80/70

DI55b (Dr Walton)

I should be grateful for any comments you can make concerning the UFO sighting reported in the attached folder 557/10/20. Enquiries made by STCCC of Air Defence Radars have proved negative.

2. You will wish to know that US of S (RAF) has agreed to change of procedures in dealing with correspondence from the public concerning UFOs, proposed in S4(Air)'s loose minute AF/CX 80/70 of 16 December, and reports received after 1 January 1972 will be acknowledged by S4F(Air) in the form of the attached letter. You may wish to consider whether we should periodically forward any of the reports to your branch for perusal.

20 January 1972.


Miss G J Jamieson
S4F(Air)
MB Ext: 7035



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE S4f(Air)
Main Building, Whitehall, LONDON S.W.1
Telephone: WHITEhall 7022, ext.

79.

Our reference: AF/CX80/70
Your reference:

7th January 1972

Sir

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Reference A: AF/X58/64/S4f(Air) dated 29 March 1967

In Reference A guidance was given on the action to be taken by units on receipt of reports of unidentified flying objects.

I am directed to inform you that approval has now been given for a change of procedure in dealing with correspondence with the public about reported UFO sightings. All reports will be examined as heretofore so that defence implications, if any, may be investigated. However, with the limited resources now available to deal with correspondence from the public on the subject of UFOs, the Department can no longer undertake to advise observers of the probable identity of the object seen. It is therefore necessary for Item-Q, which asks if a reply is requested, to be deleted from the form on which reports are made. All reports received by units should, as in the past, be forwarded to AFOR for normal circulation action.

Reports will be acknowledged by S4f(Air) to the observer with a short pro-forma letter.

Any enquiries from the press should, as before, be referred to the Ministry of Defence Press office.

It will be necessary to continue to categorize reports where possible for the Department's records of UFOs and the monthly summary currently prepared by HQ Strike Command (STCOC) will therefore still be required.

I am Sir

Your obedient Servant

MISS G J JAMIESON

To: Air Officers Commanding-in-Chief
Strike Command
Air Support Command
Maintenance Command
Training Command

Copies to: AFOR
DPR(RAF)
DST1
Ops(GE)2c(RAF)
ATSA2-Mr Rice

S4(Air) (Mr Davis) *ld*

Mr. *Cliff*

Miss *Tamison*

- Copy to: DUS(Air)
- D of Ops(A Def & O)(RAF)
- D of Ops(S)(RAF)
- DST1
- DR Met O
- DPR(RAF)

for file

ld
-3/1

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - SUGGESTED
NEW PROCEDURES

US of S(RAF) is content with the change in procedures proposed in your minute reference AF/CX 80/70 dated 16th December 1971, and with the Proforma Letter as amended by DUS(Air) (attached).

Newham
Beaumont

(N.J. BEAUMONT)
PS to US of S(RAF)

31st December 1971

DRAFT PRO-FORMA LETTER

I am writing to thank you for your report of an unidentified flying object seen on

We are grateful to you for advising the Department of this incident and your report will be examined in the Ministry of Defence to see if there are any defence implications. We cannot undertake to pursue our research, other than for defence implications, to a point where positive correlation with a known object is established, nor to advise you of the probable identity of the object seen.

You will no doubt wish to know, however, that ^{simple explanations a} ~~the great majority~~ *found for the great majority* of UFO reports, ~~turn out to have mundane explanations,~~ the most common single source being aircraft or the lights of aircraft seen under unusual meteorological conditions. Other common sources have proved to be astronomical sightings, space satellites or space junk, balloons, unusual cloud formations or aircraft condensation trails. Investigations over a number of years have so far produced no evidence that UFOs represent an air defence threat to the United Kingdom.

100. MINUTE

AF/CX 80/70

PS/US of S(RAF) [Through DUS(Air)]

- Copies to: AUS(O)(Air)
- D of Ops(A Def & O)(RAF)
- D of Ops(S)(RAF)
- DST1
- DR Met O
- DPR(RAF)

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - SUGGESTED NEW PROCEDURES

1. When the USAF announced in December 1969 the termination of project Blue Book (which was a special US unit set up to investigate reports of UFOs) the MOD position concerning UFO investigations was reviewed. It was decided early in 1970 that our policies and procedures for dealing with these reports should continue unchanged. (Flag C on AF/PS 26/70 attached).
2. In accordance with this procedure JFO reports are currently circulated, either by S4(Air) or AFOR, to STCCO, Ops(GE)2(RAF), STCIC and DI55. When it is concluded that there is no defence implication it is our current practice to make an assessment of the identity of the object from available information; where the report is not likely to have originated from an aircraft movement advice may be sought from Met O9 if a meteorological balloon might have been involved, or from the Royal Observatory if a star or planet might have been the source. We do not pursue our enquiries to a point where a positive identification is established, nor do we re-examine our conclusions if the observer disagrees with them. We do not investigate anonymous reports, nor, normally, reports forwarded by UFO associations on behalf of third parties.
3. One of the factors leading to the decision in 1970 to continue to deal with UFO reports in this way was the need to answer questions from the public which might arise from a real anxiety about national security. However, recent publicity given to the subject of UFOs by the press and television has resulted in an increased volume of reports from the public. During the three months August to October this year, 118 reports were received compared with 56 in the same period of 1970. 23 were received within three days of the showing on television on 26th October of an alleged UFO filmed at Enstone in Oxfordshire, which has since been the subject of a Parliamentary Enquiry. Since the end of October a single Banbury resident has sent to the Department 84 separate reports of UFO "sightings" in the Banbury area. There is now pressure for a responsible MOD official to appear on a BBC TV programme to discuss UFO reports and MOD procedures for handling them.
4. All letters and telephone calls during working hours concerning UFOs are at present dealt with by a single HEO in S4(Air) who is occupied almost whole time on other work. Outside working hours calls are dealt with by AFOR and actioned by S4(Air) the next day. With the limited

resources available in this Division, especially since the recent establishment cuts, it is recommended that time and effort should no longer be expended in dealing with UFO reports beyond their circulation as detailed in para 2, so that air defence implications, if any, may be examined. Members of the public would be advised that their report will be examined for this purpose but that we cannot undertake to identify the object seen. A pro-forma letter would normally be used on the lines of the draft attached to this minute.

5. If US of S(RAF) approves this proposed change in procedure S4(Air) will notify RAF Commands that individuals who report UFO sightings should no longer be asked whether they wish to be advised of our findings. We would continue to categorize reports where possible for our records and to retain the records of reports in the manner agreed in March 1970.

A. H. DAVIS

A H DAVIS
S4(AIR)

16 Dec 71

DRAFT PRO-FORMA LETTER

I am writing to thank you for your report of an unidentified flying object seen on

We are grateful to you for advising the Department of this incident and your report will be examined in the Ministry of Defence to see if there are any defence implications. We cannot undertake to pursue our research, other than for defence implications, to a point where positive correlation with a known object is established, nor to advise you of the probable identity of the object seen.

You will no doubt wish to know, however, that the great majority of UFO reports turn out to have mundane explanations, the most common single source being aircraft or the lights of aircraft seen under unusual meteorological conditions. Other common sources have proved to be astronomical sightings, space satellites or space junk, balloons, unusual cloud formations or aircraft condensation trails. Investigations over a number of years have so far produced no evidence that UFOs represent an air defence threat to the United Kingdom.

E.G.

Reference D/DSTI/126/6

Head of S.4 (Air) ✓

Copies to: AUS(O) (Air)
D of Ops(A Def & O)RAF
D of Ops(S)(RAF)
DR Met O
DPR (RAF)
ADI DI 55

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - SUGGESTED NEW PROCEDURES

Reference AF/CX 80/70 dated 9th December 1971.

I have no comments.



15 December 1971

DSTI

Note.

By Capt Scott, D.I. ops (R) (R100R) who is administratively responsible for WOK telephoned on 15/12/71 to suggest that para. 4. of the draft loss minute to PS/US95(R/R) should include a reference to the fact that calls after duty hours are dealt with through WOK and actioned by 54F(Air) the next day. He thought this would strengthen our case.

As regards the draft pro-forma letter he suggested that the word "air" should be deleted from line 3 of para 2 before "defence implications". In line 5 of para 2 he thought we should insert after "research" "other than for defence implications" & delete sentence "I regret that we are unable to extend our investigations beyond our

LOOSE MINUTE

AF/CX 80/70

AUS(O)(Air)
D of Ops(A Def & O)(RAF)
D of Ops(S)(RAF)
DST1
DR Met O
DPR(RAF)

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - SUGGESTED NEW PROCEDURES

I attach a self-explanatory draft minute which, subject to your comments, I propose to send to PS/US of S(RAF). In the absence of any comment from your Directorate by 1700 hrs on 15 December I shall assume your concurrence.

9 December 1971

A W Davis
A W DAVIS
S4(Air)

) LOOSE MINUTE

AF/CX 80/70

PS/US of S(RAF) [through DUS(Air)]

Copies to: AUS(O)(Air)
D of Ops(A Def & O)(RAF)
D of Ops(S)(RAF)
DST1
DR Met O
DPR(RAF)

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - SUGGESTED NEW PROCEDURES

1. When the USAF announced in December 1969 the termination of project Blue Book (which was a special US unit set up to investigate reports of UFOs) the MOD position concerning UFO investigations was reviewed. It was decided early in 1970 that our policies and procedures for dealing with these reports should continue unchanged. The authority of the then US of S(RAF) was recorded in the papers associated with Parliamentary Enquiry AF/PS 26/70, which were circulated to copy addressees under loose minute AF/X58/64 dated 24th March 1970 (not to AUS(O)(Air).
2. In accordance with this procedure UFO reports are currently circulated, either by S4(Air) or AFOR, to STCOC, Ops(GE)2(RAF), STCIC and D155. When it is concluded that there is no defence implication it is our current practice to make an assessment of the identity of the object from available information; if the report is not likely to have originated from an aircraft movement advice may be sought from Met 09 if a meteorological balloon might have been involved, or from the Royal Observatory if a star or planet might have been the source. We do not pursue our enquiries to a point where a positive identification is established, nor do we re-examine our conclusions if the observer disagrees with them. We do not investigate anonymous reports, nor, normally, reports forwarded by UFO associations on behalf of third parties.

3. One of the factors leading to the decision in 1970 to continue to deal with UFO reports in this way was the need to answer questions from the public which might arise from a real anxiety about national security. However, recent publicity given to the subject of UFOs by the press and television has resulted in an increased volume of reports from the public. During the three months August to October this year, 118 reports were received compared with 56 in the same period of 1970. 23 were received within three days of the showing on television on 26th October of an alleged UFO filmed at Enstone in Oxfordshire, which has since been the subject of a Parliamentary Enquiry. Since the end of October a single Banbury resident has sent to the Department 84 separate reports of UFO "sightings" in the Banbury area.

4. All letters and telephone calls during working hours concerning UFOs are at present dealt with by a single HEO in S4(Air) whose primary responsibilities are as follows:-

Co-ordination of RAF aspects of MOD War Book.

Co-ordination of NATO Alert measures with Government War Book.

Supervision of clerical work of Air Force Board and Standing Committee.

At present the MOD War Book is being entirely rewritten in line with the NATO Alert system and the HEO is concerned almost whole time with this work.

5. With the limited resources available in this Division, especially since the recent establishment cuts, it is recommended that time and effort should no longer be expended in dealing with UFO reports beyond their circulation as detailed in para 2, so that air defence implication if any, may be examined. Members of the public would be advised that their report will be examined for this purpose but that we cannot undertake to identify the object seen. A pro-forma letter would normally be used on the lines of the draft attached to this minute.

6. If US of S(RAF) approves this proposed change in procedure S4(Air) will notify RAF Commands that in future individuals who report UFO sightings should no longer be asked whether they wish to be advised of our findings. We would continue to categorize reports where possible for our records and to retain the records of reports in the manner agreed in March 1970.

DRAFT PRO-FORMA

I am writing to thank you for your report of an unidentified flying object seen on

We are grateful to you for advising the Department of this incident and your report will be examined in the Ministry of Defence to see if there are any air defence implications. I regret that we are unable to extend our investigations beyond our defence interest. We cannot therefore undertake to pursue our research to a point where positive correlation with a known object is established, nor to advise you of the probable identity of the object seen.

You will no doubt wish to know, however, that the great majority of UFO reports turn out to have mundane explanations, the most common single source being aircraft or the lights of aircraft seen under unusual meteorological conditions. Investigations over a number of years ^{so far} have produced no evidence that UFOs represent an air defence threat to the United Kingdom.

CX801

Reference AF/PS 207/71

*Mr E take a copy for ufo people
replied
CDS
New Zealand
You too may be interested
in this material
G.D. 27/5*

E3

S4(Air) Mr Owens.

Copy to: DI55

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - PARLIAMENTARY ENQUIRY FROM SIR JOHN LANGFORD-HOLT MP

You may wish to have the enclosed copy of a reply which the Minister for Trade has sent to an enquiry from Sir John Langford-Holt MP about UFOs.

2. US of S(RAF)'s own letter of 14th May to Sir John, under the above reference, refers.

I.H. Morgan
(I.H. MORGAN)
APS/US of S(RAF)

25th May 1971



E2

DEPARTMENT OF TRADE AND INDUSTRY
1 VICTORIA STREET
LONDON S W 1
01-222 7877

The Minister for Trade

Sir John Langford-Holt MP
House of Commons
SW1

21 May 1971

Dear John,

Thank you for your letter of 6 May about instructions, within the National Air Traffic Control Services, for dealing with reports of unidentified flying objects.

NATCS units have instructions that, in the event of a report concerning an unidentified flying object, they should obtain as much as possible of the information required to complete a prescribed report form. The details are to be passed by telephone to the parent Air Traffic Control Centre(ATCC), while the completed report form is forwarded to the Ministry of Defence. The ATCC is required to give the details without delay to the Military Aero-nautical Information Service.

These instructions were first issued in January 1968, and published in the Manual of Air Traffic Control. I enclose copies of the relevant pages from that Manual, which include the report form.

The NATCS does not keep statistics of these reports once they have been passed on in this way, but I understand that Antony Lambton has recently written to you about reports received by his Department during 1970. I would suggest that he may be able to supply similar information for earlier years should you so wish, and am copying this letter to him.

Yours ever

Michael

Chapter 5:-

5.5. Reporting of Unidentified Flying Objects

5.5.1. In the event of a report concerning an unidentified flying object being received by an ATS unit the following action shall be taken.

5.5.2. The ATSU receiving the report shall obtain as much as possible of the information required to complete the report form shown at Appendix "F" and pass all details by telephone to the watch supervisor at the parent ATCC (Scottish ATCC, Preston ATCC or London ATCC). The completed form shall be sent by the originating ATSU to The Ministry of Defence (AFOR), Royal Air Force, Main Building, Whitehall, London SW1.

5.5.3. The Watch Supervisor at the ATCC concerned, shall pass all details without delay via the operational telephone network to the Military Aeronautical Information Service section at West Drayton, Uxbridge, extension 374. If it is necessary to use the GPO network the information should be passed to West Drayton, Uxbridge, extension 362.

5.5.4. Such reports shall be entered in the ATC log.

5.6. Reporting of Aircraft Incidents and Breaches of Regulations

5.6.1. Aircraft Incidents

An incident is an occurrence which, but for fortuitous circumstances, might have resulted in an accident, and may be caused by:

(a) Ground Organisation:

(i) equipment defects, faulty organisation and procedure, etc.;

(ii) personnel error, incompetence, negligence, failure to comply with instructions etc.

If it is thought that the cause of the incident may be attributed to ATC error, the ATCO i/c, or in his absence the watch supervisor or senior controller on duty, will ensure that written reports are made immediately by all ATC staff concerned and that a preliminary report is telephoned to the Divisional ATCO. Reports should comply with ATCI No. 8, para. 6.3.3.

(b) Aircraft—defects in the aircraft or its equipment, loss of control due to meteorological conditions, etc.

(c) Aircrew—negligence, incompetence, failure to comply with procedures and instructions, incorrect practices and errors of judgment, etc.

5.6.1.1. Minor Incidents (Form CA 163)

5.6.1.1.1. Minor incidents, such as errors in navigation, use of incorrect procedures, faulty radio operation etc., in which the safety of the aircraft or its occupants is not involved, shall be recorded on Form CA 163 Aircraft/Aircraft Radio Operation Fault Report. The completed form will be passed to the Air Traffic Controller i/c, the Centre Superintendent or the STO, as appropriate, who will review the circumstances and decide whether or not reference to the operating company is justified. A register of such incidents will be maintained showing the following information:—

(a) Station serial No.

(b) Operating agency

(c) Date of incident

(d) Aircraft registration

(e) Date referred to operator

(f) Brief details of incident

(g) Date reply received.

(h) Summary of explanation.

5.6.1.1.2. A copy of any Aircraft Operating Fault Report submitted to an operator will be forwarded to the DATCO for information.

5.6.1.2. Incidents Involving Safety (Form CA 1260)

5.6.1.2.1. Incidents in which the safety of an aircraft or of any person is threatened other than notified accidents and airmisses shall be recorded on Form CA 1260. Incidents of this nature which may in addition involve a breach of regulations will be recorded on this form and on Form CA 939. The completed form will be passed to the Aerodrome Commandant, the Centre Superintendent, the Chief Officer or the Aerodrome Licensee as appropriate, who will decide

(Chap 5:—contd.)

whether the matter can be dealt with locally or whether it should be submitted to higher authority for attention. His decision will depend on the degree of risk involved to other operations and to persons and property on the ground. Incidents recorded at ATCCs will normally be submitted by the Centre Superintendent to the Divisional Office for attention unless they can be dealt with locally without difficulty. Reports on all incidents on which local action has been taken will be forwarded to the Divisional Office for information.

- 5.6.1.2.2. A transcript of the R/T recording relating to the incident need not be made initially but one may be required later. Such R/T records will therefore be retained until the case is finally disposed of.
- 5.6.1.2.3. Incidents caused by unexpected weather and incidents calling for a statement of weather conditions will be referred without delay to the local meteorological office, or, where this office has only limited facilities, to the appropriate main or parent office.
- 5.6.1.2.4. Any incident which it is considered might give rise to public interest shall be reported without delay to the Board of Trade Press Office, 01-222 7877 Ext. 2231, or 2684 (or Night Duty Officer 01-222 7877).
- 5.6.1.2.5. Where an arrangement exists for form CA 1260 to be prepared in respect of "off paved area" incidents, the information to be provided by the ATSU will normally be:—
- (a) aerodrome, time and date;
 - (b) aircraft type and registration ;
 - (c) direction and length of runway on which the incident occurred and, if this was not the runway in use, the fact should be noted. In the case of over-runs the state of the runway surface should be described, i.e. wet, dry, icy, etc.;
 - (d) particulars of the aircraft movement in question with a sketch plan to show its ground track, including the distances run off the paved surface and lateral displacement from the centre line of the runway or taxiway;
 - (e) wind velocity, temperature and barometric pressure. Visibility or runway visual range, weather conditions at the time, visual or radio approach procedure in use and details of obstruction lighting;
 - (f) State of unpaved surface at the time, including remarks as to the effect thereon of the season or recent weather.
- 5.6.1.3. *Ground Radio Fault Report* (Form CA 647)
- 5.6.1.3.1. When any telecommunications facility is alleged to be faulty by an aircrew member, details will be entered on Form CA 647 where held and forwarded to the STO for attention.
- 5.6.1.3.2. Notwithstanding satisfactory ground reports if a crew member of a subsequent aircraft confirms the reported fault, the procedure shall be as follows:—
- (a) At ATCC's the STO after consultation with the Centre Superintendent will decide on one of the courses of action in para. 5.6.1.3.3.
 - (b) At aerodromes, the STO after consultation with the Air Traffic Controller i/c will decide on one of the courses of action below. The STO will advise the aerodrome authority of the action taken.
 - (c) At non-state aerodromes the report should be given to the aerodrome licensee.
- 5.6.1.3.3. The courses of action are:—
- (a) To retain the facility in operation as fully serviceable.
 - (b) To retain the facility with specified limitations.
 - (c) To withdraw the facility from service.

APPENDIX "F"

REPORT OF AN UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

- A. Date, Time and Duration of Sighting
Local times to be quoted.
- B. Description of Object
Number of objects, size, shape, colours, brightness, sound, smell, etc.
- C. Exact Position of Observer
Geographical location, indoors or outdoors, stationary or moving.
- D. How Observed
Naked eye, binoculars, other optical device, still or movie camera.
- E. Direction in which Object was First Seen
A landmark may be more useful than a badly estimated bearing.
- F. Angular Elevation of Object
Estimated heights are unreliable.
- G. Distance of Object from Observer
By reference to a known landmark wherever possible.
- H. Movements of Object
Changes in E, F and G may be of more use than estimates of course and speed.
- J. Meteorological Conditions During Observations
Moving clouds, haze, mist, etc.
- K. Nearby Objects
Telephone or high-voltage lines; reservoir, lake or dam; swamp or marsh; river; high buildings, tall chimneys, steeples, spires, TV or radio masts; airfields; generating plant; factories, pits or other sites with floodlights or other lighting.
- L. To Whom Reported
Police, military organisations, the press etc.
- M. Name and Address of Informant
- N. Any Background Information on the Informant that may be Volunteered
- O. Other Witnesses
- P. Date and Time of Receipt of Report
- Q. Is a Reply Requested?



EMBASSY
OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
OFFICE OF THE AIR ATTACHE
LONDON

51

U-1397-70/AIRA TECH

23 June 1970

*Mr E
file away
(I think this
is in policy
file)*

Mr. L. W. Akhurst
(S4f (Air))
MOD, Main Building
Whitehall, SW.1

Dear Mr. Akhurst:

Reference is made to your letter of 25 February 1970 *E60*
requesting information on how the United States is
handling Unidentified Flying Objects now that Project
Blue Book is closed. We have just had a reply from
the Department of the Air Force and are enclosing the
information which they provided. I hope this informa-
tion will be of some assistance to you. *AF/X58/64 PE*

Sincerely,

Ward W. Hemenway

WARD W. HEMENWAY
Colonel, USAF
Assistant Air Attache

1 Encl

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON 20330



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

We wish to acknowledge receipt of your recent inquiry. Please accept this form of response so that we may give you a reply without undue delay.

On December 17, 1969 the Secretary of the Air Force announced the termination of Project Blue Book, the Air Force Program for the investigation of unidentified flying objects (UFOs).

The decision to discontinue UFO investigations was based on an evaluation of a report prepared by the University of Colorado entitled, "Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects;" a review of the University of Colorado's report by the National Academy of Sciences; past UFO studies; and Air Force experience investigating UFO reports during the past two decades.

As a result of these investigations and studies, and experience gained from investigating UFO reports since 1948, the conclusions of Project Blue Book are: (1) no UFO reported, investigated, and evaluated by the Air Force has ever given any indication of threat to our national security; (2) there has been no evidence submitted to or discovered by the Air Force that sightings categorized as "unidentified" represent technological developments or principles beyond the range of presentday scientific knowledge; and (3) there has been no evidence indicating that sightings categorized as "unidentified" are extraterrestrial vehicles.

With the termination of Project Blue Book, the Air Force regulation establishing and controlling the program for investigating and analyzing UFOs has been rescinded, and Project Blue Book records have been transferred to the Air Force Archives.

Attached for your information is the Project Blue Book sighting summary for the period 1947-1969. Also included is a listing of UFO-related materials currently available through publication outlets of the federal government.

Your interest in the United States Air Force is appreciated.

Sincerely,

JAMES H. AIKMAN, Lt Colonel, USAF
Chief, Civil Branch
Community Relations Division
Office of Information

Atchs

Encl 1

TOTAL UFO SIGHTINGS, 1947-1969

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>TOTAL SIGHTINGS</u>	<u>UNIDENTIFIED</u>
1947	122	12
1948	156	7
1949	186	22
1950	210	27
1951	169	22
1952	1,501	303
1953	509	42
1954	487	46
1955	545	24
1956	670	14
1957	1,006	14
1958	627	10
1959	390	12
1960	557	14
1961	591	13
1962	474	15
1963	399	14
1964	562	19
1965	887	16
1966	1,112	32
1967	937	19
1968	375	3
1969	146	1
<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
TOTAL	12,618	701

UFO MATERIALS

UFOs and Related Subjects: An Annotated Bibliography. Lynn E. Catoe.
Prepared by the Library of Congress Science and Technology Division.
Library of Congress Card Catalog No. 68-62196. For sale by the
Superintendent of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington,
D. C. 20402, \$3.50. GPO# D301.45-19-2:68-1656.

Aids to Identification of Flying Objects. For sale by the Superintendent
of Documents, U. S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C. 20402,
36 p., 20¢ per pamphlet. GPO# D301.2:F67.

Scientific Study of Unidentified Flying Objects. Study conducted by the
University of Colorado under contract F44620-67-C-0035. Three volumes,
1,465 p. 68 plates. Photoduplicated hard copies of the official report
may be ordered for \$3.00 per volume, \$9.00 the set of three, as AD 680 975,
AD 680 976, and AD 680 977, from the Clearinghouse for Federal Scientific
and Technical Information, U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA
22151

Review of University of Colorado Report on Unidentified Flying Objects.
Review of report by a panel of the National Academy of Sciences. National
Academy of Sciences, 1969. 6 p. Photoduplicated hard copies may be ordered
for \$3.00 as AD 688 541 from the Clearinghouse of Federal Scientific
and Technical Information, U. S. Department of Commerce, Springfield, VA
22151.

Extract from Wernher von Braun's book First Men to the Moon,
Copyright 1958, 1959, 1960 by Dr. Wernher von Braun, published
by Holt, Rinehart and Winston of Canada, Ltd.

"Question: What is your opinion on 'U.F.O.'s?"

"Answer: There is a rational and rather straight-forward explanation for the great majority of 'sightings of unidentified flying objects,' or 'flying saucers,' as they are more familiarly called. During the last ten years, official U.S. investigators have tabulated about six thousand sightings.' They could account for all but two per cent as belonging to any of the following categories:

- High-flying balloons of various kinds
- High-flying aircraft illuminated by the sun after the sun had set on the ground
- Nightly 'Fata Morgana' type reflections in the atmosphere of distant light sources on the ground
- Artificial satellites of U.S. or Soviet origin
- Meteorites and fireballs
- Birds
- The Planets Venus or Jupiter
- Searchlights illuminating cloud layers
- Hoaxes perpetrated by pranksters

Even the most ardent believers in flying objects of extra-terrestrial origin will usually concede that most reported 'sightings' can be traced back to one of these sources. But it is that unaccounted two per cent that makes enthusiasts cling tenaciously to their conviction.

I cannot account for the mysterious two per cent, either. But a lifetime spent with testing of guided missiles has taught me to be extremely careful with eye-witness accounts on rocket firings running into some in-flight trouble. Of three experienced observers questioned after a typical mishap, one swore that he clearly saw a part coming off before the rocket faltered; a second hotly denied this but claimed that the missile oscillated violently before it veered off the course; while the third trained observer saw neither a part coming off, nor an oscillation, nor any veering off the course but insisted that the rocket was flying perfectly steadily until it was abruptly ripped part by an internal explosion.

Such contradictions in the eyewitness accounts of old rocket men are by no means an exception; we are almost invariably confronted with this situation. Yet we are dealing here with experienced observers who not only had seen many firings, but who had the great advantage of being mentally prepared for the imminent test.

ARRIVING FROM MARS BY UFO?

In recent years there have been many reports of unidentified flying objects (UFO's), especially since the first Soviet Sputnik went up on October 4, 1957. From time to time the question has been raised as to whether the UFO's might have come from Mars or Venus, perhaps bearing intelligent beings. Usually the answer to this question has been simply a guess which depended to a considerable extent on what the individual wanted to believe. Most scientists have been inclined to doubt that the UFO's came from Mars or Venus, preferring to credit the sightings to natural phenomena which are not as well known as they should be.


There is a logical approach to this question as to whether or not UFO's have come from Mars or Venus. It is well known that if someone on the earth wants to send a space vehicle to Mars or Venus, there are specific favorable times, times when a body can be launched so that it will travel along a minimum-energy orbit, arriving at the path of Mars (or Venus) just as that planet comes to the same point. For example, favorable times for launching a rocket to travel to Venus have been listed as Oct 27, 1965, June 5, 1967 and January 11, 1969, and for Mars, December 23, 1964, January 26, 1967 and February 28, 1969. (SPACE HANDBOOK, Gov't Printing Office 1959)

Of course, there are similar favorable times for launching a space vehicle from Mars (or Venus) to the earth, and for each of these launching times, there would be a corresponding arrival time at the earth. These favorable arrival times come at intervals of about 584 days for Venus and about 780 days for Mars. Actually, in each case, the interval is a close approximation to the synodic period of the planet; for Venus, the synodic period varies from 579.8 to 587.8 days, and for Mars, from 767 to 803 days.

One could then choose intervals of 20 days, say ten days on either side of a favorable arrival date, and look to see how many UFO's were sighted in each such "favorable arrival interval", here named fai, (Plural fais). If there were no increase in the number of UFO's in these fais, then it would be unlikely that any considerable number of UFO's had been arriving from Mars or Venus.

Some one is certain to raise the question as to whether or not a Martian or a Venutian would elect to travel in a minimum-energy orbit. Here I shall assume that intelligent beings from any part of the universe will choose to travel by means and paths that will minimize the expenditure of energy.

This fai approach to the problem can be carried a step farther. One can make a list of the UFO's observed in the fais, and look at the record of each to see if the UFO was observed traveling in the direction it would have if it came from Mars (or Venus) in a minimum-energy orbit.



Spectacular corona display along General Electric's experimental 500,000-v. transmission line near Pittsfield was produced by application of more than 120% of rated voltage. Corona also is induced by dirt, salt crystals or other foreign particles on the line or insulators. An extremely high voltage gradient can develop across these, exceeding breakdown voltage of air.

Plasma Theory May Explain Many UFOs

By Philip J. Klass

Washington—Luminous plasmas of ionized air, a special form of "ball lightning" generated by electric corona that occurs on high-tension power lines under certain conditions, may explain many sightings of lower-altitude "unidentified flying objects." It is related to St. Elmo's fire, sometimes seen on or near aircraft in flight.

If this theory is correct, it would explain the increasing frequency of UFO sightings in recent years when there have been growing numbers of very high-voltage power lines. Also there has been increasing atmospheric pollution whose contaminants may play a catalytic role in the phenomenon.

Descriptions contained in a recent book, "Incident At Exeter," appear to support this theory. John G. Fuller, its journalist author, interviewed dozens of persons who reported seeing UFOs in the vicinity of Exeter, N. H., approximately a year ago.

Fuller expresses the belief that top Air Force and government officials know that the UFOs are extra-terrestrial spacecraft but have successfully kept this a secret for nearly two decades to prevent national panic. But a much more plausible scientific explanation emerges when the Exeter sightings are analyzed.

Most of the UFO sightings in the Exeter area occurred along or very near to high-tension power lines, according to the author. The same is true of two other sightings he investigated in western Pennsylvania and others reported at the time of the Northeast power black-

out last November. Fuller speculates that the extra-terrestrial spacecraft may be attracted to the power lines as a source of energy for refueling their propulsion systems.

Electric corona, which this writer believes is the mechanism that triggers one form of "ball lightning" under suitable conditions, is a moderately well understood phenomenon. But most scientific investigations of corona have been aimed at devising means of suppressing it, rather than gaining fundamental theoretical understanding.

Ball lightning, most frequently reported during or immediately following a thunderstorm, is poorly understood. Until recent years it attracted little scientific attention, having been treated by many as an "old wives tale." But in the late forties and early fifties, ball lightning attracted the attention of several

top Soviet scientists, including Academician Peter Kapitsa.




Five years ago, several U. S. laboratories began to investigate the phenomenon, motivated in part by its possible application to anti-ICBM defenses (AW&ST Dec. 4, 1961, p. 52). These included the Bendix Research Laboratories, the Illinois Institute of Technology's Research Institute and Raytheon's advanced development group.

There is a striking similarity between the reported characteristics of ball lightning and the UFOs sighted by dozens of persons in the Exeter area, as reported by Fuller, who used a tape recorder to insure accurate observation details. For example:

- **Color:** Ball lightning is multi-colored, but red is the most predominant color reported, followed by intense bluish-white and green. A vast majority of the sightings reported from Exeter said the object was red, while the remainder were either bluish-white, green, or a combination of all of these.

- **Shape:** Ball lightning normally is either spherical or ellipsoidal with many reports of a doughnut-shaped or ring configuration. The Exeter sightings were mostly round, oval-shaped or dome-shaped.

- **Sound:** Ball lightning is often ac-



Ionized plasmas produced by electric discharge in laboratories of Illinois Institute of Technology's Research Institute several years ago show some of the characteristic shapes of UFO sightings. However, these pictures were made with extremely short film exposure times of 0.2-0.5 microsec., far briefer than the Lucci photo (below).

accompanied by a sizzling or hissing sound. Exeter sightings reported that the UFO sometimes made a soft humming or hissing sound.

■ **Dynamics:** Ball lightning has been reported as hanging motionless at times, yet able to move up, down and horizontally at extremely high speeds. It appears to move by rolling and gliding, often along electrical conductors or structures and frequently exhibits a spinning motion. The Exeter sighting reports said the objects often hovered over a fixed location, frequently power lines, often rolled or bounced along, sometimes exhibiting a spinning motion and would then appear to zoom off at great speed and disappear from sight.


■ **Lifetime:** Ball lightning reports indicate that they can have a lifetime ranging from several seconds to many minutes. Observers at Exeter reported that objects remained in view for a few seconds or as long as 15 min.

■ **Size:** Ball lightning has been reported in sizes up to 15 ft. in diameter. Exeter observers estimated the size of objects sighted at from the size of a basketball to as much as 200 ft. in diameter.

This apparent size discrepancy is explainable in several ways. All but two of the sightings reported at Exeter by Fuller were made at night and one of the two occurred at dusk. The absence of visible landmarks for size comparison would make it difficult for a layman to estimate size accurately, especially when the object could induce fright in the observer.

Additionally, the type of ball lightning triggered by electric corona may be a lower-energy plasma of larger size than that usually induced by lightning discharges.

Electric corona is a luminous plasma caused by ionization of the air surrounding a transmission line or one of its insulators. When electric corona first occurs, it briefly resembles a small stroke of lightning. The corona can remain fixed or can travel along the



Unidentified flying object photographed over high-tension power lines near Beaver, Pa., in August, 1965, by James Lucci with full moon visible to the left of UFO, is believed to be a form of ball lightning induced by electric corona discharge. Photo was taken using film with ASA speed of 100, lens opening of f/3.5, set at infinity, and exposed for 6 sec. Film development time was 12 min.

power line until cooled and extinguished by external forces.

So long as a transmission line and its insulators are clean and suitably designed, corona does not normally occur. But if small particles of dust or salt crystals, for example, become affixed to the line or insulators they can trigger the corona, according to Darrell Shankle, manager of field research in Westinghouse Electric's electric utility operations. The reason is that an extremely high-voltage gradient develops across the dust or salt crystal which exceeds the breakdown voltage of air.

Even flying insects that alight on the line can trigger a corona. For example, during the months of August and September a very high-voltage transmission line in West Virginia experiences frequent coronas caused by "flying spiders" that are carried by the winds and alight on the lines, according to Shankle.

Transmission lines near the ocean are also susceptible to corona because salt crystals deposit on the lines and insulators, according to A. F. Rohifs, manager of high voltage development for General Electric at Pittsfield, Mass.

Exeter is located only 10 mi. from the ocean. The power lines of the Exeter and Hampton Electric Co., which were involved in the sightings, run right down to the ocean beach beyond Hampton. The company's chief engineer, Stanley Sawyer, says that corona occurs more frequently "when there is not much rain to clean off the lines."

A check with the U. S. Weather Bureau shows that conditions during the summer of 1965 preceding the Exeter sightings in September were especially conducive to corona in that area because it was an extremely dry summer.

For example, during the months of

July, August and September the Exeter area received barely more than half of its normal rainfall. During these three months, there was only 6.0 in. of rain, compared to the average of 10.8 in.

When corona first occurs, it usually has a bluish color which can then take on the color of a lightning strike, according to experts on the subject. But the presence of sodium-chloride (salt) on the line could give it a pronounced orangish-red color from the sodium with a touch of green due to the chlorine.

This suggests that some of the Exeter sightings could have been no more than a corona discharge traveling along the power line. Here are some of the first-hand observations described by Fuller in his book:

■ Meredith Bolduc: "This thing was coming up the power lines toward the road . . ."

■ Mrs. Jerline Jalbert: "We see it regularly along here. Always seems to be somewhere near the power lines."

■ Mr. Heselton: "Just the other night, some other people saw it along another section of the power lines."

■ Mr. A. Reid Bunker, Sr. "We were under the high-power lines . . . when at 10:45 p.m. we saw an object approach . . . It had red lights most, and sort of green and white lights . . ."

First Sighting

The first Exeter sighting on Sept. 3, 1965, that triggered many subsequent reports, made by a teenager and subsequently witnessed by two policemen, was located near the 34,500-v. transmission line of the Exeter and Hampton Electric Co. The line is mounted on wooden poles approximately 29 ft. above the ground. In total there were 73 instances, Fuller writes, where persons reporting UFO sightings near Exeter used the words "power lines" or "transmission lines" or referred to locations near power lines.

During the period in which Fuller was researching the Exeter incident, he visited Beaver, Pa., near Pittsburgh, to check UFO reports. One night sighting during the previous month near high-tension power lines had been made by 17-year-old James Lucci and two friends and Lucci had managed to photograph the object (see photo, p. 49).

When Fuller and Lucci visited the area of the sighting and he was asked to pinpoint its location, the youth responded: "I'd say it was right up there, directly over the wires, not more than fifty or sixty feet."

A sighting was made three days later in the same general area by Donald de Turka from his yard. His house, Fuller reports, was "down the street from a section of high-voltage transmission line."

The Northeast power blackout pro-

vided an unexpected opportunity for additional evidence that indicates a relationship between electric transmission lines, and associated power distribution apparatus, and the type of object sighted near Exeter and Pittsburgh.

A private pilot, Weldon Ross, was approaching Hancock Field at Syracuse, N.Y., for a landing "at almost the exact moment of the blackout. As he looked below him, just over the [345,000 v.] power lines near the Clay, N.Y., substation, a huge red ball of brilliant intensity appeared."

This particular substation initially was reported to be the "crux of the difficulty," Fuller writes.

Same Report

A total of five persons reported the same phenomenon, including Robert C. Walsh, deputy commissioner for the Federal Aviation Agency in the Syracuse area, according to Fuller.

On Nov. 26, Fuller reports that a power failure in St. Paul, Minn., coincided "with the appearance of objects overhead giving off blue and white flashes . . . Fifteen minutes later a resident on Hogt Avenue reported a 'blue-glowing' UFO as all house lights and appliances in the area went dead."

Fuller hints at foul play by extra-terrestrial spacecraft by claiming that scientists have not been able to explain the causes of the Northeast power blackout or the simultaneous proximity of the UFO sightings.

Engineers working with large-area power distribution networks concede that the complexity of such systems makes it difficult to pinpoint readily a specific faulty circuit breaker. But no competent expert has publicly advanced the idea that the blackout resulted from external causes.

Voltage Surges

During conditions of such power network instabilities, there are voltage surges at some points in the network. These higher-than-normal voltage conditions would induce very large corona discharges.

The leakage current during corona contains harmonics in larger than usual proportions, creating an inductive effect which aggravates network instability. But only to this extent could the corona or corona-induced ball lightning have contributed to the blackout problem, according to several experts.

The marked resemblance between many of the Exeter sightings and reported observations of ball lightning appears significant, as well as their frequent appearance on, along or near high-tension power lines under atmospheric conditions likely to produce corona discharges along the lines.

The only unresolved question is the mechanism by which the corona dis-

explode

...the theory that a challenging career has to include challenging living conditions. United Control, the fastest growing aerospace electronics corporation in the Pacific Northwest, has career opportunities open now. Men who join us will have a chance to contribute to advanced projects of major importance to the aircraft and space industry. They will be members of a young, vigorous organization that is already leading the way in its field. They'll work with some of the brightest minds in the aerospace industry. Read the ad on the opposite page. This is the kind of action you'll be involved with at United Control. Yet, outside the plant you'll enjoy living in one of the world's most beautiful regions. Drive 20 minutes to the cosmopolitan bustle and cultural attractions of Seattle. Drive 40 minutes to snow-capped peaks and mountain wilderness. Golf year 'round, cruise on hundreds of miles of sheltered waters, enjoy clean air...space...a home with a view. For full details on careers at United Control, send your resume to Mr. D. G. Vawter, Employment Manager.



UNITED CONTROL CORP./ REDMOND, WN. 98052

UFO-Ball Lightning Observations Compared

CHARACTERISTICS	EXETER UFOs	BALL LIGHTNING
Color	Usually reddish-orange and/or bluish-white, sometimes green.	Multi-colored, with red dominating or bluish-white.
Shape	Round, oval or dome-shaped	Spherical, ellipsoidal or doughnut-shaped.
Movement	Often hovering or moving up/down slowly. Also moving horizontally at slow or high speed.	Sometimes hangs motionless or moves vertically and horizontally at slow or high speed.
Dynamics	Often seems to move with rocking or undulating motion. Sometimes appears to be spinning.	Appears to bounce or roll in horizontal direction. Sometimes exhibits spinning motion.
Sound	No sound, or slight humming or hissing.	Sometimes exhibits a sizzling or hissing sound.
Lifetime	From several minutes to up to half an hour.	From few seconds to many minutes.
Size	Difficult to estimate by most observers during night sightings, but those given range from basketball size to 200 ft. in diameter.	Daytime sightings (in brighter ambient light) usually are a few inches in diameter but have ranged up to 15 ft.

charge expands into a larger plasma with ball lightning characteristics. Present limited knowledge of both phenomena complicates this problem. But the similarity of electric corona discharge and natural lightning discharge which is known to induce ball lightning would seem to support strongly the theory presented here.

Despite long years of experience with corona, the experts disagree even over the effect of temperature, barometric pressure and humidity in inducing corona. The reason is that power line corona is difficult to duplicate realistically for study under controlled conditions. To do so would require construction of a huge facility, large enough to house a long transmission line within a chamber so that barometric pressure and temperature could be varied while a variety of atmospheric contaminants were introduced.

There is considerably less scientific information available on ball lightning, although a number of conflicting theories have been advanced to explain it. Several years ago Dr. J. Rand McNally, Jr. of the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratories made an informal survey of 1,962 persons in the laboratory. Surprisingly, he found that 110 of them, or 5.6% of the total sample, had observed ball lightning at some time. Usually it was associated with a conventional stroke of lightning; but not always.

Analyzing the returns, McNally concluded that ball lightning can originate randomly in space but is most often

seen in proximity to wires or structures. It is usually airborne or partially airborne, moving randomly in space or along electric conductors. It often exhibits rolling, tumbling or spinning motions.

Small-diameter ball lightning has been reported inside houses and other buildings. Recently an Air Force Strategic Air Command flight crew reported seeing it inside an aircraft during flight, AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY was told by a scientist working in the field.


Many of the ball lightning sightings reported by persons surveyed by McNally occurred on or near power lines.

Many different theories and mathematical models have been advanced by scientists here and abroad to explain the basic mechanism which generates ball lightning and the internal-external forces that enable it to survive for extended periods.

Within recent months two Westinghouse Electric research laboratory scientists, Dr. Martin A. Uman and Dr. C. W. Helstrom published a mathematical model that predicts many of the unusual properties of ball lightning. The Westinghouse research was partially funded by the Office of Naval Research.

This theory suggests that ball lightning is a luminous, high-temperature region of air having high electrical conductivity that has been heated to the required temperature by a stroke of lightning under suitable conditions. When cloud-to-ground lightning currents are symmetrical through the ball,

Easy reading



This is the
new

KODAK LINAGRAPH
Direct Print Paper,
Type 1843


Expose it to light (fluorescent or daylight) and almost instantly you get a high-contrast blue trace that can be easily read. But that isn't the only reason you'll like this paper.

The excellent image it produces lasts for hours, even in bright daylight... and for days, in room light.

If you want the image to last for years and years, process the paper in the surprisingly inexpensive KODAK EKTAMATIC Processor, Model 218K. Or in ordinary chemistry.

Prefer an extra-thin base material? Specify KODAK LINAGRAPH Direct Print Paper, Type 1855.

Want more detailed information? Get it fast from Instrumentation Products Sales. EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY, Rochester, N. Y. 14650.





RESEARCH IN TARGET CHARACTERISTICS BENEFITS AICBM SYSTEMS

This special-purpose computer, designed by Cornell Aeronautical Laboratory under contract to Bell Telephone Laboratories, Inc., is capable of processing resolvable targets detected by an AICBM radar and designating for further processing those which are likely to be lethal threats. In addition to its specific application to ballistic missile defense systems, this Signal Data Processor represents a significant advance in the extraction of discrimination data from raw radar signals.

CAL's continuing systems research program on radar discrimination has defined potential targets — including their expected motions. An extensive study of down-range experimental data is supported by theoretical research in reentry physics.

In addition to AICBM investigations, our systems research encompasses various programs for tactical and strategic weapon systems: penetration aids for tactical aircraft, new delivery techniques for chemical ordnance, command and control techniques for air and sea operations, ground mobility studies, ASW investigations, and advanced research on reconnaissance and surveillance systems.

**EXPERIENCED PERSONNEL ARE NEEDED FOR SUCH
RESEARCH IN BOTH BUFFALO AND WASHINGTON**



CORNELL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY, INC.
OF CORNELL UNIVERSITY

J. V. Rentschler
CORNELL AERONAUTICAL LABORATORY, INC.
Buffalo, New York 14221

T/C

Please send me a copy of your factual, illustrated prospectus, "A Community of Science," and an application blank.

I'm not interested in investigating job opportunities now, but I would like to see your latest "Report on Research at CAL."

Name.....

Street.....

City.....

State.....

Zip.....

An Equal Opportunity Employer

it hangs stationary in air, but if these currents become unsymmetrical the ball will move.

The lightning ball will disappear quietly if the internal electric currents gradually fade away, according to the Westinghouse scientists' theory, but it can also collapse with a bang if the current drops sharply.

One scientist who has worked in the field for some time, Carsten M. Haaland, says that none of the proposed models fully explains the phenomenon and that it is possible to find flaws in all theories proposed so far. Haaland, currently employed by AEC's Oak Ridge National Laboratory, previously conducted experiments in ball lightning when he was a member of the Illinois Institute of Technology's Research Institute.

Using relatively crude discharges in air produced by exploding wires, Haaland was able to create small ball lightning for brief intervals (see p. 49).

Haaland believes that there are at least two different types of ball lightning, perhaps more, which would explain why none of the theories advanced to date explains all sightings.

Most theories on ball lightning hold that some external source of energy is needed to sustain the plasma for more than a few seconds. Haaland pointed out, in support of the proposed new theory, that the electromagnetic lines of force from high-tension lines extend for a considerable distance and could supply such energy. The Exeter lines are at a relatively low height (29 ft.) above the ground.


Another scientist working in the field, who declined to be quoted by name, was asked if he could positively exclude the possibility that power line corona could generate ball lightning. He re-

Transmission Grating

Washington—Tiny, low-cost transmission grating which can be used to view UFOs to determine if they are balls of ionized air, as a new theory predicts, can be obtained from two scientists employed by the Westinghouse Research Laboratories.

The transmission grating, roughly the size of a 35-mm. color slide, is small enough to fit into a man's wallet. If the object when viewed through the grating shows an intense red line rather than a full color spectrum, it is a plasma.

Readers interested in obtaining a grating and instructions for its use should send \$1, to cover fabrication and mailing cost, to Drs. J. L. Moruzzi/Martin Uman, 579 Lucia Road, Pittsburgh, Pa. 15221. The gratings are being made by the scientists in a home workshop. It is not a Westinghouse sponsored effort.



PREDICT POINT-OF-FAILURE WITHOUT DESTRUCTION

You can use Kaman Variable Impedance Displacement Transducers for test stand measurements to determine point-of-failure without running the test unit to destruction! For example, Kaman Non-Contacting Transducers have been used in high speed jet engines to measure growth of turbine blades in increments as small as .000025"—equivalent to 1 part in 1,000 total transducer range—to determine blade elongation and other distortion as a function of turbine rpm. Vibration of the jet engine housing, extreme fluctuations in temperature do not influence accuracy of measurements. Kaman Transducers measure displacement between transducers and adjacent conductive surface without mechanical connection to the turbine blades. If you make measurements in hostile environments, send for technical data and application information on Kaman Nuclear's Variable Impedance Transducer.

tion of turbine rpm. Vibration of the jet engine housing, extreme fluctuations in temperature do not influence accuracy of measurements. Kaman Transducers measure displacement between transducers and adjacent conductive surface without mechanical connection to the turbine blades. If you make measurements in hostile environments, send for technical data and application information on Kaman Nuclear's Variable Impedance Transducer.


Kaman Transducers Excel in Hostile Environments



Kaman Nuclear

1700 GARDEN OF THE GODS ROAD, COLORADO SPRINGS, COLORADO 80907
Telephone: (303) 473-5880 • TWX: (510) 431-4929

PROBLEMATICAL RECREATIONS 341



Show, with a simple example, that an irrational number raised to an irrational power need not be irrational. —Contributed

WESCON 1966 starts tomorrow and 8 is the number of the week! We'll explain. This year's show is "8-great-shows-in-one" featuring 8 special product areas from communication and detection to computers to air and space control systems. (There are 5 other areas to see.) And we're happy to announce that our eighth puzzle booklet, *Problematical Recreations*⁸, is available to all problem solvers during WESCON. Pick up your free copy at the Litton booth #1507. We'll be on the main floor of the Los Angeles Sports Arena displaying our latest advances and new products. Hope to see you the 23rd through the 26th!

ANSWER TO LAST WEEK'S PROBLEM: Let BC be the side opposite the 20° angle and D the point 10" from A on side AB. Construct triangle ADE congruent to ABC with ED||BC. Join EC. Then triangle AEC is equilateral and angle DEC = 40°. Triangle EDC is isosceles and angle EDC is 70°. Thus the stripe makes an angle of 150° (or its supplement) with the edge.

 LITTON INDUSTRIES
Beverly Hills, California

©Copyright 1966

plied: "I wouldn't reject this possibility, because a conventional smoke-ring is an interesting example of a plasma held together under the proper conditions by a combination of internal and external forces which are difficult to explain scientifically."

This seems an appropriate analogy because not every instance of corona along power lines generates ball lightning. The presence of salt vapor near Exeter would increase the conductivity of the air, and vaporization of the salt crystals deposited during the dry summer could provide a mechanism for increasing current flow and air temperature once corona occurred. Other contaminants in the air at Exeter and at other locations could provide similar catalytic action.

A spokesman for the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP), quoted by Fuller, says that UFO "sightings seem to concentrate in small geographic areas during any wave. But the concentration area will shift around." This indicates that when the required combination of atmospheric conditions exists, the phenomenon occurs repeatedly.

It seems more than coincidence that only one of the dozens of Exeter UFO sightings reported by Fuller occurred in broad daylight. This prompted one police officer who was interviewed by Fuller to ask: "Where does it go in the daytime?"

It is possible that the necessary atmospheric conditions, including air contaminants, do not occur until the cooler night air arrives. Another possible explanation is that the luminous plasma of ionized air usually is too faint to be easily visible in daylight, although it could appear quite bright in the dark.

In the photograph taken by Lucci near Pittsburgh, using a 6-sec. exposure, the UFO appears to have about the same brightness as the full moon alongside it.

Westinghouse's Dr. Martin Uman suggests several possible tests which can be made in the presence of a UFO sighting to confirm or deny the ball lightning theory. If it is an electrical discharge, it should generate radio noise. At least several persons interviewed by Fuller reported that their automobile radios had briefly become inoperative when the object came near.

If the object is viewed through an inexpensive prism or transmission grating it should be possible to ascertain whether the object is a solid spacecraft or a form of ball lightning, Dr. Uman points out. If the object is a solid, the viewer will see a continuous spectrum, but if it is a form of ball lightning he will see instead a number of individual color lines, including intense red radiation due to the presence of hydrogen and blue due to nitrogen in the air.

This question was discussed on 27/3/74 by Mr. Grouther with APS/US95 (RBT) who considered that US95 (RBT) could not well be consulted about the proposed change of procedure regarding cessation of categorisation. The drafts at A + B, as amended, were agreed by Mr. Conliffe.

You mentioned recently that because our interest in UFOs is limited to defence aspects and the fact that we do not now undertake to advise observers of the probable identity of the object seen, we should no longer attempt to categorise UFO reports; with our limited information our somewhat haphazard allocation could be embarrassing should we be required to defend it in the context of a PE or PQ.

With this change in procedure in view, I have re-drafted the two standard letters, the draft at 'A' to be used to acknowledge the receipt of specific UFO reports, & the one at 'B' in response to enquiries about the MoD attitude to UFOs, for your approval please.

Before we bring a new procedure into operation, however, you may wish to see the

correspondence/

'A'

DRAFT

I am writing to thank you for your report of an unidentified flying object seen on

We are grateful to you for advising the Department of this incident and your report will be examined in the Ministry of Defence to see if there are any defence implications. We cannot undertake to pursue our research, other than for defence implications, to a point where positive correlation with a known object is established, nor to advise you of the probable identity of the object seen.

You will no doubt wish to know, however, that investigations over a number of years have so far produced no evidence that UFOs represent an air defence threat to the United Kingdom.

'B'

DRAFT

I am writing to thank you for your letter asking for information about unidentified flying objects.

The Ministry of Defence investigates UFO reports, which are received from various sources, eg members of the public, the police, Service units, etc, to see if there are any defence implications. Reports are examined in the Ministry of Defence by experienced staff. They do this with open minds. They have access to all information available to the Ministry of Defence. They call on the full scientific and professional resources of the Ministry of Defence and may, if necessary, call in expert advice from other Government and non-Government bodies.

Since the Ministry of Defence interest in unidentified flying objects is limited to the defence aspect investigations into the scientific significance of the phenomena are not carried out.

You will no doubt wish to know, however, that ~~investigations over a number of years have so far produced no evidence that UFOs represent an air defence threat to the United Kingdom.~~ Reported ^{from experience over a number of years} sightings are considered to ~~have originated~~, in the main, from aircraft or the lights of aircraft being seen under unusual conditions, balloons and various meteorological phenomena as well as astronomical sightings, space satellites and space "junk".

Mr. Pedrycz

UFOs

1. Attached is a request from the Royal Holloway College, University of London, to be allowed to look at our UFO reports.
2. In the past, we have received from time to time, similar requests from individuals and these have always been refused on the grounds that although the reports may themselves be unclassified, correspondence between the Department and members of the public is treated as confidential and thus documents cannot be made available without either the reports being edited to preserve the anonymity of the reporter or our obtaining the observer's permission to release the information. We also point out that the reports would need examination to ensure that no classified information was inadvertently

inadvertently disclosed & explain that the extensive time and effort needed for these tasks would not be justified & that UFO records therefore remain closed to public scrutiny until they become available under the Public Record Acts i.e. after 30 years.

3. However we have also stated to members of the public and also to MPs. that a request by a major scientific organisation of high standing with strong reasons for obtaining access to our reports would be considered on its merits. This view was taken in 1970 when the (M.P.) position concerning UFO investigations was reviewed following the USAF announcement in December 1969 of the termination of their Project Blue Book (which was a special US unit set up to investigate

investigate reports of UFOs) and pressure by an M.P. about the destruction of reports and access to UFO records. It was agreed in 1970 that policies and procedures should remain unchanged except that all reports would be retained (up to that time reports received before 1962 had been destroyed as being of a transitory interest, the explanation being of a mundane nature). In saying that applications for access to our records from a major scientific organisation could be considered on their merits, it was noted that, up to that time, no requests from such scientific bodies had been received, and in view of the negative findings of the Colorado University Scientific Study on UFOs it seemed unlikely that any reputable scientific organisation would ask for access to our UFO records in the foreseeable future.

4/ The first approach on this London University request was made in a telephone call from [redacted] who told me that he had spoken to Mr Davis (one of your predecessors) when Mr Davis took part in a BBC 2 television programme on UFOs at Bambery in January 1972~~4~~ who told [redacted] that an application for access to reports by a scientific organisation would be considered on its merits.

was therefore making his request on this basis; I therefore told ~~me~~ him that the University would have to submit a case for consideration but I did not encourage him to hold out much hope that it would be agreed.

5/ The letter from the University hardly presents "strong reasons" for seeing
over/

our records and while they invite us to seek further information, if required, it seems unwise to do so, if we have no intention anyway of releasing the reports.

6. For various reasons, I think it could be embarrassing to the Department to release reports

a. One of the factors leading to the 1970 decision to continue the same mod procedures on UFOs was the need to answer questions from the public which might arise from a real anxiety about national security.

b. Since that time, with increases of pressures on other aspects of S&F work & the general need for economies, less time has been spent on UFO work which is now given pretty low priority of importance. In 1971 US & S agreed a change in procedure,

as a result of which we merely acknowledge receipt of reports + advise reporters that they would be examined (in mo) to see if there are any defence implications, but that we could not advise them of the probable identity of the object seen.

c At that time we continued to categorize reports, where possible, into probable identity groups, for our own records, and any correspondence d who asked for the Dept's views on UFOs was given an analysis by years of probable identity of objects reported. In March 1974, Mr. Crowther discussed with AAS/UPPS a further possible reduction in UFO work, viz. that we should cease to attempt to categorize reports - it was felt that with SAs limited information

and somewhat haphazard allocation of identity, it could be embarrassing if we were required to defend the analysis in the context of a PE or PA. This further change in procedure was agreed.

d. We hold, either at Archives or here, all reports received since 1962 & also letters in the correspondence files which would constitute reports. However, the majority of these reports are, I consider, of such a sketchy nature ~~that~~ as to be useless for a scientific study or as material for a scientific conference!! We always maintain, of course, that our interest being only in defence, we have never undertaken any scientific studies. But any examination of the papers in my custody could, I feel, lead an outside body to the conclusion that the reports are given very little investigation, or lead to questions

about the nature of our investigations.
questions which we would not
wish to get involved in - an
attitude which could lead to
allegations that we were covering
up information when we always
maintain in correspondence that the
our view on UFOs is quite
straightforward & we do not suppress
facts. It might also be thought that
we do little to allay fears
arising as in para 6a.

7. While I consider, for the reasons given in para
that a general release of our papers from
1962 should be resisted, I feel that we
could equally find ourselves in some
difficulties if we appear to be anything
but co-operative with a body such as the
University of London when they no doubt
feel that they were led to believe
that a request from a body of their
standing would be looked on
favourably. Apart from a straight refusal

the alternatives open to us seem to be

a To accede to the request,

b Select, say, 2 months reports & send them to the University to demonstrate the nature of the reports, in the hope that they would realize that papers were of no scientific importance. This still leads us open to the question I foresee in para 6.

c Tell the University that only about 7% of reports received have been thought to be attributable to meteorological & natural phenomena, supplying one or two examples & hope that a sight of these would discourage them from pursuing their request.

8. Action under any of the above alternatives leaves us open to the question I foresee at para 6, but, more importantly for S4F

a lot of additional work, which I cannot see being completed within any reasonable time with our present staff. Any of the alternatives would mean that the papers would have to be edited by us to ensure anonymity & also from the security aspect. This would be a mammoth task & the University would have to be told of this & that the work would, of necessity, have to take a low priority & we could not say when it could be completed. I would hope that this in itself would discourage them from pursuing the request. However, you may feel that the difficulties for us complying with the request are sufficient to justify a refusal to the application.

9. You will wish to consider our line of action.

John

Miss Jameson

How much of X can I reveal in a letter
to the Royal Holloway College? ~~in a letter~~
Do you know what Davis said about DOD policy
in his TV talk? — I have in mind a
letter which says openly that we don't
investigate OTO reports beyond the national defence
implications here as files etc would be of
little value — Then, we can't reveal the
reports themselves because of the difficulties given at Y.

Can you put me on to an DOD
scientist who can advise on the standing
of the people at RHC and the validity
of their investigations — i.e. do they fit
the criteria in class para of Y?

Mr Dawson of D58 is a scientist. He
might be able to give you informal advice

E.125 sent
to. es (RHC)

2/6

Note.

Sqn Lds. Davies STCOC phoned regarding the monthly return by STCOC of their results of UFO investigations which now invariably show 'nil'. He suggested that, for the future, the monthly return should cease and they would only send us any positive information they had.

I agreed to this change in procedure.

By James
SFC(OV)

7/8/75.

P.S. He mentioned that if any report received by them was more than 24 hrs. old it was very difficult for them to make a radar check. *egf.*

Miss Jameson
Thank you - a most useful survey.

Mr. Reddy.

I agree that we should not pursue the AHB idea
- particularly a consultant who ^{works} ^{with} the clerical labors
beneath ^{the} editor ^{was} not attempted staff.

1. We spoke about ACS (6)'s suggestion
at the last sentence of E16 of this file,
that AHB might employ a consultant to
edit our UFO reports in order to preserve
anonymity & to exclude any classified
material.

Noting X of para 4 &
agrees no
further
action
should
be taken
at present
JES
7/17/75

2. The task would involve the
examination of reports received from the
beginning of 1962 until the present time.
These total approx. 2600 reports (filed in
individual folders, the bulk of which are
held in Archives). In addition some 19 or
20 general correspondence files which contain
letters from the public & which were recorded
as reports, sometimes the subject of
protracted correspondence, would require
examination. Some of these letters probably
contain more intelligent material than
a lot of the other reports & the files would
need careful scrutiny to extract the
relevant enclosures. Each report or other

would have to be copied with the name & address of the observer blanked out. The geographical location of the sighting would have to be inserted instead, otherwise the report would be useless. Any classified material would also have to be declassified, but this is not thought to amount to very much.

3. At first sight the idea of asking AHB to undertake this task is very attractive, but on further consideration I feel it would be very difficult to justify the use of any staff (either AHB or DCF) on this work, & so far as AHB is concerned the work seems to be inappropriate to a "consultant", falling more in the category of a "clerical chore".
4. AES (G) may well be right in saying that sooner or later the data will have to be sanitised.

X | sanitised, and it would indeed be an ideal situation if we were able to have the task completed in anticipation of a successful application for access to our UFO records. But the statement about possible access to a major scientific organisation was made in March 1970, and five years have elapsed before we even received an application which gave us any cause for thought, during which time other increasing pressures on other aspects of S&T work & the need for economies resulted in less time being spent on UFO work which is now given a relatively low priority of importance. The idea of employing a CO. on the job of editing UFO reports ^{as part of normal duties} during these five years would not have been entertained.

5. At the present time we are no more certain of receiving an application for access from a scientific body of high standing than we were five years ago.

On the other hand, we are certain that defence expenditure is to be drastically cut & this must inevitably result in further staff cuts. In these circumstances there seems to be even less justification for embarking on the formidable task of editing UFO reports. In the present climate of cuts & economies, it seems possible that, even if an application worthy of approval were to be received, the 1970 ministerial ruling could be reversed, and the Dept. refuse to engage in extra work to assist a scientific project which would go beyond our purely defence interest.

6. In view of our experience with the Royal Holloway College we have slightly amended our procedures for holding UFO reports. From the beginning of August 75 we will hold a file containing a duplicate copy of all reports received with the necessary items blanked out. Thus, if at some future date, we

forced to disclose any of the reports,
a certain number will already be
prepared.

7. Do you agree that no further action
should be taken to edit the
1962-July 75 reports?

Spencer

SEP (ai)

7/8/75.

LOOSE MINUTE

AF/CX 80/70

AFOR

REVISION OF AIR FORCE OPERATIONS ROOM STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES-
REPORTS OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

References:

- A. MOD AFOR SOP No 502.
- B. AFOR/92 dated 22.7.75.

Our suggested amendments to Ref A are as follows:

Information

Amend paras 1, 2 and 4 to read:

Para 1. S4f(Air) co-ordinate detailed investigation into reports on Unidentified Flying Objects, consulting Ops (GE)2(RAF), DI 55, DI 50, Science 3 and STCOC and correspond with the public on the subject of UFOs when required.

Para 2. Circulation of reports on UFOs is S4f(Air) responsibility during normal working hours, and AFOR responsibility outside normal working hours. Reports may be received by telephone message or by signal message.

Para 4. The above mentioned reference gives considerable detail on the stages of investigation of UFO reports, and information should be passed to S4f(Air) as early as possible.

Para 3 - No change.

Action by the Duty Operations Officer

Para 5. Amend S4f(Air) telephone extension numbers to read 'Ext 7035/6020'.

Para 6. - No change.


Annex to SOP 502 - Report of an Unidentified Flying Object

Item B. Amend to read:

Description of Object (No. of objects, size, shape, colour, brightness, sound and smell).

Item R. Presumably 'ADOC' should read 'STCOC'.

6 Aug 75


MISS G J JAMIESON
S4f(Air)
Room 8235 7035 MB

1519



MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building Whitehall London SW1A 2HB

MOD (AFOR) (RAF)

Telephone ~~01-3307022 ext~~
01-218-6117/8

To: *S.H.F. Air*

Your reference
Our reference AFOR/92
Date *22nd*, July, 1975

REVISION OF AIR FORCE OPERATIONS ROOM STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES

1. Many of the Standard Operating Procedures used by the Duty Operations Officers in AFOR are in urgent need of review or amendment.
2. It is requested that you check those SOP's which are sponsored by your Department and advise AFOR, by completion of the attached certificate, of the action that needs to be taken.

G J CLARK
Squadron Leader
for Officer in Charge
Air Force Operations Room

COPY NO _____

SOP NO 502

PAGE NO 1

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
AIR FORCE OPERATIONS ROOM
STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURE NO 502
REPORTS OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Reference: AFOR/92/500, ~~50275-14473~~

AL/3

Annex : Report of an Unidentified Flying Object

Sponsor : S4f Air

*See E57-59
D/154(01)8/11*

INFORMATION

1. S4f(Air) co-ordinate detailed investigation into reports on Unidentified Flying Objects, consulting Ops(GE)2(RAF), DI55, ~~DL50~~, Science ~~4~~, and ~~ADOC~~, when necessary. S4f(Air) reply to those originators that request a reply. *copy sent with the public a/c*
2. The initial investigation of reports on UFOs is S4f(Air) responsibility during normal working hours, and AFOR(RAF) responsibility outside normal working hours. Reports may be received by telephone message or by signal message.
3. Copies of all UFO reports received in AFOR(RAF), and reports of AFOR(RAF) initial investigation, are circulated to S4f(Air), Ops(GE)2(RAF), DI55, ~~DI500~~, Science ~~4~~, and ~~STOCC~~. *UK R & Doc.*
4. The above-mentioned reference gives considerable detail on the stages of investigation of UFO reports, and ~~except in cases where a field investigation is necessary the aim is that S4f(Air) is provided, within 10 days of the initial report, with the information on which to base the reply to the originator.~~ *Reports should be passed as early as possible.*

ACTION BY THE DUTY OPERATIONS OFFICER

5. During Normal Working Hours. Refer telephone calls reporting UFOs to S4f(Air), Ext 7035/~~242~~. No action is required on signal message reports. *6020*
6. Outside Normal Working Hours.
 - a. Reports Received by Telephone. Complete the pro-forma at the Annex to this SOP. Dispatch it through the Registry.
 - b. Reports Received by Signal Message.
 - (1) Ensure that the message has been circulated to the staffs detailed at para 3 above.
 - (2) Complete para R of the pro-forma at the Annex to this SOP and insert on the pro-forma, the signal message reference to which the investigation refers. Dispatch it through the Registry.

SECRET

C22

INVESTIGATION OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. It has been stated in the House of Commons and in policy correspondence in the Ministry of Defence that all reported sightings of UFOs are investigated by M.O.D. to determine their cause and to assess if they constitute a military threat. The present procedure in M.O.D. is that all sightings are channelled to S.4f(Air) who is responsible for all communications with the public on these matters. S.4f(Air), in collaboration with the A.F.O.R., make preliminary enquiries with Fylingdales or R.S.R.S. Slough, for possible satellite sightings, and with other organisations who may be flying aircraft or balloons, or operating equipment that could cause optical phenomena giving rise to the sightings. In the majority of cases the sightings can be attributed to these causes and no further action is required.

2. In the cases where no immediate satisfactory explanation can be determined, i.e. they are truly unidentified flying objects, then D.S.T.I. are required by M.O.D. to carry out further investigations. These investigations were originally carried out by Tech. Intelligence (Air) but they became the responsibility of the Space Section in DI.55 from the beginning of May 1967. After receiving UFO sightings from S.4f(Air) for a complete month, the Space Section have now had a chance to assess the magnitude of the task. It is emphasised that the information given in the reports is quite inadequate for any decision to be made from within the office, and if the task is to be done at all, more details must be obtained from those members of the public who originated the sightings. This can only be done from personal interviews as it is sure to involve the preparation of sketches, geographic bearings, distances, heights, movements and further statements. Armed with this knowledge the investigating officer would then be obliged to assess the facilities in the local area, such as air bases, university experimental areas and factories, and consider the prevailing meteorological conditions at the time for conditions which could possibly have given rise to the phenomena. Finally, the investigating officer would be required to make his decisions and write a report on the results of his investigations. It is suggested, therefore, that if the investigation is to be carried out in accord with the official policy statements on the subject, 2-3 man days will be required for each investigation. A total of nine UFO sightings requiring further investigation by DSTI were received during May 1967.

3. From the above, it is apparent that investigations into UFOs cannot be regarded as a part-time or secondary task, and that it is completely beyond inclusion in the work schedule of the already overworked and undermanned Space Section of DI.55. Under these circumstances it is recommended that it be recognised that DSTI cannot undertake the investigation of UFOs to the standard required by the stated policy on the subject, or, alternatively, an officer and transport be established in DSTI specifically for this purpose.



(E. HUMPSTON)

Sqdn.Ldr.

DI.55 b.

7th June 1967

SECRET

— Around America —

**ASTRONAUTS
TO DO OWN
DENTISTRY**DAILY TELEGRAPH STAFF
CORRESPONDENTS

NEW YORK, Thursday.

INDIANA University's School of Dentistry is developing a do-it-yourself kit at the request of the Air Force.

When ready, it will enable astronauts and others cut off from civilisation to kill pain, fill their own teeth, and stop the spread of decay for a year.

Dr. Ralph Phillips, Director of the Air Force School of Aerospace Medicine, said the Air Force was losing too many man hours because of toothache.

"Under stress, fliers often grind their teeth and break the molars," he said.

"TOO MUCH SUCCESS"

Airline to be merged

PACIFIC AIRLINES' startling advertising campaign has had an equally startling result. "Hey, there, you with the sweat on your palms," it began and proceeded on the principle that "most people are scared witless of flying." Passengers were given a "lucky rabbit's foot."

It was disclosed today that Mr. Matthew McCarthy, the president, has resigned, and that the line is to be merged into West Coast Airlines. The campaign "was too successful, it scared people away," said a spokesman for the new company.

TV BULLFIGHTS

Humane society protests

FOUR bullfight "kills" are being shown by a Los Angeles television station each Saturday night in its peak-hour sports programme. The series, filmed in Tijuana and Mexico City, produced an 83 per cent. favourable response after the first week, Mr. Mal Klein, the station's general manager, said.

"We are using the programmes on an experimental basis. Our community has a strong Latin heritage and that heritage includes bullfighting." Protests by the Society for Prevention of Cruelty to Animals and the American Humane Society have been made to the Federal Communications Commission.

SAUCER-SIGHTERS MEET

Visits to other planets

SAUCER-SIGHTERS from this country and Britain were arriving in New York today to attend a weekend conference. Officially, it is the 1967 Congress of Scientific Ufologists, commemorating the first recorded "flying saucer" sighting 20 years ago near Mt. Rainier in the State of Washington.

The public will be admitted to the sessions for \$2 (14s). Saucer-sighters will relate their experiences, and there will be talks by delegates who are convinced that they have travelled to other planets, and some who say they have talked with men from outer space.

TS 51/JTIC

Joint
Reports

No.	Subject	Circulated
1.	German CW Installation, Dylonfurth. (CW. Wkg. Pky. - W. Shaw)	24. 10. 51
2.	German CW Installation, Falkenberg. (CW. Wkg. Pky. - W. Shaw).	24. 10. 51
3.	Russian Valve Post (Electronics Wkg. Pky.)	1. 3. 51.
4.	Russian Electronics (Electronics Wkg. Pky.) (W. Shaw)	4. 2. 51
5.	Russian Manufacture of Navy Gaps at Belokorka. (CW. Wkg. Pky. - W. Shaw) (W. Shaw)	2. 3. 51
6.	Russian in German & Russian most control members (Electronics Wkg. Pky.) - W. Shaw	19. 6. 51
7.	Identified flying objects TS 1/3	20. 6. 51
8.	Russian Electronics (Summary TS 1/3 JTIC 4.)	5. 12. 51
9.	Russian Electronics (Summary NO 8).	4. 7. 52
10.	USSR - a body of Russian based development Transmitter Report	21. 10. 51
11.	Russian Valve Post.	5. 11. 53

DSIC
JTIC
REPORTS

ARCHIVE
MAIN

in Room 820

in Room 820

6379

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

E 28

COVERING **SECRET**

Air Cdre (Int)/2117

DGI

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Reference : DSTI/126/6 dated 19th June 1967

1. Having examined the attached minute from DSTI, I have the following comments to make.
2. I agree with DSTI that, if UFO are to be investigated in any depth, the task would be formidable and entirely outside the scope of current resources. In the United States, to allay public concern, the Department of Defence has been forced to delegate detailed investigation to Universities on a substantial research contract. In our case, we have tailored our efforts to meet the minimum requirement of protecting UK airspace from any incursions which might pose a threat or a hazard.
3. Since investigations began no positive evidence has come to light which would indicate activity other than that associated with known phenomena. Most reported sightings in recent years have been traced to satellites in orbit, space debris, or meteorological sources. In no case has a report been received which would indicate a real or potential hazard to UK air space. Prima facie as this is a problem connected with the integrity of our air space, it is arguable that the Air Staff should have full responsibility for it. However, because of the high percentage of UFO reports which have space or scientific connotation it is inevitable that DSTI staff will be consulted and become involved in the major part of any investigation. There is no one else capable of doing this. They should therefore continue to hold responsibility for advising S.4(Air) and other sections of the Air Staff as a direct extension of the work done on a single service basis by the former DDI(Tech). In fact I can think of no better place in which to undertake this work than DI 55 with its breadth of scientific and technical knowledge in space study. In the future they will be helped in this task by the presentation of detail of space, missile and aircraft events in the STCIC.
4. In my view the case for deeper investigation into UFOs to meet public and House of Commons demands has been overstated. Our questioners have appeared satisfied with the service given over ten years and I believe it would be illogical to give higher priority or devote more effort than we do now to such a nebulous subject.
5. I therefore recommend that DI 55 should retain responsibility for UFOs and attach a minute to DSTI for your consideration. I also attach a Daily Telegraph cutting of 23rd June which epitomises the medium in which we are dealing.

27th June 1967

J.A.C. Aiken

(J.A.C. AIKEN)
Air Commodore (Intelligence)

DEFENCE
INTELLIGENCE STAFF
30 JUN 1967
SECRET
RECEIVED

SECRETD.G.I.Unidentified Flying Objects

The old Air Ministry had a responsibility for reporting on Unidentified Flying Objects. This was delegated through ACAS(I) to DDI(Tech.), and we have inherited this responsibility, which we have merged into the space section of DI 55.

2. I am attaching minutes by Mr. Hunter and Squadron Leader Hampston setting out the position in more detail.

3. I agree with Mr. Hunter that we cannot afford to devote much effort to pursuing these matters, but I feel that I ought to bring this to your attention, because it is a subject that is always liable to involve newspaper sensationalism or parliamentary questions.

4. We have the choice of divesting ourselves of our responsibility in the matter or accepting the risk that we shall on some occasion be found wanting.

D.S.T.I.19th June, 1967.DEFENCE
INTELLIGENCE STAFF

21 JUN 1967

SECRETARIAT
REGISTRY**SECRET**

329H

~~SECRET~~

15 JUN 1967 1/46

Reference..... E23

MR. A. POTTS,
DSTI.

U. F. O.'s

I recently discussed with you the problem which U.F.O.'s present and you endorsed the provisional ruling I had made in DI.55 that they were to receive the lowest priority of all the current tasks of the Space Section.

2. I now enclose a note by the DI.55 Space Weapons Systems Officer (S/Ldr. E.A.R. HUMPHSON) which sets out in greater detail the handling by the Ministry of Defence of U.F.O. sightings.

3. When we are so short of staff for tasks of much higher priority, it is clear that we cannot contemplate a special appointment for the investigation of U.F.O.'s and we must therefore always fall short of what is required to implement the stated official policy.

A.O. Hunter
A.O. HUNTER,
ADI/DI.55.

13th June 1967

~~SECRET~~

DSTI

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Please refer to your loose minute DSTI/126/6 of 19th June. I accept your contention that if UFOs are to be fully investigated in detail DI 55 will have to put greater effort into this task. However, I question the need to do any more than is being done now to deal with this nebulous subject.
2. The prime reason for undertaking UFO investigation at all is to protect the integrity of UK airspace. Since investigation began over ten years ago no positive evidence has come to light which would indicate activity other than that associated with known phenomena. In no case that I am aware of has a report been received which would support a real or potential hazard to UK airspace. It follows that there is no case for giving greater emphasis to the subject than in the past. Furthermore, there is no suggestion that our customers either service, or public, are dissatisfied with the way in which their questions have been investigated.
3. The absorption of the UFO task by DI 55 from the former DDI Tech is a logical outcome of the integration of staff within your directorate. Inevitably intelligence has the major role to play in these investigations and, because of the space or scientific explanations given to most UFO reports, this work fits into the general areas of investigation conducted in their primary tasks by DI 55. Once the STCIC is a going concern the DI 55 role in this field should be made considerably easier as a particular report on a UFO will be capable of immediate cross-reference to space activity at the time.
4. Until there is a clear case for treating UFOs with more concern than at present, I accept the way in which the problem is being dealt with and the priority being given to it by you.

A. Egan

29th June, 1967

DSTI

CONFIDENTIAL

Note: Action 10 Jan. 67

DAS4A(SEC)

From: DAS4A(SEC)
Sent: 05 January 2001 10:17
To: OMD14
Subject: LOOSE MINUTE
Importance: High

[I note from your out of office message that you are away until 8 Jan. I am away on 8/9 Jan but would like to be able to reply to Dr Clarke (see my minute 12 Dec, attached) on my return if possible as he has written again, in good humour but clearly anxious for a response!

With thanks - Section 40



From: Section 40
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

66

Telephone (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

Section 40
020 7218 9000
Section 40

Dr D W Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS(Sec)64/3/1
Date
5 January 2001

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter of 2 January enquiring about progress photocopying the material you requested.

The task was finished on 21 December, the material reached this building between Christmas and New Year and is now being packed for posting to you. I am not sure how many days it may take to reach you and so, although I shall have a copy of this letter placed in the parcel, I am also sending a separate copy to keep you informed.

You will receive the contents of:

AIR 2/18564 (PRO reference)

AIR 2/18873 (PRO reference)

AF/584 (MOD reference)

AF/3459/75 (MOD reference)

A number of 'UFO' related documents on files DEFE 3119 and DEFE 44/1 have also been photocopied and accompany the material listed above.

The work has taken 16 hours and 15 minutes to complete and, as indicated in my letter of 6 October, the first 4 are free of charge. The remaining 12 hours and 15 minutes, at £15.00 an hour, result in a cost of £183.75. I would be grateful if you would let me have your crossed cheque, made payable to "Accounting Officer MOD", once all the material has reached you.

I apologise for the fact that I am still not able to reply to your request concerning the "additional policy files 1968-81". If, by the middle of next week a response early in January seems unlikely I shall let you know.

Finally, in your letter of 10 October, you asked about the possibility of a further search within MOD files for DSI/JTIC Report Number 7. Unfortunately, there are not the resources to undertake a full search of files stored in the MOD archives, which seems to be what you have in mind. However, Records staff have, in recent years, seen many files in the course of an

accelerated review of records closed for more than 30 years and reviewed DIS material more than 20 years old. As even this extensive work, along with more recent searches, has failed to locate Report Number 7 the opinion, that it has not survived the passage of time, appears very reasonable. Perhaps your other lines of inquiry have been more successful.

Yours sincerely,

65


Dr David Clarke

Section 40



Section 40

**DAS 4a(Sec)
Ministry of Defence
Room 8240
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB**



Dear **Section 40**

You may recall our exchange of correspondence in October last year with regards to my request for access to certain MOD documents related to 'UFO' phenomena under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information.

In your most recent communication, dated 6 October 2000, you listed the material which you said "could be made available to you during December 2000."

I responded on October 10 (copy enclosed), when I confirmed I was willing to meet the appropriate charges and asked if you could proceed with this arrangement.

I perfectly understand your staff will have been extremely busy checking material which will have been released at the PRO in the New Year. However, having not heard from you since that date, I wonder if you could let me know if my request has been progressed, and when the material you listed is likely to be available.

Many thanks for your help and I look forward to hearing from you,

Section 40



D.W.Clarke

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

**DAS 4a(Sec)
Ministry of Defence
Room 8240
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB**

10 October 2000

Your ref: DAS(Sec)/64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your letters of 29 September and 6 October in response to my request for access for MOD documents under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. Firstly, I wish to thank you and your staff for the help you have provided and the efficient and detailed attention which my enquiries have received.

Secondly, thank you for listing the contents of the documents you have located, and for explaining both the 'sanitisation' procedure and the details of the charging regime for copies which I feel is very reasonable. On that basis I want to confirm that I wish to proceed with this enquiry in terms of the documents requested, listed as nos. 1 and 3-6 in your letter of 6 October, and that I am willing to meet the appropriate charge specified.

With reference to the question concerning the contents of the Meteorological Office file, BJ 5/311 (no. 2 in your list); after taking into consideration the fact that an 'un-sanitised' version of this document will be available at the Public Record Office from 1 January 2001, I feel it would be an unnecessary waste of your staff resources to request a copy of this document from the MOD at this late stage. Therefore I do not wish to proceed with this particular part of my request.

With ref to no. 5 in your list '**additional policy files 1968-81**' I am grateful that you have been able to identify a number of files relating to this enquiry, and I wish to proceed with my request for access to these documents. I realise there will probably be a large number of documents which fall within this category. It might therefore help if you could provide me with a brief summary of the number of files and pages, estimated cost of copying and the years and subjects they relate to, when your research is completed.

Finally, with regards to my request for access to **DSI/JTIC Report No 7** on UFOs (1952). It is disappointing that this document has not been located during your review of closed files. The attachment I enclosed with my letter of September 4 clearly demonstrated this document existed in 1967 when it was referred to by an officer of the DSTI branch, DI55. It seems improbable that such an important document (the basis of a briefing by the Secretary of State for Air to Prime Minister Winston Churchill in 1952) would have been lost or 'not have survived the passage of time' when other material of lesser interest *has* survived and is available in the Public Record Office today.

From the DSI/JTIC committee minutes available at the PRO it is stated that a 'watered down' copy of the Report No. 7 was being considered for release to the Press during October 1952 by DDI (Security), so it is possible copies may have been sent to a number of different MOD departments. As it is also noted that the Americans (presumably the US Air Force) would have to be consulted before any Press release, copies of Report No 7 may also have been sent to the US Embassy in 1952-53. In addition, there is a note in the minutes stating that copy of this report had been sent to Sir Henry Tizard, whose papers are preserved at the Imperial War Museum. I intend to visit the Museum to research Tizard's papers in the near future, and will notify you if I find the document among these papers.

In the meantime, I would appreciate any information or advice you could supply as to the options which remain open to me in terms of requesting a further, comprehensive search of Defence Records to locate this historically important Intelligence report.

I look forward to hearing from you again before the end of the year as and when the first part of this request is processed.

Yours Sincerely,

Dr. D.W.Clarke



Postage
paid
by
addressee

Please
do not
cancel



Section 40

DAS 4a (Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
ROOM 8240
MAIN BUILDING
WHITEHALL
LONDON SW1A 2HB

64

Loose Minute

D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8

21 December 2000

DAS4a(Sec)

OMD14

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO UFO FILES – Dr CLARKE

Reference: A. D INFO(EXP)R/3/7/8 dated 16 November 2000

1. Further to Reference A you will be relieved to note that the photocopying of the papers is now complete. I forward six folders, each representing the relevant files identified by Dr Clarke.

2. I previously estimated that the exercise would take 14.9 hours and cost Dr Clarke £163.50. In the event it took 16 hours 15 minutes to complete with a final cost of £183.75. The time taken on individual files was:


DSI/JTIC Report NO7 and related intelligence reports on "UFOs" 1951-1952 – two folders representing pages from DEFE 31/19 & DEFE 44/1 – time taken not quantified.

✓ AIR 2/18564 – 3 hours 30 minutes. (AF/CX/295/72)

✓ AF/3459/75 – 3 hours 10 minutes.

AIR 2/18873 & AF/584 – two folders 5 hours 35 minutes and 4 hours respectively.

Section 40



D Info(Exp)R1

Section 40



DAS4A(SEC)

63

From: OMD14
Sent: 21 December 2000 14:23
To: DAS4A(SEC)
Subject: Out of Office AutoReply: DR CLARKE EXERCISE

I'm away on leave until 8th January. If you have an urgent enquiry please contact Section 49 on Section 40 on Chots at OMD/AD(E+MG).

Loose Minute

D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8

21 December 2000

DAS4a(Sec)

OMD14

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO UFO FILES – Dr CLARKE

Reference: A. D INFO(EXP)R/3/7/8 dated 16 November 2000

1. Further to Reference A you will be relieved to note that the photocopying of the papers is now complete. I forward six folders, each representing the relevant files identified by Dr Clarke.

2. I previously estimated that the exercise would take 14.9 hours and cost Dr Clarke £163.50. In the event it took 16 hours 15 minutes to complete with a final cost of £183.75. The time taken on individual files was:

DSI/JTIC Report NO7 and related intelligence reports on "UFOs" 1951-1952 – two folders representing pages from DEFE 31/19 & DEFE 44/1 – time taken not quantified.

AIR 2/18564 – 3 hours 30 minutes.

AF/3459/75 – 3 hours 10 minutes.

AIR 2/18873 & AF/584 – two folders 5 hours 35 minutes and 4 hours respectively.

* 16h 15m = £243.75

minus 4 "free" hours = £183.75

at £15 per hour.

Section 40

D Info(Exp)R1

GSY 1.01 Section 40

62

61



From: Section 40

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Section 40 Old War Office Building, Whitehall, London. SW1A 2EU

Direct Dial: Section 40

Switch Board: 0171 218 9000

Facsimile: Section 40

Section 40

Ministry of Defence,
DAS4a(Sec),
Room 8243 Main Building,
Horseguards Avenue,
London.

Your Reference:
D/DAS(Sec)/64/3-12th Dec 00
Our Reference:
D/DI55/108/15
Date:
15 Dec 2000

Dr CLARKE's REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES ON UFOs

At your reference above you have asked whether papers up to 1981 on Part 4 of file DI55/108/15 can be released to the PRO. This file was opened on 9th December 1971 and closed on the 11 December 1996 with retention recommended for 10 years.

It is not MoD Policy to spilt or disturb closed files, doing so would be likely to create future concerns and suspicion when these files are released to PRO.

You also asked for our view on whether MoD should reveal that file part 3 of file D/DI55/40/9/1 has been destroyed. DI55 sees no reason not to be open about the destruction of this file in 1984 but we do not have any information relating to its destruction. You should be aware that DIST wrote to Hd Sec (AS) on the 4th December 2000 terminating any further involvement of DI55 in UAP reporting on the grounds that it is not a formal task and that, in 30 years, no evidence has been found of relevance to DIS interests.

Section 40

Copy to:

Hd DIS(Sy)
AD/DI55
OMD14



From: Section 40 [redacted]

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

Section 40 Old War Office Building, Whitehall, London. SW1A 2EU

Direct Dial: Section 40 [redacted]

Switch Board: 0171 218 9000

Facsimile: Section 40 [redacted]

Section 40 [redacted]

Ministry of Defence,
DAS4a(Sec),
Room 8243 Main Building,
Horseguards Avenue,
London.

Your Reference:
D/DAS(Sec)/64/3-12th Dec 00
Our Reference:
D/DI55/108/15
Date:
15 Dec 2000

Dr CLARKE's REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES ON UFOs

At your reference above you have asked whether papers up to 1981 on Part 4 of file DI55/108/15 can be released to the PRO. This file was opened on 9th December 1971 and closed on the 11 December 1996 with retention recommended for 10 years.

It is not MoD Policy to spilt or disturb closed files, doing so would be likely to create future concerns and suspicion when these files are released to PRO.

You also asked for our view on whether MoD should reveal that file part 3 of file D/DI55/40/9/1 has been destroyed. DI55 sees no reason not to be open about the destruction of this file in 1984 but we do not have any information relating to its destruction. You should be aware that DIST wrote to Hd Sec (AS) on the 4th December 2000 terminating any further involvement of DI55 in UAP reporting on the grounds that it is not a formal task and that, in 30 years, no evidence has been found of relevance to DIS interests.

Section 40 [redacted]

Copy to:

Hd DIS(Sy)
AD/DI55
OMD14

To: Section 40 [redacted]

OMD14.

Fax: Section 40 [redacted]


See Paras 1 and 2.
I am not inclined to press
DI to open their file (Paras
1 and 2) but you may
have views under the
Code of Practice

Section 40 [redacted]

60

DAS4A(SEC)

From: Info(Exp)-Records1
Sent: 12 December 2000 13:49
To: DAS4A(SEC)
Subject: Dr Clarke



Section 40

Photocopying of the files for Dr Clarke is progressing. I'll let you know towards the end of the week when we estimate completion.

So far as payment is concerned. A cheque payable to "Accounting Officer MOD" and crossed for the relevant sum (again final cost in due course).

Records 2 at Hayes has a well established billing system and will be happy to bank the cheque.

Section 40

59

LOOSE MINUTE

~~DDAS(Sec)/64/3~~

12 December 2000

OMD14

copy to:
DD Info(Exp)R1
DI 55

DR CLARKE's REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES ON UFOs

Reference:

D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8 dtd 16 November 00

1. Following earlier correspondence from Dr Clarke calling for a wide range of information a refined request was provided to us on 4 September. Papers from a small number of files are now in the process of being sanitised and copied for him.
2. The outstanding element of the work relates to policy files covering the years 1968-81 and, over the last month, we have been engaged in checking what material (originating from the Air Staff Secretariat) might be included in this category. Records 1 has been good enough to draw together a list of files on the subject of UFOs originating from two areas within MOD (Reference) identifying five Secretariat files with the word "Policy" in the title. Unfortunately, despite the Secretariat's confident pronouncement that files on the subject had been retained since 1967, not all have survived. Amongst the casualties are four entitled "Policy" which, according to our records, were destroyed within the Secretariat in 1990 (along with a number of other files on the same subject containing letters from members of the public). The file held by Records 1 (AF/3459/75 Policy and Policy Statements) has already been requested by Dr Clarke and is being photocopied.
3. Three other files are marked by Records 1 in their "Comments" column "Policy File"; AF/419 BBC2 "Man Alive Programme", AF/S4f(s)/422 "UFOs Radio Oxford programme" and AF/S4(Air)/506 "Statistical analysis of UFOs (in response to PQs)". This highlights our dilemma; most Secretariat files will contain a few papers that might be termed policy. When Dr Clarke was asked to refine his request in August 2000 he wrote back asking for "AF/3459/75 UFOs: Policy and Policy Statements 1970. **This file plus additional policy files 1968-1981.**" It seems to me that the ~~only files we are obliged to look at in order to close this exercise are those with the word Policy in the title, perhaps you would confirm that this assumption is correct.~~ If that is the case, and in the light of the destruction in 1990, there are now no more Secretariat policy files from the period that Dr Clarke has not already viewed, or are in the process of being photocopied for him. ~~I assume any reply to Dr Clarke must mention the fact that four additional policy files existed but unfortunately appear to have been destroyed in 1990.~~ I would appreciate your advice on this point also.
4. There are 6 DI files on the list. The first two are already in the PRO and therefore readily available to Dr Clarke if he wishes to view them. The third (55/40/9/1 Pt 3) is no longer available.

The final three contain more recent material almost entirely outside the period Dr Clarke has requested. Only Part 4 of 55/108/15 probably holds some papers from the years up to and including 1981 and may fall to be considered at this time. I would be grateful if DI 55 would contact OMD 14 direct on this subject and would either DI or OMD let me have a form of words for the reply to Dr Clarke. Would you please indicate whether I should mention the destroyed Pt 3 of 55/40/9/1. As I must write by the end of this year I would be grateful for comments by COP 19 December.

Section 40

DAS4a(Sec)

MB8243 Section 40

LOOSE MINUTE

D/DAS(Sec)64/3

58

8 December 2000

DD Info(Exp)R1

copy to: OMD14

DR CLARKE's REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO UFO FILES

Reference: D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8 dtd 16 Nov 00

1. Thank you for your minute at Reference in which you suggest that Dr Clarke might be asked to pay a deposit in advance of work being undertaken on his behalf. I am sorry not to have replied sooner, unfortunately I was out of office unexpectedly and did not return until 6 December.
2. When I wrote to Dr Clarke on 6 October I mentioned two options to him. One was to copy a larger body of information, costing approximately £330, the second option was estimated at some £160. Dr Clarke accepted our offer to copy the smaller number of papers at around £160. As the re-estimation recently made by you increases that latter sum by £3.50 only I do not think we can now insist on a deposit, having made no mention of that possibility in the first place.
3. I would be grateful if you would now undertake the main task as Dr Clarke is expecting to hear from us by the end of the year, with the photocopied papers. Who produces the invoice, perhaps you would let me know?

Section 40

DAS4a(Sec)

MB8243 Section 40

LOOSE MINUTE

57/11

D INFO(EXP)R/3/7/8

6 December 2000

D Info(Exp)R1c

Copy To:

DAS4a(Sec)

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES: DR CLAKE

1. Following Dr Clarke's request for access to a number of files it has subsequently been agreed that photocopies from the files should be made available. In all four files, not yet release under the provisions of the 30-year rule are involved, plus copies of a few pages from two retained files.

2. Action required:

AIR 2/18564 - file consists of approximately 77 pages of which 23 require redaction. In the main the redactions relate to the identification of G/C Whitworth and Hennessey's, their names and addresses, from correspondence, but not Whitworth's from newspaper clippings. Note that there are references to both in minutes and submissions which should also be deleted. The original file cover should also be photocopied.

AF 3459/75 - File consists of approximately 115 pages of which just five require redaction. Leave the Royal Holloway College's details in but remove the name of those writing to the MOD. The *UFO Register*, the three books at the back of the file, to be photocopied also. For convenience copy two page at a time rather than attempt to reproduce the books as they are in the original. As before the original file cover to be photocopied.

AF/584 - Number of pages 105 approx, number to be redacted 50. Photocopy the front cover of each enclosed file. Watch out for reportee's details in signals. Front file cover to again be photocopied.

AIR 2/18873 - Number of pages 156 approx, number of redactions 102. Photocopy original file cover but not the PRO cover. Do not photocopy envelopes. On a few occasions a divider (dummy) has been inserted ie E44/45. This should be photocopied. In addition, letters from "officials" (state funded) institutions are included - these made be release without redaction but watch out for references to member of the public ie E11 RSRS letter, it refers to a "Mr Best" (delete "Mr Best").

Extracts from DEFE 31/19 – six pages only – these are to be photocopied, no redactions.

Extract from DEFE 41/1 – one page only to be photocopied. No redactions.

3. The photocopied pages are to be placed in new (PRO) file covers endorsed with file titles and references. In addition, please ensure that all protective marking are cancelled on photocopied documents by over stamping UNCLASSIFIED.
4. Finally, Dr Clarke has agreed to meet charges, which we have estimated to be in the region of £130, we therefore need to monitor very closely the time spent on this exercise. I suggest that you record the time taken to process each file separately. This will, of course, prove useful for similar exercises in the future.
5. Any problems please let me know.

Section 40

DD INFO(EXP) RECORDS1

GSY 1.01 Section 40

Chots: INFO(EXP)-Records1

Internet: defence.records1@gtnet.gov.uk

57
+1

DAS4A(SEC)

From: Info(Exp)-Records1
Sent: 06 December 2000 09:55
To: DAS4A(SEC)
Subject: DR CLARKE EXERCISE

Janet

Please see the attached.

Iain

LOOSE MINUTE

D INFO(EXP)R/3/7/8

6 December 2000

D Info(Exp)R1c

Copy To:

DAS4a(Sec)

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES: DR CLAKE

1. Following Dr Clarke's request for access to a number of files it has subsequently been agreed that photocopies from the files should be made available. In all four files, not yet release under the provisions of the 30-year rule are involved, plus copies of a few pages from two retained files.

2. Action required:

AIR 2/18564 - file consists of approximately 77 pages of which 23 require redaction. In the main the redactions relate to the identification of G/C Whitworth and Hennessey's, their names and addresses, from correspondence, but not Whitworth's from newspaper clippings. Note that there are references to both in minutes and submissions which should also be deleted. The original file cover should also be photocopied.

AF 3459/75 - File consists of approximately 115 pages of which just five require redaction. Leave the Royal Holloway College's details in but remove the name of those writing to the MOD. The *UFO Register*, the three books at the back of the file, to be photocopied also. For convenience copy two page at a time rather than attempt to reproduce the books as they are in the original. As before the original file cover to be photocopied.

AF/584 - Number of pages 105 approx, number to be redacted 50. Photocopy the front cover of each enclosed file. Watch out for reportee's details in signals. Front file cover to again be photocopied.

AIR 2/18873 - Number of pages 156 approx, number of redactions 102. Photocopy original file cover but not the PRO cover. Do not photocopy envelopes. On a few occasions a divider (dummy) has been inserted ie E44/45. This should be photocopied. In addition, letters from "officials" (state funded) institutions are included - these made be release without redaction but watch out for references to member of the public ie E11 RSRS letter, it refers to a "Mr Best" (delete "Mr Best").

Extracts from DEFE 31/19 - six pages only - these are to be photocopied, no redactions.

Extract from DEFE 41/1 - one page only to be photocopied. No redactions.

3. The photocopied pages are to be placed in new (PRO) file covers endorsed with file titles and references. In addition, please ensure that all protective marking are cancelled on photocopied documents by over stamping UNCLASSIFIED.
4. Finally, Dr Clarke has agreed to meet charges, which we have estimated to be in the region of £130, we therefore need to monitor very closely the time spent on this exercise. I suggest that you record the time taken to process each file separately. This will, of course, prove useful for similar exercises in the future.
5. Any problems please let me know.

Section 40

DD INFO(EXP) RECORDS1

GSY 1.01 **Section 40**

Chots: INFO(EXP)-Records1

Internet: defence.records1@gtnet.gov.uk

Loose Minute

D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8

16 November 2000

DAS4a(Sec)

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO UFO FILES – Dr CLARKE

Reference: A. D/DAS(Sec)64/3 dated 12 October 2000

1. Your minute (Reference) together with a copy of Dr Clarke's reply (10 October 2000) to your earlier letter seeks to resolve a number of outstanding matters.

A revised estimate of providing photocopies

2. I have revisited this part of the exercise. There are some minor variations in the figures but overall no changes in the final total:

DSI/JTIC Report NO7 and related intelligence reports on "UFOs" 1951-1952 –
Seven pages from DFE 31/19 & DEFE 44/1.

AIR 2/18564 – 75 pages (25 to be sanitised).

AF/3459/75 – 115 pages (5 to be sanitised).

AIR 2/18873 & AF/584 – 250 pages (150 to be sanitised).

In all I estimate that 447 pages will require photocopying, of which 180 will need to be sanitised. On the same basis as previously advised, assuming 2 minutes per enclosure the exercise will take approximately 14.9 hours, the first four hours are free leaving 10.9 hours to be charged at £15 per hour, totalling £163.50.

3. In view of the large sum involved I suggest that Dr Clarke be asked to pay a deposit, say £100, before we start work. The balance on completion. Time-scale, as before we will devote three hours per week to the activity making it a five week exercise. On receipt of the deposit (?) we will commence work.

The identification of policy files covering the period 1968-1981

3. I attach a list of unreleased "UFO" files (Annex A). The list was compiled from; the PRO catalogue, trawl through DAS(Sec), and predecessor files stored at the main MOD archives at Hayes and through contacts in DIS. The list does not purport to be a definitive listing of "UFO" files held by MOD but just those created by two branches.

4. Three files originally stored at Hayes may be relevant to this exercise:

(1) AF/419 BBC2 Man Alive Programme - "UFOs" (1972)

(2) AF/422 "UFOs" BBC Radio Oxford Programme (1973)

(3) AF/S4fU/506 Statistical Analysis of "UFOs" (1973)

These three and the other records noted in the comments column "Records 1" await cataloguing and eventual transfer to the PRO. Should you wish to view them please let me know. Two DI55 files may also be relevant, one, appears to have been destroyed DI55/40/9/1 Part 3, covering the period 1968-71, the other, Part 4 covers the period 1971-96. -

5. All other files attributed to "Records" have, following a cursory examination, the standard exchanges of correspondence between members of the public and the MOD about incidents that have been witnessed or enquiries of general interest. Files located at the PRO have not been examined as part of this exercise, but I note that all carry the standard description "UFO" reports!

~~What other steps could be made to locate DSI/JTIC Report No 7/Unidentified Flying Objects (1952)?~~

6. In short there are not the resources to undertake a full search of files stored in the two MOD archives.

7. For your background information: the PRO recommends that government departments undertake two reviews (1) one at around the five year point, and (2) another, for records surviving the first review, at the 25 year point. MOD action varies slightly in that branches undertake a local review before archiving surviving files. Records subsequently surviving local and first these reviews receive a review at the 25-year point ie my staff are currently reviewing records dating from the mid-1970s. Records selected for permanent preservation but that are too sensitive to release at the normal 30-year point may remain closed subject to the Lord Chancellor's of the day agreement. Record, whether open or closed, appear on the PRO catalogue.

8. Open records are, of course, available to researchers at Kew. Closed records can be identified by their PRO references and descriptions on the PRO catalogue. With the advent of the open government initiative (1993) more than 700 member of the public have approached this office about closed records. In addition, my staff have undertaken an accelerated review of records closed for more than 30 years. During the same period my staff have been given access to the DIS store in order to review records more than 20 years old. Our actions since 1993 have failed to locate the

missing report and as with other records over 30 years old its absence from the PRO catalogue leads to only one conclusion that it has not survived the passage of time.

Section 40


D Info(Exp)R1

GSY 1.01 Section 40

**FILES IDENTIFIED RELATING TO THE SUBJECT OF "UFOs" COVERING THE PERIOD 1970 - 1981:
CLARKE EXERCISE (October 2000)**

Note.

1. At the time of the PQ December 1998 a trawl was made through the most likely MOD Form 262Fs stored at Hayes for files relating to UFOs (search was in fact limited to Sec(AS) and predecessor branches only).
2. In addition, files already reviewed, catalogue and transferred to the PRO, but have yet to be released are identified.
3. Comments column record the location of the file, if known:
 - a. PRO - Public Record Office ie awaiting release at the designated date.
 - b. Records 1 = D Info (Exp)R 1, GSY. The files are awaiting cataloguing and eventual transfer to the PRO.
 - c. Records 2 = D Info (Exp)R2, Hayes. Files are held pending transfer to D Info (Exp)R1.
 - d. Defence Intelligence Staff - DIS, OWO. Records to be transferred to D Info (Exp)R 1 / 2 in due course.
 - e. Sec(AS), now DAS(Sec).

File ref.	Date	Title	Comments
AIR 2/18564	1957-71	UFO reports West Freugh	PRO for release 2002, but as the subject of Dr Clarke's enquiry with Records 1
AIR 2/18565	1970-71	UFO reports	PRO for release 2002
AIR 2/18872	1972-73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 2/18873	1973-74	UFO reports 	PRO for release 2005, but as the subject of Dr C's enquiry with Records 1.
AIR 2/18874	1974-75	UFO reports	PRO for release 2006
AIR 2/18920	1975-76	UFO reports	PRO for release 2007
AIR 2/18921	1976	UFO reports	PRO for release 2007
AIR 20/12067	Jan 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12297	Feb 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12298	Mar 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12299	Apr 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12300	May 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12301	Jun 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12302	Jul 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12303	Aug 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12304	Sep 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12305	Oct 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12306	Nov 70	UFO reports	PRO for release 2001
AIR 20/12399	1971-72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12400	Jan 71	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12401	Feb 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12402	Mar 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12403	Apr 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12404	May 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003

24 Files

AIR 20/12405	Jun 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12406	Jul 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12407	Aug 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12408	Sep 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12409	Oct 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12410	Nov 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12411	Dec 72	UFO reports	PRO for release 2003
AIR 20/12544	Jan 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12545	Feb 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12546	Mar 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12547	Apr 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12548	May 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12549	Jun 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12550	Jul 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12551	Aug 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12552	Sep 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12553	Oct 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12554	Nov 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
AIR 20/12555	Dec 73	UFO reports	PRO for release 2004
BJ 5/311	1968-70	UFO: Met aspects	PRO for release 2001
AF/419	Dec 71	BBC 2 Man Alive programme	"POLICY FILE" Records 1
AF/S4f(a)/422	Dec 72	UFOs Radio Oxford programme	"POLICY FILE!" Records 1
AF/447 Pt 1	Aug 75- Jun 76	Edited Reports	Records 1 Edited very badly. Some are duplicated in files marked thus * (below)
AF/S4f(Air)/506	1967-73	Statistical analysis of UFOs (in response to PQs)	"POLICY FILE!" Records 1
AF/584	Jan 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/585	Feb 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/586	Mar 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/587	Apr 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/588	May 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/589	Jun 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/590	Jul 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/591	Aug 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/592	Sep 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/593	Oct 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/594	Nov 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/595	Dec 74	Reports	Records 1
AF/596	Jan 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/587	Feb 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/598	Mar 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/599	Apr 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/560	May 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/561	Jun 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/562	Jul 75	Reports	Records 1
AF/607	Dec 75	Reports	Records 1 *
AF/608	Jan 76	Reports	Records 1 *
AF/610	Mar 76	Reports	Records 1 *
AF/611	Apr 76	Reports	Records 1 *
AF/612	May 76	Reports	Records 1 *
AF/613	Jun 76	Reports	Records 1 *

Requested
See para 4

See para 4

49

AF/616	Sep 76	Reports	Records 1
AF/617	Oct 76	Reports	Records 1
AF/618	Nov 76	Reports	Records 1
AF/619	Dec 76	Reports	Records 1
* AF/3459/75	1970	Policy and policy statements	"POLICY FILE" Records 1
→ D/DS8/25/3	1978	Parliamentary correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt A	1977	UFO reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt B	1977	UFO reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt C	1978	UFO reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt F	1979	UFO reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt G	1980	UFO reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/1 Pt H	1980	UFO reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt A	1977	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt B	1977	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt C	1977	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt D	1977	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt E	1978	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt F	1978	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt G	1979	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt H	1979	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt J	1979	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt K	1979	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt L	1980	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS8/75/2/2 Pt M	1980	UFO reports (edited copies)	Records 2
D/DS75/2/3 Pt D	1978	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS75/2/3 Pt E	1978	UFO reports	Sec(AS) - 8/00
D/DS75/2/3 Pt F	1978	UFO reports	Sec(AS) - 8/00
D/DS75/2/3 Pt G	1978	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS75/2/3 Pt H	1978	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS75/2/3 Pt J	1978	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS75/2/4 Pt A	1979	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS75/2/4 Pt B	1979	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS75/2/4 Pt D	1979	UFO reports	Records 2
→ D/DS8/75/2/5 Pt A	1980	UFO reports	Records 2
→ D/DS8/75/2/5 Pt B	1980	UFO reports	Records 2
D/DS8/75/6 Pt A	1979	TV discussion	Records 2
D/DS8/75/7 Pt A	1979	Satellite debris	Records 2
→ D/DS8/10/209 Pt A	1981	General briefs and reports, UFO correspondence	Records 2
→ D/DS8/10/209 Pt B	1981	General briefs and reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/10/209 Pt C	1982	General briefs and reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/10/209 Pt D	1982	General briefs and reports, correspondence	N/T Hayes
D/DS8/10/209 Pt E	1983	General briefs and reports, correspondence	N/T Hayes
D/DS8/10/209 Pt F	1984	General briefs and reports, correspondence	N/T Hayes
D/DS8/10/209 Pt G	1984	General briefs and reports, correspondence	Records 2
D/DS8/10/209/1 Pt A	1983	General briefs and reports, UFO correspondence reports	Records 2

Policy -
already
requested.

No trace
Hayes.

45

D/DS8/10/209/1 Pt B	1984	General briefs and reports, UFO correspondence reports	Records 2
D/DS8/10/209/1 Pt C	1985	General briefs and reports, UFO correspondence reports	Records 2
AF/X58/64	1968	UFO policy & policy statements	DAS(Sec), LM 24 Aug 00
AF/X58/64	1970	UFO policy & policy statements	DAS(Sec), LM 24 Aug 00
D/DS8/75/1 Pt A	1979	UFO policy & policy statements	DAS(Sec), LM 24 Aug 00
D/DS8/75/1 Pt B	1979	UFO policy & policy statements	DAS(Sec), LM 24 Aug 00

Policy 68-71
 approx. Air Staff Sec. to be destroyed March '90

FILES IDENTIFIED BY DR CLARKE (LETTER DATED 11 AUGUST 2000) THAT APPEAR TO BE OUTSIDE THE DESIGNATED PERIOD

D/Sec(AS)/12/1 Pt A	1985	UFO policy	DAS(Sec) ?
D/Sec(AS)/64/1 Pt A	1996	UFO policy	DAS(Sec) ?
D/Sec(AS)/64/1 Pt B		UFO policy	DAS(Sec) ?
D/Sec(AS)/64/1 Pt C		UFO policy	DAS(Sec) ?
D/Sec(AS)/64/1 Pt D		UFO policy	DAS(Sec) ?
D/Sec(AS)/64/5 Pt A	1996	Media issues	DAS(Sec) ?

Policy but outside period of inquiry.

UFO FILES CREATED BY DIS

Note: Information obtained by Section 40 D Info (Exp)R1b, during the early phases of the CLARKE exercise.

55/40/9/1 Pt 1	58 - 63	UFO policy	IN PRO DEFE 31/118
55/40/9/1 Pt 2	63 - 67	UFO policy	IN PRO DEFE 31/119
55/40/9/1 Pt 3	68 - 71	UFO policy	DESTROYED 8 Aug 84
55/108/15 Pt 4	71 - 96	UFO policy	DIS
55/108/15 Pt 5	96 - 00	UFO policy	DIS
55/108/15 Pt 6	2000 - date	UFO policy	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 1	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 2	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 3	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 3	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 4	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 5	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 6	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 7	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 8	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 9	N/K	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 10	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 11	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 12	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 13	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 14	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 15	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 16	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 17	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 18	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 19	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 20	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 21	1977	Incident file	Records 1
108/15/1 Pt 22	1977	Incident file	Records 1
108/15/1 Pt 23	1977	Incident file	Records 1

Beyond period of query

20 surviving

12 - Destroyed + 4

6 in DAS

108/15/1 Pt 24	1977	Incident file	Records 1
108/15/1 Pt 25	1977	Incident file	Records 1
108/15/1 Pt 26	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 27	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 28	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 29	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 30	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 31	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED DATE N/K
108/15/1 Pt 32	Feb 78 - Jan 83	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 33	N/K	Incident file	DESTROYED 30 Nov 92
108/15/1 Pt 34	Jun 83 - Mar 85	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 35	Apr 85 - Dec 86	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 36A	Dec 86 - Nov 87	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 36B	Nov 87 - Jul 88	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 37	Aug 88 - Jul 89	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 38	Jul 89 - Dec 89	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 39	Jan 90 - Jun 91	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 40	Jun 91 - Jan 92	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 41	Feb 92 - Apr 93	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 42	Apr 93 - Oct 93	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 43	Oct 93 - Jan 94	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 44	Jan 94 - May 94	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 45	Jun 94 - Nov 94	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 46	Nov 94 - May 95	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 47	Jun 95 - Jan 96	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 48	Feb 96 - Jul 96	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 49	Aug 96 - Oct 96	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 50	Nov 96 - Dec 97	Incident file	DIS
108/15/1 Pt 51	Jan 97 - to date	Incident file	DIS
108/15/2 Pt 1	1993	"Title unknown"	DIS

23 Dis/R1.

7 destroyed

LOOSE MINUTE

55

D/DAS(Sec)64/3

12 October 2000

Hd of DR 1

copy to:
OMD 14

REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO 'UFO' FILES - DR CLARKE

Reference: DAS(Sec)64/3 dtd 6 October 00

1. Dr Clarke has replied speedily to my letter of 6 October (Reference) and I attach a copy of his reply to this minute.
2. As you will see, he is accepting the offer as expressed in my letter, excluding copying of BJ 5/311. With the reduction in the amount of material to be copied (by some 300 pages) it would be helpful if we were able to let Dr Clarke have a revised estimate of the date by which he might hope to receive the documentation, perhaps you would let me know. As the task progresses we also need to be alive to the costs involved and if there is any chance of exceeding the estimate given at Reference. I would be grateful if you would keep a close watch on that aspect and alert me if necessary. I have no idea how the invoicing is handled, perhaps either you or OMD 14 would advise.
3. Dr Clarke's outstanding request relates to policy files 1968-81. From records kept in this office it appears four files, labelled 'UFO' policy files were almost certainly destroyed in 1990, along with a number of other files on the same subject. This is very disappointing but there might be a possibility of drawing policy material from other files. I shall look through the list and speak with you further.

Section 40

DAS4a(Sec)

MB8243 **Section 40**

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

**DAS 4a(Sec)
Ministry of Defence
Room 8240
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB**

10 October 2000

Your ref: DAS(Sec)/64/3

Dear **Section 40**

Many thanks for your letters of 29 September and 6 October in response to my request for access for MOD documents under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. Firstly, I wish to thank you and your staff for the help you have provided and the efficient and detailed attention which my enquiries have received.

Secondly, thank you for listing the contents of the documents you have located, and for explaining both the 'sanitisation' procedure and the details of the charging regime for copies which I feel is very reasonable. On that basis I want to confirm that I wish to proceed with this enquiry in terms of the documents requested, listed as nos. 1 and 3-6 in your letter of 6 October, and that I am willing to meet the appropriate charge specified.

With reference to the question concerning the contents of the Meteorological Office file, **BJ 5/311** (no. 2 in your list); after taking into consideration the fact that an 'un-sanitised' version of this document will be available at the Public Record Office from 1 January 2001, I feel it would be an unnecessary waste of your staff resources to request a copy of this document from the MOD at this late stage. Therefore I do not wish to proceed with this particular part of my request.

With ref to no. 5 in your list '**additional policy files 1968-81**' I am grateful that you have been able to identify a number of files relating to this enquiry, and I wish to proceed with my request for access to these documents. I realise there will probably be a large number of documents which fall within this category. It might therefore help if you could provide me with a brief summary of the number of files and pages, estimated cost of copying and the years and subjects they relate to, when your research is completed.

1
Outstanding

Finally, with regards to my request for access to **DSI/JTIC Report No 7** on UFOs (1952). It is disappointing that this document has not been located during your review of closed files. The attachment I enclosed with my letter of September 4 clearly demonstrated this document existed in 1967 when it was referred to by an officer of the DSTI branch, DI55. It seems improbable that such an important document (the basis of a briefing by the Secretary of State for Air to Prime Minister Winston Churchill in 1952) would have been lost or 'not have survived the passage of time' when other material of lesser interest *has* survived and is available in the Public Record Office today.

From the DSI/JTIC committee minutes available at the PRO it is stated that a 'watered down' copy of the Report No. 7 was being considered for release to the Press during October 1952 by DDI (Security), so it is possible copies may have been sent to a number of different MOD departments. As it is also noted that the Americans (presumably the US Air Force) would have to be consulted before any Press release, copies of Report No 7 may also have been sent to the US Embassy in 1952-53. In addition, there is a note in the minutes stating that a copy of this report had been sent to Sir Henry Tizard, whose papers are preserved at the Imperial War Museum. I intend to visit the Museum to research Tizard's papers in the near future, and will notify you if I find the document among these papers.

In the meantime, I would appreciate any information or advice you could supply as to the options which remain open to me in terms of requesting a further, comprehensive search of Defence Records to locate this historically important Intelligence report.

I look forward to hearing from you again before the end of the year as and when the first part of this request is processed.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



Dr. D.W. Clarke

DAS4A(SEC)

From: APS(1)/USofS(Personal)
Sent: 11 October 2000 09:25
To: DAS4A(SEC)
Subject: UFOS

54

Importance: High

Section 40

Thanks very much for the files and the other bits and pieces on ufos. Minister is in office today and tomorrow and I'll try and get him to focus on this.

I'll let you know what the outcome is as soon as I can. In the meantime, if you need the files let me know.

Thanks

Section 40

Assistant Private Secretary to the
Under Secretary of State



with the compliments of
Ministry of Defence

Please see enclosed your list
that you sent us, I have checked
and this is the outcome.

Regards

DR 20 FILES OUT AS.
BOURNE AVENUE
NAYES
MIDDLESEX UB3 1RF

Section 40



53

From: Section 40 DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Secretariat (Air Staff)
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) Section 40
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40


FAX MESSAGE

TO: Section 40 - "Files Out"

SUBJECT: Location of closed files

DATE: 11 Oct 00

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 3



LOCATION OF CLOSED FILES

I attach a list of files, all 'UFO' volumes, that appear to have been sent for destruction during March 1990.

Numbers 1-2 and 5-6 you have already searched for and confirmed that you still have 6 (D/DS8/75/1). I would be grateful if you would now check your records to see if you have any of those files up to and including number 17 and let me know the result of your search.

With thanks.

Section 40

UFO Files And Their Status

KEY D=Destroyed
 C=Current
 n/q=not quoted
 hir=held in room

Title & Date of Last Encl	Number	Part	Status
1. UFO Policy & Policy Statements-22/2/68	AF/X58/64	1	DESTROYED ✓ <i>Confirmed destroyed - Not located</i>
2. UFO Policy & Policy Statements-31/3/70	AF/X58/64	2	D ✓ <i>Confirmed destroyed - Not located</i>
3. Parliamentary Enquiries on UFOs- Prime Minister's (JJA Hennessey)-1/7/70	AF/1505	2	D ✓
4. Parliamentary Questions and Enquires on UFO's-13/1/77	AF/1505	3	D ✓
5. UFOs- Policy Statements 18/1/79	D/DS8/75/1A	A	D ✓ <i>Confirmed destroyed - Not located</i>
6. UFOs- Policy Statements 4/12/79	D/DS8/75/1	B	D ✓ <i>located</i>
7. UFOs- Reports Correspondence 25/8/78	D/DS8/75/2/1	D	D ✓
8. UFOs- Reports Correspondence 10/1/79	D/DS8/75/2/1	E	D ✓
9. UFOs- Reports Correspondence JJA Hennessey-11/1/78	D/DS8/75/2/1/1	I	D ✓
10. UFOs- Correspondence-12/2/82	D/DS8/75/2/1	J	D ✓
11. UFOs- Reports Correspondence M.D.Davies-13/1/77	D/DS8/75/2/1/2	A	D ✓
12. UFOs Reports June-Oct 79 24/9/79	D/DS8/75/2/4	C	D ✓
13. UFOs Parliamentary Correspondence-25/1/79	D/DS8/75/3	B	D ✓
14. UFOs Parliamentary Correspondence-11/2/82	D/DS8/75/3	C	D ✓
15. UFOs Parliamentary Correspondence- House of Lords Debate Jan 1979 15/1/79	D/DS8/75/3/1	A	D ✓



52

From: **Section 40** DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Secretariat (Air Staff)
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) **Section 40**
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

FAX MESSAGE

TO: **Section 40** - "Files Out"

(Fax: **Section 40**)

SUBJECT: Location of closed files

DATE: 11 Oct 00

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 3

LOCATION OF CLOSED FILES

I attach a list of files, all 'UFO' volumes, that appear to have been sent for destruction during March 1990.

Numbers 1-2 and 5-6 you have already searched for and confirmed that you still have 6 (D/DS8/75/1). I would be grateful if you would now check your records to see if you have any of those files up to and including number 17 and let me know the result of your search.

With thanks.

Section 40

UFO Files And Their Status

KEY D=Destroyed
 C=Current
 n/q=not quoted
 hir=held in room

Title & Date of Last Encl	Number	Part	Status
1. UFO Policy & Policy Statements-22/2/68	AF/X58/64	1	D ✓ <i>Confirmed destroyed - Not located</i>
2. UFO Policy & Policy Statements-31/3/70	AF/X58/64	2	D ✓ <i>Confirmed destroyed - Not located</i>
3. Parliamentary Enquiries on UFOs- Prime Minister's (JJA Hennessey)-1/7/70	AF/1505	2	D ✓
4. Parliamentary Questions and Enquires on UFO's-13/1/77	AF/1505	3	D ✓
5. UFOs- Policy Statements 18/1/79	D/DS8/75/1A	A	D ✓ <i>Confirmed destroyed - Not located</i>
6. UFOs- Policy Statements 4/12/79	D/DS8/75/1	B	D ✓ <i>located</i>
7. UFOs- Reports Correspondence 25/8/78	D/DS8/75/2/1	D	D ✓
8. UFOs- Reports Correspondence 10/1/79	D/DS8/75/2/1	E	D ✓
9. UFOs- Reports Correspondence JJA Hennessey-11/1/78	D/DS8/75/2/1/1	I	D ✓
10. UFOs- Correspondence-12/2/82	D/DS8/75/2/1	J	D ✓
11. UFOs- Reports Correspondence M.D.Davies-13/1/77	D/DS8/75/2/1/2	A	D ✓
12. UFOs Reports June-Oct 79 24/9/79	D/DS8/75/2/4	C	D ✓
13. UFOs Parliamentary Correspondence-25/1/79	D/DS8/75/3	B	D ✓
14. UFOs Parliamentary Correspondence-11/2/82	D/DS8/75/3	C	D ✓
15. UFOs Parliamentary Correspondence- House of Lords Debate Jan 1979 15/1/79	D/DS8/75/3/1	A	D ✓

16. UFOs Parliamentary
Correspondence- House of
Lords Debate Jan 1979
15/2/79

D/DS8/75/3/1 B

D ✓

17. UFOs Solar Satellite Power
Station-Not Quoted

D/DS8/75/5 n/q

D ✓

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-30/7/81

D/DS8/10/209 A

~~n/q~~

Archives

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-30/12/81

D/DS8/10/209 B

~~n/q~~

"

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-30/6/81

D/DS8/10/209 C

~~n/q~~

"

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-29/10/82

D/DS8/10/209 D

~~n/q~~

"

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-10/5/83

D/DS8/10/209 E

~~n/q~~

"

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-22/2/84

D/DS8/10/209 F

~~n/q~~

"

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-6/8/84

D/DS8/10/209 G

~~n/q~~

"

General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence-24/12/84

D/DS8/10/209 H

D ?

General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence. Reports
23/10/83

D/DS8/10/209/1 A

n/q ✓

→ General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence. Reports
No date quoted

D/DS8/10/209/1 B

n/q ✓

Archives

General Briefs + Reports
UFO Correspondence. Reports
No date quoted

D/DS8/10/209/1 C

n/q ✓

UFOs- Policy

D/DSec(AS)12/1 A

C

UFOs- Reports

D/DSec(AS)12/2 A

hir

"

"

B

hir

"

"

C

hir

"

"

D

hir

"

"

E

hir

"

"

F

hir

"

"

G

hir

MODE = MEMORY TRANSMISSION

START=11-OCT 10:39

END=11-OCT 10:40

FILE NO. = 098

51

STN NO.	COM	ABBR NO.	STATION NAME/TEL.NO.	PAGES	DURATION
001	OK		Section 40	003/003	00:00'52"

-SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) -

***** -

- ***** -

Section 40



From: Section 40, DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Secretariat (Air Staff)
 Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
 LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) Section 40
 (Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
 (Fax) Section 40

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Section 40 - "Files Out"

SUBJECT: Location of closed files

DATE: 11 Oct 00

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 3

LOCATION OF CLOSED FILES

I attach a list of files, all 'UFO' volumes, that appear to have been sent for destruction during March 1990.

Numbers 1-2 and 5-6 you have already searched for and confirmed that you still have 6 (D/DS8/75/1). I would be grateful if you would now check your records to see if you have any of those files up to and including number 17 and let me know the result of your search.


With thanks.

Section 40

50

Dr David Clarke

Section 40



Section 40

DAS 4a(Sec)
Ministry of Defence
Room 8240
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

10 October 2000

Your ref: DAS(Sec)/64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your letters of 29 September and 6 October in response to my request for access for MOD documents under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. Firstly, I wish to thank you and your staff for the help you have provided and the efficient and detailed attention which my enquiries have received.

Secondly, thank you for listing the contents of the documents you have located, and for explaining both the 'sanitisation' procedure and the details of the charging regime for copies which I feel is very reasonable. On that basis I want to confirm that I wish to proceed with this enquiry in terms of the documents requested, listed as nos. 1 and 3-6 in your letter of 6 October, and that I am willing to meet the appropriate charge specified.

With reference to the question concerning the contents of the Meteorological Office file, **BJ 5/311** (no. 2 in your list); after taking into consideration the fact that an 'un-sanitised' version of this document will be available at the Public Record Office from 1 January 2001, I feel it would be an unnecessary waste of your staff resources to request a copy of this document from the MOD at this late stage. Therefore I do not wish to proceed with this particular part of my request.

With ref to no. 5 in your list '**additional policy files 1968-81**' I am grateful that you have been able to identify a number of files relating to this enquiry, and I wish to proceed with my request for access to these documents. I realise there will probably be a large number of documents which fall within this category. It might therefore help if you could provide me with a brief summary of the number of files and pages, estimated cost of copying and the years and subjects they relate to, when your research is completed.

Finally, with regards to my request for access to **DSI/JTIC Report No 7** on UFOs (1952). It is disappointing that this document has not been located during your review of closed files. The attachment I enclosed with my letter of September 4 clearly demonstrated this document existed in 1967 when it was referred to by an officer of the DSTI branch, DI55. It seems improbable that such an important document (the basis of a briefing by the Secretary of State for Air to Prime Minister Winston Churchill in 1952) would have been lost or 'not have survived the passage of time' when other material of lesser interest *has* survived and is available in the Public Record Office today.

From the DSI/JTIC committee minutes available at the PRO it is stated that a 'watered down' copy of the Report No. 7 was being considered for release to the Press during October 1952 by DDI (Security), so it is possible copies may have been sent to a number of different MOD departments. As it is also noted that the Americans (presumably the US Air Force) would have to be consulted before any Press release, copies of Report No 7 may also have been sent to the US Embassy in 1952-53. In addition, there is a note in the minutes stating that a copy of this report had been sent to Sir Henry Tizard, whose papers are preserved at the Imperial War Museum. I intend to visit the Museum to research Tizard's papers in the near future, and will notify you if I find the document among these papers.

In the meantime, I would appreciate any information or advice you could supply as to the options which remain open to me in terms of requesting a further, comprehensive search of Defence Records to locate this historically important Intelligence report.

I look forward to hearing from you again before the end of the year as and when the first part of this request is processed.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



Dr. D.W. Clarke

REPLY reqd.

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

**DAS 4a(Sec)
Ministry of Defence
Room 8240
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB**

10 October 2000

Your ref: DAS(Sec)/64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your letters of 29 September and 6 October in response to my request for access for MOD documents under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. Firstly, I wish to thank you and your staff for the help you have provided and the efficient and detailed attention which my enquiries have received.

Secondly, thank you for listing the contents of the documents you have located, and for explaining both the 'sanitisation' procedure and the details of the charging regime for copies which I feel is very reasonable. On that basis I want to confirm that I wish to proceed with this enquiry in terms of the documents requested, listed as nos. 1 and 3-6 in your letter of 6 October, and that I am willing to meet the appropriate charge specified.

With reference to the question concerning the contents of the Meteorological Office file, **BJ 5/311** (no. 2 in your list); after taking into consideration the fact that an 'un-sanitised' version of this document will be available at the Public Record Office from 1 January 2001, I feel it would be an unnecessary waste of your staff resources to request a copy of this document from the MOD at this late stage. Therefore I do not wish to proceed with this particular part of my request.

With ref to no. 5 in your list '**additional policy files 1968-81**' I am grateful that you have been able to identify a number of files relating to this enquiry, and I wish to proceed with my request for access to these documents. I realise there will probably be a large number of documents which fall within this category. It might therefore help if you could provide me with a brief summary of the number of files and pages, estimated cost of copying and the years and subjects they relate to, when your research is completed.

Finally, with regards to my request for access to **DSI/JTIC Report No 7** on UFOs (1952). It is disappointing that this document has not been located during your review of closed files. The attachment I enclosed with my letter of September 4 clearly demonstrated this document existed in 1967 when it was referred to by an officer of the DSTI branch, DI55. It seems improbable that such an important document (the basis of a briefing by the Secretary of State for Air to Prime Minister Winston Churchill in 1952) would have been lost or 'not have survived the passage of time' when other material of lesser interest *has* survived and is available in the Public Record Office today.

From the DSI/JTIC committee minutes available at the PRO it is stated that a 'watered down' copy of the Report No. 7 was being considered for release to the Press during October 1952 by DDI (Security), so it is possible copies may have been sent to a number of different MOD departments. As it is also noted that the Americans (presumably the US Air Force) would have to be consulted before any Press release, copies of Report No 7 may also have been sent to the US Embassy in 1952-53. In addition, there is a note in the minutes stating that a copy of this report had been sent to Sir Henry Tizard, whose papers are preserved at the Imperial War Museum. I intend to visit the Museum to research Tizard's papers in the near future, and will notify you if I find the document among these papers.

~~In the meantime, I would appreciate any information or advice you could supply as to the options which remain open to me in terms of requesting a further, comprehensive search of Defence Records to locate this historically important intelligence report. /~~

I look forward to hearing from you again before the end of the year as and when the first part of this request is processed.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



Dr. D.W. Clarke



49

From: Section 40 [redacted] DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Secretariat (Air Staff)
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) Section 40 [redacted]
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40 [redacted]

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Section 40 [redacted] - "Files Out" (Fax: Section 40 [redacted])
SUBJECT: Location of closed files Tel: * Section 40 [redacted]
DATE: 9 Oct 00
NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 1

LOCATION OF CLOSED FILES

I would be grateful if you would attempt to trace the following files:

UFO Policy and Policy Statements - AF/X58/64 Part 1 - Opened 22.2.68

UFO Policy and Policy Statements - AF/X58/64 Part 2 - Opened 31.3.70

UFO - Policy Statements - D/DS8/75/1 Part A - Opened 18.1.79

UFO - Policy Statements - D/DS8/75/2/1 Part B - Opened 4.12.79 ← only file remaining of

the above 4.

With thanks -

Section 40 [redacted]

Pages have no record of receiving the other files as this page.

Section 40 [redacted]
10. Oct 00

MODE = MEMORY TRANSMISSION

START=09-OCT 15:27

END=09-OCT 15:27

FILE NO. = 079

STN NO.	COM	ABBR NO.	STATION NAME/TEL.NO.	PAGES	DURATION
001	OK	*	Section 40	001/001	00:00'25"

-SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) -

- ***** -

Section 40



From: Section 40, DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Secretariat (Air Staff)
 Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
 LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) Section 40
 (Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
 (Fax) Section 40

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Section 40 - "Files Out"
SUBJECT: Location of closed files
DATE: 9 Oct 00
NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 1

LOCATION OF CLOSED FILES

- I would be grateful if you would attempt to trace the following files:
- UFO Policy and Policy Statements - AF/X58/64 Part 1 - Opened 22.2.68
 - UFO Policy and Policy Statements - AF/X58/64 Part 2 - Opened 31.3.70
 - UFO - Policy Statements - D/DS8/75/1 Part A - Opened 18.1.79
 - UFO - Policy Statements - D/DS8/75/2/1 Part B - Opened 4.12.79

With thanks -

Section 40



From: Section 40 [redacted] DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8240, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40 [redacted]

Dr David Clarke

Section 40 [redacted]

Your Reference

Our Reference

→ DAS(Sec)/643

Date

06 October 2000

Dear Dr Clarke,

I am writing further to my letter of 29 September in which I indicated that I hoped to be able to reply to you in greater detail during the course of the first week in October.

Towards the end of your own letter of 4 September you summarised your request for access to information under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, asking six main questions. I shall now address these questions in the order they were asked but before doing so it might be helpful if I explain the use of the term "sanitise" in the paragraphs below. This simply means that all personal details (names, addresses) are obscured as documents that have not been released to the PRO are copied for supply to individual enquirers.

- 1) **DSI/JTIC Report No 7 'Unidentified Flying Objects' (1952) and related intelligence reports on 'UFOs' 1951-52** - I can confirm that a review of closed files has taken place but none were found to contain the report you seek. As a consequence of this, and earlier searches which failed to locate the report, we conclude it has not survived the passage of time. However, this latest review identified a number of 'UFO' related documents, six on DEFE 31/19 and one page on DEFE 44/1 which might be photocopied and supplied to you, as I shall explain below in greater detail. I am informed that these documents represent the full extent of 'UFO' material contained in closed intelligence records.
- 2) **BJ 5/311 Records of the Meteorological Office, 'Unidentified Flying Objects': meteorological aspects, 1968-79** - The file contains some 360 enclosures, mostly letters to and from members of the public, and is due for release to the Public Records Office in January 2001. Sanitising and photocopying the contents of the file might be done marginally in advance of that date (see below).
- 3) **AIR 2/18564 Air Ministry/MOD, 'UFO' Report West Freugh 1957-1971** - This file is for release in January 2002. In the meantime it would be possible to sanitise the dozen or so pages that contain personal details and photocopy them and the remainder of the file (around 40 documents), supplying you with those copies (see below).
- 4) **AF/3459/75 'UFOs': Policy and policy statements 1970** - The file includes policy documents, published articles and pamphlets, and some six pages require sanitising. It would be possible to photocopy the contents of the file and provide you with copies (see below).
- 5) **Additional policy files 1968-81** - Our researches have identified a substantial number of files, although many appear to contain correspondence from members of the public. We are now working on locating those that may include policy documents and shall write to you as soon as we have completed that research.

- 6) AIR 20/12556 'UFO' reports January 1974 (additionally AIR 2/18873) - File AIR 20/12556 is not a 'UFO' file. AIR 2/18873 contains public enquiries concerning 'UFOs' covering the period June 1973 to February 1974 and amounts to some 109 enclosures. Additionally, AF/584 contains 'UFO' reports for January 1974 amounting to some 100 enclosures. It would be possible to sanitise and photocopy the contents of both files (see below).

As I mentioned in my letter of 29 September, the Ministry of Defence is bound by the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. This means that we are committed to providing you with the information you require, as long as it is not exempted under the Code. However, to ensure this does not create an extra burden on the taxpayer, we have a charging regime for more complicated requests. If a request is likely to require over four hours' work, each hour's work over four hours (or part thereof) is charged at £15.00 per hour.

We estimate that the number of documents to be copied in the files mentioned in 1-4 and 6 above is in the region of 800 pages. Assuming it will take two minutes to check, sanitise and photocopy each page our calculation is that, after the first 4 hours, 22 hours of work at £15.00 per hour will remain totalling some £330.00. To copy the full 800 pages would be a four day task spread over eight half days. As the fairly small section likely to take on the work will also be heavily involved in checking material to be released in January 2001, those eight half days would be spread over an eight week period. The material could be made available to you during December 2000.

If you decide to wait to view the contents of file BJ 5/311 until its release to the Public Records Office in January 2001, then the cost of copying the remaining files falls, after deducting the first four hours of work, to around £160.00. I would be grateful for confirmation that you wish to proceed with this enquiry, indicating whether including or excluding BJ 5/311, and that you are willing to meet the appropriate charge. If the cost of obtaining the information is likely to be significantly greater than our estimate suggests we will contact you again before proceeding further.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely

Section 40



From: **Section 40** [redacted] DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Room 8240, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

47

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
 (Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
 (Fax) **Section 40** [redacted]

Dr David Clarke

Section 40
 [redacted]

Your Reference

Our Reference
 DAS(Sec)/64/3
 Date
 06 October 2000

Dear Dr Clarke.

I am writing further to my letter of 29 September in which I indicated that I hoped to be able to reply to you in greater detail during the course of the first week in October.

Towards the end of your own letter of 4 September you summarised your request for access to information under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, asking six main questions. I shall now address these questions in the order they were asked but before doing so it might be helpful if I explain the use of the term "sanitise" in the paragraphs below. This simply means that all personal details (names, addresses) are obscured as documents that have not been released to the PRO are copied for supply to individual enquirers.

- 1) **DSI/JTIC Report No 7 'Unidentified Flying Objects' (1952) and related intelligence reports on 'UFOs' 1951-52** - I can confirm that a review of closed files has taken place but none were found to contain the report you seek. As a consequence of this, and earlier searches which failed to locate the report, we conclude it has not survived the passage of time. However, this latest review identified a number of 'UFO' related documents, six on DEFE 31/19 and one page on DEFE 44/1 which might be photocopied and supplied to you, as I shall explain below in greater detail. I am informed that these documents represent the full extent of 'UFO' material contained in closed intelligence records.
- 2) **BJ 5/311 Records of the Meteorological Office, 'Unidentified Flying Objects': meteorological aspects, 1968-79** - The file contains some 360 enclosures, mostly letters to and from members of the public, and is due for release to the Public Records Office in January 2001. Sanitising and photocopying the contents of the file might be done marginally in advance of that date (see below).
- 3) ✓ **AIR 2/18564 Air Ministry/MOD, 'UFO' Report West Freugh 1957-1971** - This file is for release in January 2002. In the meantime it would be possible to sanitise the dozen or so pages that contain personal details and photocopy them and the remainder of the file (around 40 documents), supplying you with those copies (see below).
- 4) ✓ **AF/3459/75 'UFOs': Policy and policy statements 1970** - The file includes policy documents, published articles and pamphlets, and some six pages require sanitising. It would be possible to photocopy the contents of the file and provide you with copies (see below).
- 5) **Additional policy files 1968-81** - Our researches have identified a substantial number of files, although many appear to contain correspondence from members of the public. We are now working on locating those that may include policy documents and shall write to you as soon as we have completed that research.

OUT-
 STANDING

- Not a UFO file

- 6) AIR 20/12556 'UFO' reports January 1974 (additionally AIR 2/18873) - File AIR 20/12556 is not a 'UFO' file. AIR 2/18873 contains public enquiries concerning 'UFOs' covering the period June 1973 to February 1974 and amounts to some 109 enclosures. Additionally, AF/584 contains 'UFO' reports for January 1974 amounting to some 100 enclosures. It would be possible to sanitise and photocopy the contents of both files (see below).

As I mentioned in my letter of 29 September, the Ministry of Defence is bound by the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. This means that we are committed to providing you with the information you require, as long as it is not exempted under the Code. However, to ensure this does not create an extra burden on the taxpayer, we have a charging regime for more complicated requests. If a request is likely to require over four hours' work, each hour's work over four hours (or part thereof) is charged at £15.00 per hour.

We estimate that the number of documents to be copied in the files mentioned in 1-4 and 6 above is in the region of 800 pages. Assuming it will take two minutes to check, sanitise and photocopy each page our calculation is that, after the first 4 hours, 22 hours of work at £15.00 per hour will remain totalling some £330.00. To copy the full 800 pages would be a four day task spread over eight half days. As the fairly small section likely to take on the work will also be heavily involved in checking material to be released in January 2001, those eight half days would be spread over an eight week period. The material could be made available to you during December 2000.

If you decide to wait to view the contents of file BJ 5/311 until its release to the Public Records Office in January 2001, then the cost of copying the remaining files falls, after deducting the first four hours of work, to around £160.00. I would be grateful for confirmation that you wish to proceed with this enquiry, indicating whether including or excluding BJ 5/311, and that you are willing to meet the appropriate charge. If the cost of obtaining the information is likely to be significantly greater than our estimate suggests we will contact you again before proceeding further.

I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

46

CLASSIFICATION:

CAVEAT:

COVERING:

Ministry of Defence
DOMD/DMCS
Fax No: Section 40
Section 40

Fax

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
CAS 4 (SEC)
- 5 OCT 2000

To: Section 40
From: Section 40 (COMD14)
Fax: [Redacted]
Phone: [Redacted]
Date: 5th October 2000.

Pages : 11 (INC. COVER PAGE).

Urgent For Review Please Comment Please Reply Please Recycle

• Comments:

Section 40
[Redacted]

WE'VE TALKED OVER ANY POSSIBLE CONCERNS ABOUT DR1'S PROPOSAL ON REASONABLE HOURS SET ASIDE FOR THE WORK TO BE DONE. ESSENTIALLY, WHAT IS DEFINED AS 'REASONABLE AMOUNT OF HOURS' VARIES FROM DEPARTMENT TO DEPARTMENT. TAKING INTO ACCOUNT STAFF LEVELS, RESOURCES, PRACTICALITIES EACH DIVISION, SECTION, AGENCY, ETC. CAN DECIDE ~~THEMSELVES~~ FOR THEMSELVES.

ADDITIONALLY, CONCERNING THE EITHER/OR OPTION GIVEN TO DR CLARKE OVER SOON TO BE PUBLISHED MATERIAL; HAVE A LOOK AT EXEMPTION 10 OF 'THE CODE' (WHICH I HAVE ENCLOSED). WE COULD SIMPLY REFUSE TO DO THE WORK RELATED TO FILES WHICH WILL BE IMMEDIATELY RELEASED.

Section 40
[Redacted]

(COMD14).



Open Government
CODE OF PRACTICE
ON ACCESS TO
GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION

Second Edition (1997)



CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

PART I

Purpose

1. This Code of Practice supports the Government's policy under the Citizen's Charter of extending access to official information, and responding to reasonable requests for information. The approach to release of information should in all cases be based on the assumption that information should be released except where disclosure would not be in the public interest, as specified in Part II of this Code.

2. The aims of the Code are:

- to improve policy-making and the democratic process by extending access to the facts and analyses which provide the basis for the consideration of proposed policy;
- to protect the interests of individuals and companies by ensuring that reasons are given for administrative decisions, except where there is statutory authority or established convention to the contrary; and
- to support and extend the principles of public service established under the Citizen's Charter.

These aims are balanced by the need:

- to maintain high standards of care in ensuring the privacy of personal and commercially confidential information; and
- to preserve confidentiality where disclosure would not be in the public interest or would breach personal privacy or the confidences of a third party, in accordance with statutory requirements and Part II of the Code.

Information the Government will release

3. Subject to the exemptions in Part II, the Code commits departments and public bodies under the jurisdiction of the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (the Ombudsman):¹

- i) to publish the facts and analysis of the facts which the Government considers relevant and important in framing major policy proposals and decisions; such information will normally be made available when policies and decisions are announced;

¹ In Northern Ireland, the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration and the Commissioner for Complaints.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

- ii) to publish or otherwise make available, as soon as practicable after the Code becomes operational, explanatory material on departments' dealings with the public (including such rules, procedures, internal guidance to officials, and similar administrative manuals as will assist better understanding of departmental action in dealing with the public) except where publication could prejudice any matter which should properly be kept confidential under Part II of the Code;
- iii) to give reasons for administrative decisions to those affected;²
- iv) to publish in accordance with the Citizen's Charter:
 - full information about how public services are run, how much they cost, who is in charge, and what complaints and redress procedures are available;
 - full and, where possible, comparable information about what services are being provided, what targets are set, what standards of service are expected and the results achieved.
- v) to release, in response to specific requests, information relating to their policies, actions and decisions and other matters related to their areas of responsibility.

4. There is no commitment that pre-existing documents, as distinct from information, will be made available in response to requests. The Code does not require departments to acquire information they do not possess, to provide information which is already published, or to provide information which is provided as part of an existing charged service other than through that service.

Responses to requests for information

5. Information will be provided as soon as practicable. The target for response to simple requests for information is 20 working days from the date of receipt. This target may need to be extended when significant search or collation of material is required. Where information cannot be provided under the terms of the Code, an explanation will normally be given.

² There will be a few areas where well-established convention or legal authority limits the commitment to give reasons, for example certain decisions on merger and monopoly cases or on whether to take enforcement action.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION

Second Edition (1997)

Scope

6. The Code applies to those Government departments and other bodies within the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman (as listed in Schedule 2 to the Parliamentary Commissioner Act 1967).³ The Code applies to agencies within departments and to functions carried out on behalf of a department or public body by contractors. The Security and Intelligence Services are not within the scope of the Code, nor is information obtained from or relating to them.

Charges

7. Departments, agencies and public bodies will make their own arrangements for charging. Details of charges are available from departments on request. Schemes may include a standard charge for processing simple requests for information. Where a request is complex and would require extensive searches of records or processing or collation of information, an additional charge, reflecting reasonable costs may be notified.

Relationship to statutory access rights

8. This Code is non-statutory and cannot override provisions contained in statutory rights of access to information or records (nor can it override statutory prohibitions on disclosure). Where the information could be sought under an existing statutory right, the terms of the right of access takes precedence over the Code. There are already certain access rights to health, medical and educational records, to personal files held by local authority housing and social services departments, and to personal data held on computer. There is also a right of access to environmental information. It is not envisaged that the Ombudsman will become involved in supervising these statutory rights.

The White Paper on Open Government (Cm 2290) proposed two new statutory rights to information:

- an access right to personal records, proposed in Chapter 5;
- an access right to health and safety information, proposed in Chapter 6.

³ In Northern Ireland the Code applies to public bodies under the jurisdiction of the Northern Ireland Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration and the Commissioner for Complaints, with the exception of local government and health and personal social services bodies, for which separate arrangements are being developed as in Great Britain. Some Northern Ireland departments and bodies are expressly subject to the jurisdiction of the Parliamentary Commissioner under the 1967 Act.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

Where a statutory right is proposed but has yet to be implemented, access to relevant information may be sought under the Code, but the Code should not be regarded as a means of access to original documents or personal files.

Public records

9. The Code is not intended to override statutory provisions on access to public records, whether over or under thirty years old. Under s12(3) of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act 1967, the Ombudsman is not required to question the merits of a decision if it is taken without maladministration by a Government department or other body in the exercise of a discretion vested in it. Decisions on public records made in England and Wales by the Lord Chancellor, or in Scotland and Northern Ireland by the Secretary of State, are such discretionary decisions.

Jurisdiction of courts, tribunals or inquiries

10. The Code only applies to Government-held information. It does not apply to or affect information held by courts or contained in court documents. ("Court" includes tribunals, inquiries and the Northern Ireland Enforcement of Judgements Office). The present practice covering disclosure of information before courts, tribunals and inquiries will continue to apply.

Investigation of complaints

11. Complaints that information which should have been provided under the Code has not been provided, or that unreasonable charges have been demanded, should be made first to the department or body concerned. If the applicant remains dissatisfied, complaints may be made through a Member of Parliament to the Ombudsman. Complaints will be investigated at the Ombudsman's discretion in accordance with the procedures provided in the 1967 Act.⁴

⁴ Separate arrangements will apply in Northern Ireland.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

PART II

Reasons for confidentiality

The following categories of information are exempt from the commitments to provide information in this Code. In those categories which refer to harm or prejudice, the presumption remains that information should be disclosed unless the harm likely to arise from disclosure would outweigh the public interest in making the information available.

References to harm or prejudice include both actual harm or prejudice and risk or reasonable expectation of harm or prejudice. In such cases it should be considered whether any harm or prejudice arising from disclosure is outweighed by the public interest in making information available.

The exemptions will not be interpreted in a way which causes injustice to individuals.

1. Defence, security and international relations

- a) Information whose disclosure would harm national security or defence.
- b) Information whose disclosure would harm the conduct of international relations or affairs.
- c) Information received in confidence from foreign governments, foreign courts or international organisations.

2. Internal discussion and advice

Information whose disclosure would harm the frankness and candour of internal discussion, including:

- proceedings of Cabinet and Cabinet committees;
- internal opinion, advice, recommendation, consultation and deliberation;
- projections and assumptions relating to internal policy analysis; analysis of alternative policy options and information relating to rejected policy options;
- confidential communications between departments, public bodies and regulatory bodies.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

3. *Communications with the Royal Household*

Information relating to confidential communications between Ministers and Her Majesty the Queen or other Members of the Royal Household, or relating to confidential proceedings of the Privy Council.

4. *Law enforcement and legal proceedings*

- a) Information whose disclosure could prejudice the administration of justice (including fair trial), legal proceedings or the proceedings of any tribunal, public inquiry or other formal investigations (whether actual or likely) or whose disclosure is, has been, or is likely to be addressed in the context of such proceedings.
- b) Information whose disclosure could prejudice the enforcement or proper administration of the law, including the prevention, investigation or detection of crime, or the apprehension or prosecution of offenders.
- c) Information relating to legal proceedings or the proceedings of any tribunal, public inquiry or other formal investigation which have been completed or terminated, or relating to investigations which have or might have resulted in proceedings.
- d) Information covered by legal professional privilege.
- e) Information whose disclosure would harm public safety or public order, or would prejudice the security of any building or penal institution.
- f) Information whose disclosure could endanger the life or physical safety of any person, or identify the source of information or assistance given in confidence for law enforcement or security purposes.
- g) Information whose disclosure would increase the likelihood of damage to the environment, or rare or endangered species and their habitats.

5. *Immigration and nationality*

Information relating to immigration, nationality, consular and entry clearance cases. However, information will be provided, though not through access to personal records, where there is no risk that

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

disclosure would prejudice the effective administration of immigration controls or other statutory provisions.

6. *Effective management of the economy and collection of tax*

- a) Information whose disclosure would harm the ability of the Government to manage the economy, prejudice the conduct of official market operations, or could lead to improper gain or advantage.
- b) Information whose disclosure would prejudice the assessment or collection of tax, duties or National Insurance contributions, or assist tax avoidance or evasion.

7. *Effective management and operations of the public service*

- a) Information whose disclosure could lead to improper gain or advantage or would prejudice:
 - the competitive position of a department or other public body or authority;
 - negotiations or the effective conduct of personnel management, or commercial or contractual activities;
 - the awarding of discretionary grants.
- b) Information whose disclosure would harm the proper and efficient conduct of the operations of a department or other public body or authority, including NHS organisations, or of any regulatory body.

8. *Public employment, public appointments and honours*

- a) Personnel records (relating to public appointments as well as employees of public authorities) including those relating to recruitment, promotion and security vetting.
- b) Information, opinions and assessments given in confidence in relation to public employment and public appointments made by Ministers of the Crown, by the Crown on the advice of Ministers or by statutory office holders.
- c) Information, opinions and assessments given in relation to recommendations for honours.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

9. *Voluminous or vexatious requests*

Requests for information which are vexatious or manifestly unreasonable or are formulated in too general a manner, or which (because of the amount of information to be processed or the need to retrieve information from files not in current use) would require unreasonable diversion of resources.

10. *Publication and prematurity in relation to publication*

Information which is or will soon be published, or whose disclosure, where the material relates to a planned or potential announcement or publication, could cause harm (for example, of a physical or financial nature).

11. *Research, statistics and analysis*

- a) Information relating to incomplete analysis, research or statistics, where disclosure could be misleading or deprive the holder of priority of publication or commercial value.
- b) Information held only for preparing statistics or carrying out research, or for surveillance for health and safety purposes (including food safety), and which relates to individuals, companies or products which will not be identified in reports of that research or surveillance, or in published statistics.

12. *Privacy of an individual*

Unwarranted disclosure to a third party of personal information about any person (including a deceased person) or any other disclosure which would constitute or could facilitate an unwarranted invasion of privacy.

13. *Third party's commercial confidences*

Information including commercial confidences, trade secrets or intellectual property whose unwarranted disclosure would harm the competitive position of a third party.

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACCESS TO GOVERNMENT INFORMATION
Second Edition (1997)

14. Information given in confidence

- a) Information held in consequence of having been supplied in confidence by a person who:
 - gave the information under a statutory guarantee that its confidentiality would be protected; or
 - was not under any legal obligation, whether actual or implied, to supply it, and has not consented to its disclosure.
- b) Information whose disclosure without the consent of the supplier would prejudice the future supply of such information.
- c) Medical information provided in confidence if disclosure to the subject would harm their physical or mental health, or should only be made by a medical practitioner.

15. Statutory and other restrictions

- a) Information whose disclosure is prohibited by or under any enactment, regulation, European Community law or international agreement.
- b) Information whose release would constitute a breach of Parliamentary Privilege.

1516

64/3

SEC(AS)2A

From: Hd of DR1
Sent: 03 October 2000 13:13
To: SEC(AS)2A
Cc: OMD14
Subject: DR CLARKE'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO UFO FILES
Importance: High

45

Section 40

Thank you for your loose minute dated 2 October 2000, together with a draft reply to Dr Clarke.

You sought comments and for ease of reference I offer the following in the order raised by you:

DSI/JTIC Report No 7 UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS (1952) and related intelligence reports on UFOs 1951 - 1952.

We presume that as no reports survive they must have been destroyed, but in the absence of supporting evidence, for example Destruction Certificates, the convention has been to say that "we conclude that the papers have not survived the passage of time" (or something very similar).

My staff's review of DIS records over the last few years has specifically targeted records over 25 years old. This is because under the terms of the Public Records Act government departments are not permitted to hold records in excess of 30 years without first receiving the Lord Chancellor's approval. This Report has been on our target list. But no success.

An additional difficulty, is that under current security instructions destruction certificates need only be kept for a minimum of five years.

The copies of papers identified on closed files - I think we should identify the files DEFE 31/19, which contains six UFO related documents and DEFE 44/1 which contains just one page (an entry that refers to Report No 7!). I also believe that the reply should also make clear that although neither piece (a generic term used to describe the record) is being released the copies we are offering to make available represents the full extent of UFO documentation contained in intelligence records identified by Dr Clarke that he wish us to review ie closed intelligence records.

BJ 5/311

The file contains around (362) pages (many enclosures consist of multiple pages). Whilst I agree with your options (a) that Dr Clarke should wait until January (b) or we take photocopies I have some pertinent comments re the resource and cost implications (see below).

AIR 2/18564

The file consists of some 60 pages. I am happy to seek the Lord Chancellor's approval to release it ahead of time, but if during the interim Dr Clarke would like copies this could be arranged. Early release will take about three months. As above the cost verses the time might be particularly relevant.

AF/3459/75

Although about six pages to be sanitised the file consists of around 150 enclosures. As the files dates from 1970 to 1975 normal release would not occur until January 2006, but note the file

04/10/00

that over a period of eight weeks. In other words he should get his copies by Christmas. My EO has other things to do and we at a particularly busy time checking material closed for more than 30 years that should also be released in January.

Your final question

Dr Clarke is quite right there is indeed nothing to stop departments reviewing and transferring records to Kew and arranging for release in advance of 30 years. The White Paper on Open Government, published July 1993, offered this as an option, subject to resources.

files must still be sanitised.

You may wish to say this to Dr Clarke:

"The White Paper on Open Government identified an number of initiatives that, subject to resources, that would lead to the release of material closed for more than 30 years and also encouraged the release of blocks of material in advance of the normal date. Hitherto, the Ministry of Defence has, as have a number of other government departments, concentrated on records closed in excess of 30 years. To date more than 11,700 such records have been released since July 1993.

Also, as with other government departments the MOD has a structured review programme and in compliance with Public Record Office guidelines the final review of records takes place at the 25 year point. The MOD has no thematic database of records due for review, as a consequence review occurs according to date rather than subject.

This present exercise has apparently identified a few files that would appear to fall outside the kind of UFO material that hitherto has been preserved ie reports from members of the public. Consideration will now be given to seeing whether these few files could not be processed and released in advance of the normal date." [On this point would DAS(Sec) wish Records to progressively review and release all surviving UFO material in advance of the designated date. Although, a special exercise review would be fairly straight forward what would take time the is the deletion of personal details from files]

Addresses at taken date.

Rather longer than I hoped but I trust that it answers your questions.

Section 40

1. All - 1-4+6

$$800 \times 2 (\text{mins}) = 1600 \text{ m.}$$

$$\div 60 = 26.6 \text{ hours}$$

$$- 4 = 22.6 \text{ hours} \times$$

$$\pounds 15.00 = \pounds 339.9$$

(rounded $\pounds 330.00$)

2. $\frac{1, 3-4+6}{800 - 362 = 438 \times 2 \text{m}}$

$$= 876 \text{ m} \div 60 =$$

$$14.6 \text{ hours} - 4 =$$

$$10.6 \text{ hrs.} \times \pounds 15.00 =$$

$$\pounds 159.00 \text{ (rounded } \pounds 160)$$

4.10.00
 Discussed alterations to draft reply with Section 40 and agreed amendments.
 Section 40

From: OMD14
Sent: 03 October 2000 15:10
To: SEC(AS)2A
Subject: Dr Clarke - Privileged Access

Section 40

Just a quick response to your enquiry as to whether Dr Clarke would be able to obtain privileged access to the files containing the information he has requested on UFO's.

Since many of the vast number of files involved will contain personal details of those who have reported seeing a UFO we would have to deny Dr Clarke privileged access under Article 14 of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, which makes it our duty to protect the anonymity of those mentioned in the files.

Sanitising the quantity of documents concerned would be a massive job thus if he suggested we do that to allow him a look at the files he wants, we could refuse him under Article 9 - Voluminous Requests.

The only thing I can suggest is that Dr Clarke refine his request somewhat, allowing staff to perhaps sanitise a more manageable number of documents.

I hope this helps.

Section 40

OMD14

NH617

Section 40

SEC(AS)2A

From: OMD14
Sent: 03 October 2000 17:22
To: SEC(AS)2A
Subject: Dr Clarke: Privileged Access

43

Section 40

Sorry to have missed this point out in my original Email. The Data Protection Act legally forbids us from violating the anonymity of those persons whose details are contained in our files.

This supersedes the Code. It basically amounts to the same thing as exemption 14 except it is enshrined in law and not merely a guideline.

Apologies for neglecting to mention this earlier.

Section 40

OMD14

NH617

Section 40

N.B. Discussed with **Section 40** DRI's "offer" to commit news re excess of 14 (attached per **Section 40** request, expanded by Sec (As). **Section 40** considered internally (**Section 40**). Work per Dr. Clarke need not be on the same basis as **Section 40** work being done by another section with different priorities/resources.

Offer (in respect of B/S 5/311) of either waiting till Jan 00 for the release of the file to the PRO or sanitising/copying now, quite acceptable. If however DR wished to refuse copying of that file, that would also be in order.

Section 40

5.10.00.

42

LOOSE MINUTE

D/DAS(Sec)/64/3

2 October 2000

Hd of DR1

copy to:
OMD 14

DR CLARKE'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES - UFO's

Reference:

- A. D/PUS/23/7 (1301) dtd 12 Jan 00
- B. DR/3/7/8 dtd 6 Sep 00
- C. D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8 dtd 25 Sep 00

1. Thank you for your minute at Reference C. On the basis of the advice contained in that minute and our subsequent telephone conversation I attach a draft letter to Dr Clarke. I should appreciate receiving further advice and comments in view of the fact that the reply concerns your own area of expertise rather than Secretariat (Air Staff) (now DAS(Sec)) procedure.
2. I suggest it would be advisable to employ a consistent approach in our reply to Dr Clarke in making offers of either sanitising records or applying for release in advance of 30 years. Dr Clarke has already been made aware of the Department's ability to sanitise files, in a Sec(AS) letter to him dated 25 July. I suggest an offer (in relation to BJ 5/311) to apply for early release of one file alone, an action that would take almost three months, might not be seen as being particularly helpful.
3. I assume the cost of sanitising and photocopying material will be £15.00 per hour (or part thereof) over and above the first four hours, as stipulated in the DCI. However, I would appreciate OMD 14's confirmation on that point in view of the cost levied on **Section 40** which was abated by 50% as a gesture of goodwill (Reference A). I suggest we might also want to consider the nature of our response in the unlikely event that Dr Clarke offers to pay a substantial sum of money in order to have the files copied! Perhaps OMD would advise in slower time.

4. Dr Clarke's throw-away mention of "additional policy files 1968-81" in his question 4 appears to refer, on the evidence of your further research (Reference B), to some 80 additional files. You do not advise on that point but it seems reasonable to assume it constitutes a voluminous request and I have worded my draft accordingly. Perhaps OMD 14 would confirm his contentment with that approach. I suggest we might then offer him the list of file titles from which he might choose a small number (OMD 14 and DR1 how many?) to be sanitised and copied for him.

5. We must reply to Dr Clarke by the end of this week. I would, therefore, be grateful if you would let me have your amendments and additions by 1400 Tuesday 3 October. An alternative would be for us to meet, discuss options and redraft the reply and I would be very happy to come over to GSY in order to accomplish the task. Perhaps you would telephone me and let me know what you think.

5. Finally, I am in the process of enquiring with the Air Historical Branch about privileged access as defined in Chapter 3 of JSP 400 (as suggested by DDC&L (F&S) Legal). Such access may not be appropriate but it seems reasonable to at least ask the question. Unfortunately I may not have an answer in time to influence this reply to Dr Clarke but I shall inform you when I do.

Section 40

DAS 4a(Sec)

MB8243 Section 40

DRAFT reply to Dr Clarke

I am writing further to my letter of 29 September in which I indicated that I hoped to be able to reply to you in greater detail during the course of the first week in October.

Towards the end of your own letter of 4 September you summarised your request for access to information under the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information, asking five main questions. I shall answer these in the order they were asked.

- **DSI/JTIC Report No 7 Unidentified Flying Objects (1952) and related intelligence reports on UFOs 1951-52** - I can confirm that a review of the closed files has taken place but none were found to contain the report you seek. As a consequence of this, and earlier searches which failed to locate the report, we conclude that it has not survived the passage of time. (**Question: can we just say destroyed?**) However, this latest review identified a number of 'UFO' related papers and copies of these papers may be made available to you at your request, as I shall explain below.
- **BJ 5/311 Records of the Meteorological Office, Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects, 1968-79** - The file contains some 300 enclosures, mostly letters to and from members of the public, and is due for release to the Public Records Office in January 2001. You may wish to view the file at that time but, should you not wish to wait, it would be possible to sanitise the documents and supply copies to you (see below).
- **AIR 2/18564 Air Ministry/MOD, 'UFO' Report West Freugh 1957-1971** - This file is for release in January 2002. In the meantime it would be possible to sanitise the dozen or so pages before containing personal details, photocopying the full number of around 50 and supplying you with those copies (see below).

- **AF/3459/75 'UFOs': Policy and policy statements 1970** - This file contains a very small number, perhaps six, to be sanitised. It would be possible to photocopy the file and provide you with photocopies (see below).
- **Additional policy files 1968-81** - Our researches suggest this may represent around 80 files. There will be a matter of thousands (**Question: can we quote an approximate figure?**) of documents on these files including many containing personal details that would require sanitising before copies might be released. This is because, as mentioned in our letter of 25 July, the MOD has a duty to protect third party confidentiality over a 30-year period. In order to sanitise the likely number of papers and photocopy the full contents of all the files, staff would need to be diverted from their essential defence-related tasks. Your request in relation to the policy files 1968-81 is therefore refused under Exemption 9 of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (voluminous or vexatious requests and Exemption 12, Privacy of an individual). Were you able to be more specific about dates this would enable us to consider a more focussed effort on a limited amount of material. I attach a list of the files and their titles. If you wish to identify (**Question: Number?**) of files we would be able to sanitise and photocopy the contents. If you are unhappy with the decision to refuse your request for access to those MOD files and wish to appeal, you should write in the first instance to the Ministry of Defence, DOMD, Room 619, Northumberland House, Northumberland Avenue, London WC2N 5BP requesting the decision be reviewed. If following the internal review you remain dissatisfied you can ask your MP to take up the case with the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (the Ombudsman) who can investigate on your behalf. The Ombudsman will not, however, consider an investigation until the internal review process has been completed.
- **AIR 20/12556 'UFO' reports January 1974 (additionally AIR 2/18873)** - File AIR 20/12556 is not a 'UFO file'. (**Would it be disingenuous of us to fail to mention AF/584 UFO reports January 1974? If so I suggest the following.**) AF/584 contains UFO reports for January 1974 amounting to some 100 enclosures. AIR 2/18873 contains public enquiries amounting to some 109 enclosures. It would be possible to sanitise and photocopy the contents of both files (see below).

As I mentioned in my letter of 29 September, the Ministry of Defence is bound by the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. This means that we are committed to providing you with the information you require, as long as it is not exempted under the Code. However, to ensure this does not create an extra burden on the taxpayer, we have a charging regime for more complicated requests. If a request is likely to require over four hours' work, each hour's work over four hours (or part thereof) is charged at £15.00 per hour. Our estimate is that we will have to charge you £X (**Question: please estimate cost, and perhaps timescale to accomplish the task**) in order to sanitise and copy the papers referred to in your major questions (excluding material included in the "additional policy files 1968-81"). I would be grateful for confirmation that you wish to proceed with this enquiry and that you are willing to meet this charge. If the cost of obtaining the information is likely to be significantly greater than our estimate suggests we will contact you again before proceeding further. (**Question: are we able to copy the full 600 enclosures, or thereabouts, contained in the files referred to in the 5 questions excluding the reference to policy files 1968-81, or may we tell Dr Clarke it would be a voluminous request? If that is the case I suggest our offer might be to request him to wait till January 01 for BJ/ 5/311 but offer to copy the remaining 300 enclosures. We do have, of course, to consider our answer alongside any offer we may make in respect of copying a small number of the policy files from 1968-81.**)

(**Question: I am not sure how to answer the third paragraph of Dr Clarke's letter. I believe one of the points he is trying to make is why files that contain material that is not subject to confidentiality may not be opened to the public. Perhaps you would add a short paragraph as Dr Clarke will, I am sure, light on files with titles such as "UFOs BBC Radio Oxford Programme" in the list of policy files and wonder why they may not be released!**)



41

From: Section 40 DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Secretariat (Air Staff)
Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) Section 40
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Hd of AHB - Section 40

SUBJECT: Privileged access to files - Dr Clarke


DATE: 29 Sep 00

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 4

Following my telephone call to your office, I attach a "sample" letter from Dr Clarke who wishes to gain access for research purposes to a range of files on Unidentified Flying Objects that are currently closed to the public under the 30 year rule protecting confidentiality of personal details.

Earlier in the summer (F&S) Legal alerted this Directorate to the fact that there was a provision, administered by yourselves, to award a special dispensation from disclosure practice to enable privileged access to bona fide historical researchers (JSP 400 paragraph 3.23).

In advance of consulting with DOMD and DR I would be grateful for your advice concerning what you would regard as bona fide historical research and whether you consider Dr Clarke might merit such access, on the basis of the information available to us in the attached letter.



Dr David Clarke

Section 40

1 August, 2000

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your detailed letter of 25 July with reference to my request to view MOD files relating to 'unidentified flying objects.'

Firstly, I realise your staff have many other more pressing defence-related duties and I apologise if my request has added to that burden. I contacted the Freedom of Information office on 20 July inquiring as to what had become of my original request, simply because I was concerned that my letter had gone astray, or had been sent to the wrong department, as I had not at that stage received an acknowledgement. Almost immediately I received your acknowledgement in the post, and would like to make it clear that I have always been satisfied with the helpful and detailed responses received from the MOD's Secretariat (Air Staff) on the occasions I have contacted your department in the past.

With regards to my request to view files, I accept that my request for access to files covering the period 1969 to present was a little ambitious in terms of staff time. From your response, it appears that the main obstacle preventing the use of these files for research projects such as my own is the Exemption 9 in the Code of Practice which relates to Privacy of the individual. You say you receive up to 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters, but I wonder if you could specify how many of the individuals who contact the department in any one year have requested that their personal details should remain confidential for 30 years? From cursory viewing of the files which are available at the PRO relating to the period before 1969, I cannot recall finding one single request of this kind, and indeed many of the sightings and letters relate to events which are already in the "public domain", for example have already been reported in newspapers and other media.

While I would question the basis upon which my request has been refused, I do not wish to add to your administrative burden by asking for a review or involving my MP at this stage. I would be more happy to take up your offer of help to locate "a more limited amount of material" which might fall within the terms of your Code of Practice for Access to Government Information. I would be happy to be guided by yourself as to what you feel would be a reasonable request for access to a "limited amount" of material.

Further to your offer, firstly I would like to point out that my research is not specifically concerned with the details of individual "UFO sightings" reported by

individuals to the MOD. I am more interested in studying the evolution of how the old Air Ministry, and later the MOD, dealt with these kind of inquiries, how policy on this subject was formulated, and how that policy has been influenced by specific incidents, Government policy, Parliamentary questions, scientific opinion and the media.

To this end, I have found the material in the Defence Intelligence Staff registered files particularly of interest. Of the two files currently available at the PRO, DEFE 31/118 (UFO policy 1953-63) and DEFE 31/119 (UFO Policy 1967) contain precisely the category of information I am seeking: for example internal memorandums, draft policy documents etc. There is little, if any, correspondence from the public contained within these files which fall within Exemption 12 (Privacy) or the exemptions relating to national security. Further to this detail, I would like to apply for access to the sequence of files which follow DEFE 31/119 and which presumably relate to UFO policy, between the years 1968 and 1981. This request relates to specific files, falling within a specified period of time, so you may feel it would be worthwhile employing a more focussed search to retrieve and scrutinise these papers on my behalf.

In terms of Air Staff files relating to sighting/s reported by the general public, the one specific file I wish to view relates to UFO/unidentified aircraft sightings reported to the MOD during the month of January 1974. Following the file sequence at the PRO I suspect this file would be found at the reference Air 20/12556 (Air 20/12555 relates to December 1973).

I would also like to apply for access to a file produced by the Meteorological Office for the MOD, reference BJ 5/311 titled "Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects" which relates to the period 1968-1970. This file is due to be opened at the PRO on 1 January 2001.

From my research into historical files at the Public Record Office, I suspect there may also be memoranda and reports relating to UFOs in the 1950s hidden within the Defence Intelligence Files, class numbers DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21, and I have contacted the MOD Departmental Record Officer separately with a request for access to this material. DEFE 44 contains papers from as far back as 1946, but these remain classified because the file also contains material from 1991. I would like to request access to the block of files and memoranda which relate to the period 1946 to 1969, which should be available for scrutiny under the Freedom of Information Act.

I hope you will feel it is possible to allow me to have access to at least some of the material specified in this letter, for use in what is a bona fide academic research programme. I would be happy to meet any reasonable costs incurred as a result of this application, and would be willing to sign any undertakings related to Data Protection or Official Secrets which you might feel appropriate. In addition, I will be happy to provide the MOD with a copy of my completed research paper, which I plan to publish via the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition at the University of Sheffield.

In making this request, I am simply responding to the Government's and the MOD's own stated manifesto pledge to "establish a general statutory right of access to official records and through culture change throughout the public sector" (MOD website). This laudable aim will only be seen to working in practise if reasonable requests for

access to non-sensitive material, a category I feel my request falls within, are successful. This touches upon the discussion I mentioned I had with the MOD/RAF Press Office in January this year, when I tried to follow up a story in the national Press which suggested that *all* files relating to UFOs were soon to be released to the PRO. I was told at that time by the duty Press Officer that the former minister Peter Kilfoyle had indeed expressed the opinion that there was no good reason for keeping files related to UFOs restricted for 30 years. He said release of UFO data was likely to be a priority following "a review of the files." There was, I was told, "a general move within the department to give out information that is not security sensitive and take away the myth of secrecy that surrounds this subject."

I hope we will be able to reach an agreement on access to the limited amount of files specified in this letter, and that this application will not be too onerous upon your department's time.

I am copying this reply to **Section 40** at OMD/AD, Room 617, Northumberland House, so that he is aware that I am happy with the expeditious and helpful way you have dealt with my inquiry.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



DW Clarke

MODE = MEMORY TRANSMISSION

START=29-SEP 15:08

END=29-SEP 15:21

FILE NO. = 231

STN NO.	COM	ABBR NO.	STATION NAME/TEL.NO.	PAGES	DURATION
001	634	■	Section 40	000/004	00:00'00"

-SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) -

***** -

- ***** -

Section 40



From: Section 40, DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Secretariat (Air Staff)
 Room 8243, Main Building, Whitehall
 LONDON SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) Section 40
 (Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
 (Fax) Section 40

FAX MESSAGE

TO: Hd of AHB - Section 40

SUBJECT: Privileged access to files - Dr Clarke

DATE: 29 Sep 00

NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS COVER: 4

Following my telephone call to your office, I attach a "sample" letter from Dr Clarke who wishes to gain access for research purposes to a range of files on Unidentified Flying Objects that are currently closed to the public under the 30 year rule protecting confidentiality of personal details.

Earlier in the summer (F&S) Legal alerted this Directorate to the fact that there was a provision, administered by yourselves, to award a special dispensation from disclosure practice to enable privileged access to bona fide historical researchers (JSP 400 paragraph 3.23).

In advance of consulting with DOMD and DR I would be grateful for your advice concerning what you would regard as bona fide historical research and whether you consider Dr Clarke might merit such access, on the basis of the information available to us in the attached letter.



From: **Section 40** [redacted] DAS 4a(Sec)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8245, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

40

Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Dr David Clarke

Section 40
[redacted]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/DAS(Sec)/64/3
Date
29 September 2000

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter of 4 September in which you further refined your request for information addressing your letter to the Secretariat (Air Staff). I should explain the Secretariat has now merged with Directorate Air Staff and, as a result, Secretariat (Air Staff)2 is now titled DAS 4(Sec), as appears in the heading to this letter.

In her letter of 23 August, **Section 40** mentioned she hoped to be able to give you a progress report by the end of September and so I am writing to you at this time. I am pleased to say that we have identified most of the files mentioned in the major queries raised in your letter. I think you will understand the reference in your fourth question to "additional policy files 1968-81" might encompass a considerable body of papers and that has indeed turned out to be the case.

I am at present speaking with Defence Records in order to identify material that may be made available to you within the Department's reasonable resources, for which there may be a charge. The Ministry of Defence is bound by the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. This means that we are committed to providing you with the information you require, as long as it is not exempted under the Code. However, to ensure this does not create an extra burden on the taxpayer, we have a changing regime for more complicated requests. If a request is likely to require over four hours' work, each hour's work over four hours (or part thereof) is charged at £15.00 per hour. I shall estimate the charge, if one is likely, when I next write to you.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40
[redacted]

REPLY TO

64/3

Dr David Clarke

Section 40
[Redacted]

Section 40

**Secretariat(Air Staff)2
Ministry of Defence
Room 8247
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB**

4 September 2000

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3



Dear Section 40

Thank you for your letter of 23 August referring to my requests for access to UFO-related MOD files, addressed to Sec (AS)2 and the MOD Record Officer.

Firstly, let me assure you that other than the four letters you mention, addressed to Sec (AS)2 and the Record Officer I have not made any additional requests to other parts of the MOD for access to UFO-related files. For your information, I contacted the MOD Records Officer directly and separately because I was advised to do so by staff at the Public Records Office. I had asked the PRO for help in determining the specific closure period and content of certain Defence Intelligence files retained by the MOD under Section 3(4) of the Public Record Act 1967 which I wished to access under the Freedom of Information legislation. Staff advised that I should contact the MOD Record Officer directly, and provided an address for me to do so. As my request for access related to "historical" files - dating from 1950-1971 - I felt this would not fall within the remit of Sec (AS) 2.

Secondly, thank you for explaining the MOD's policy relating to the 30-year retention of files and the duty which the Department has to protect the confidentiality of employees and third parties. I did misunderstand the general policy, and fully accept your reasoning, as it is strictly applied under present legislation. However, my point was that confidentiality should only extend to material which is *not already in the public domain* - hence my comment upon the many UFO reports on file at the MOD which have already been the subject of publicity in newspapers, TV etc and where the identity of observers is known and their views have been quoted in the media (a number of whom, for example RAF air crews, are ex-MOD employees!). For this reason I find it difficult to understand why files which consist largely of newspaper cuttings (for example Air 2/18871-4) should remain 'closed' for 30 years if the MOD wishes "to encourage more open and accountable government by establishing a general statutory right of access to official records and through culture change throughout the public sector" (MOD website - Freedom of Information).

Skabemel

That caveat aside, I do understand and sympathise with the MOD's position on the subject of UFOs. My ongoing research into the social history of the subject at the PRO and the British Library has demonstrated how dealing with inquiries about UFOs has become an on-going public relations problem for your staff dating back to the early 50s. On the subject of "UFOs" themselves, I completely concur with the MOD's conclusions that the vast majority - if not all - observations can be explained as misidentifications of natural phenomena, balloons, planets and stars etc. However, the ongoing 'will to believe' in the existence of 'exotic' UFOs intruding into UK airspace on the part of UFOlogists and the attitude of the media, which you note observers often seek out to promote their alleged experiences, has meant the UFO myth has continued to develop and will not go away.

It is precisely these social and psychological contexts - particularly periods of Press interest and Parliamentary Questions - which I am examining as part of my on-going research based at the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition and Language, University of Sheffield. The paperwork generated by the various MOD departments which have dealt with the UFO issue - both in terms of public and internal policy - since 1950 are a crucial source of information for my project, hence my request for access to documents which currently fall within the 30 year rule.

I am grateful that you are taking the trouble to retrieve and review the UFO-related files to which I have requested access, and look forward to your progress report at the end of September.

In the meantime, as new information has come to light I am now in a position to be more specific in terms of my request for access to files addressed to the MOD Record Officer on 27 July and 7 August. I am now able to precisely specify the name and what I suspect to be the current location of the file/s to which I referred in my earlier requests to the Record Officer. The document I am seeking is known as **DSI/JTIC Report No. 7 on Unidentified Flying Objects**. It was created in 1952 by the 'Flying Saucer Working Party' set up in August 1950 at the request of Sir Henry Tizard. DSI/JTIC minutes I have viewed at the Public Record Office (DEFE 4/74-76) demonstrate that the Working Party consisted of representatives from DSTI, ADNI (Tech), MI 10 and ADI (Tech). Report No 7 is referred to in a minute of 7 October 1952 and is listed on a register of DSI/JTIC reports in DEFE 41/76 (see enclosed, Attachment A). However, the document is missing from the DSI/JTIC reports and papers which are contained within DEFE 152-54. This is not because the file has been destroyed, but rather because it was "retrieved" (moved to another file?) by a member of the DSTI branch, DI55, in December 1967. In evidence for this assertion, I attach a copy (enclosed, Attachment B) of an internal memo, copied from PRO file Air 2/18117, where JE Dickison of DI55 states that: "*we [DI55] have recovered all but two of the Metropole (ie Intelligence) files on UFOs for the period 1951-2...we consider that the report DSI/JTIC Report No. 7 Unidentified Flying Objects covers the situation as a whole for such activity at that time.*"

Track → It is accepted that all files and papers relating to UFOs have been permanently preserved by the MOD from 1967 at the request of the Secretary of the State for Defence. Attachment B demonstrates that DSI/JTIC Report No 7 existed in 1967, and should therefore still exist today if that policy has been followed. I would suggest a

copy of the report will be found in the DIS/DSTI Intelligence Papers from the period 1967-70 (possibly DEFE 31/19,64 and/or DEFE 44/1), which cover the period during which it was 'retrieved' by DI55. Further copies may well exist in other MOD departments, and I would be surprised if even today Air Staff are not aware of this document, as its conclusions (that UFOs do not exist) appear to form the origin of the MOD's policy on UFOs from 1952 right up to the present day!

As the original report was created in 1952, it should be available for public scrutiny under the 30 year rule and I request access to a copy of this document plus any attached appendices under the Freedom of Information Act.

— Lost!
Destroyed!
— (still at Bill stage 09/00)

To summarise my request for access to UFO-related documents, set out in my letters to the MOD Record Officer on 27 July and 7 August and to Sec (AS) 2 of 1 and 11 August, these are:

REQUEST

Outstanding

- ✓ 1. DSI/JTIC Report No 7, Unidentified Flying Objects (1952), plus related Intelligence reports on UFOs, 1951-2 (see attachment).
- ✓ 2. BJ 5/311 Records of the Meteorological Office. Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects, 1968-1970
- ✓ 3. Air 2/18564 Air Ministry/MOD. UFO Report: West Freugh, 1957-1971
- ✓ 4. AF/3459/75 UFOs: Policy and Policy Statements 1970. This file plus additional policy files 1968-1981.
5. Air 20/12556 (?) UFO reports January 1974 (additionally Air 2/18873 may contain information relevant to reports in this month.)


I feel this is a reasonable request for access to MOD documents under the terms of the draft Freedom of Information Act. Based upon the knowledge I already have pertaining to their contents, there is nothing contained within these documents which could conceivably compromise national security, or the privacy of individuals, particularly if any sensitive personal details are removed before release.

I would be happy to pay any reasonable charges for access to this material, and wish to thank you in advance for your efforts to retrieve and review these documents.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



Dr D.W. Clarke

ATTACHMENT "B"

File

AF/PS 427/67
Unidentified Flying Objects
Wg Cdr Sir Eric Bullus, M.P.
Julian J. A. Hennessey, Esq.

E180

M8

S4 (Air) MOD (Mr. W. P. Cassell)

1. Further to your M7, we have recovered all but two of the 'Metropole' (ie Intelligence) files on UFOs for the period 1951-2.
2. The files examined indicate that Topcliffe-Meteor incident, which occurred during the NATO Exercise MAINBRACE, was typical of reports about such aircraft at that time. (The Meteor was being extensively operated in a variety of roles and was the first UK jet to be so deployed).
3. As regards the particular incident the 'object' only appeared to come from the aircraft. There is no specific evidence in the files examined so far, that the object tracked or came from the aircraft. In fact, the trajectory of the apparent object was not established in absolute terms and thus typical questions such as true range have not been answered.
4. We consider that the report DSI/JTIC Report No 7 Unidentified Flying Objects covers the situation as a whole, ~~and~~ such activity at that time. Similar remarks apply to the observed radar anomalies which occurred at that time.

(J. C. DICKISON)
DI55
ROOM 4/58 EXT 5230
Metropole Building
13th December 1967

ATTACHMENT "A"


SECRET

<u>Report No.</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Security Class'n</u>
DSI Report No. 21	Leningrad Physico-Technical Institute.	<u>SECRET</u>
" " " 22	Soviet Impressions of the XVIII. International Physiological Conference.	<u>SECRET</u>
" " " 23	Science in France.	<u>SECRET</u>
" " " 24	Wind Tunnels in the U.S.S.R.	<u>TOP SECRET</u> <u>DISCREET</u>
" " " 25	Scientific Research Work of Ts. N.I.E.L. by Eng. S.M. Gortinskiy Elektricheskiye Stantsiyi No. 12, 1950.	<u>RESTRICTED</u>
" " " 26	General Background Information obtained from German Scientists and Engineers returned from Russia January, 1951.	<u>SECRET</u>
" " " 27	Major-General Andrei Grigorievich Kostikov.	<u>CONFIDENTIAL</u>
" " " 28		
" " " 29	RUS-2 and Dumbo Pulse widths measurements.	<u>TOP SECRET</u>
" " " 30	Physics Institute 1/N P.M. Lebedev, Academy of Science U.S.S.R. (Short Title FIAN).	<u>SECRET</u>
DSI/JTIC Report No. 1.	German C.W. Installation at Dyhernfurth.	<u>TOP SECRET</u> <u>DISCREET</u>
" 2. "	German C.W. Installations at Falkenhagen.	<u>TOP SECRET</u> <u>DISCREET</u>
" 3. "	Russian Valve List.	<u>TOP SECRET</u>
" 4. "	Russian Electronics.	<u>TOP SECRET</u>
" 5. "	Russian Manufacture of nerve gases at Beketovka.	<u>TOP SECRET</u> <u>DISCREET</u>
" 6. "	Receivers in German and Russian Remote Controlled Missiles.	<u>SECRET</u>
" 7. "	Unidentified Flying Objects.	<u>SECRET</u> <u>DISCREET</u>
DSI Translations No. 1.	The plan of Scientific Research Work of the Academy of Sciences U.S.S.R. and plan of Scientific Cadres for 1950.	<u>RESTRICTED</u>
" 2. "	Vestnik Akademii Nauk S.S.S.R. August, 1950. Conference on Stainless Steels.	<u>CONFIDENTIAL</u>
" 3. "	Moscow Directory (20th Jan. 1950) Extract of Academies Scientific Institutes and Laboratories.	<u>SECRET</u>

Loose Minute

D Info(Exp)R/3/7/8

25 September 2000

DAS4a(Sec)



'UFOs' - Dr CLARKE'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES

Reference: A. DR/3/7/8 dated 6 September 2000

B. D/Sec(AS)64/3 dated 11 September 2000, together with a letter from Dr Clarke dated 4 September 2000

C. My email 14 September 2000 12.42

D. Dr Clarke's letter dated 1 August 2000

1. Dr Clarke's most recent communication (attached to Ref B) significantly refines his early requests for access to files relating to "ufo" matters. I believe that I can now update earlier advice to you (Refs A and C).

2. Dr Clarke identifies five files (or categories of files) he seeks access to:

(1) DSI/JTIC Report No 7, Unidentified Flying Objects (1952), plus related Intelligence reports on UFOs, 1951 - 1952.

That this report once existed is not disputed. It is documented in a number of pieces at the Public Record Office, for example DEFE 10/496 & 497 (both released some four years ago). In correspondence Dr C has identified a number of closed intelligence files from the PRO catalogue that might contain the report - DEFE 21, DEFE 31/19 & 64 and DEFE 44/1. The closed files have been examined and although we are not able to release complete files reviewers did look out for papers relating to "ufos". First, the Report No. 7 is not on any of these files; second, a few "ufo" related papers have been identified. DEFE 31/19, out of 108 enclosures some six (dated June 1967) concern "ufos", DEFE 44/1 one paper (only) refers to Report No. 7. These pages are not sensitive and could be released.

I BELIEVE THAT THERE IS ONLY ONE OPTION:

- a. to advise Dr C that a review of the closed files identified by him none contained the report he seeks, and
- b. that as a consequence of earlier searches for, and failure to locate, this report we conclude that it has not survive the passage of time, but

39

- c. our review of these files did identify a number of "ufo" related papers. Copies of which can be made available [for a fee?]. I did discuss with a representative of the PRO the best method of releasing these papers into the public domain and he concurred that providing photocopies by far the best.

NOTE:

Although, not referred to in Reference B an earlier letter Reference D sought the release of successor files to two files located at the PRO under references DEFE 31/118 & 119 (former MOD references DI55/40/9/1 Pts 1 & 2). I understand that Pt 3, whilst in DIS custody and covering the period 1967 to 1971 was destroyed August 1984, Pts 4, 5 & 6 still survive in the DIS archive and cover the periods 1971-1996, 1996-2000 & 2000 to date. In addition, a large number of "ufo report" files are held. Parts 1-9, 21-25, 32 & 33, 34-51, covering the period May 1975 to date. The sample I've seen reveals they mirror Sec(AS) files from the respective period.

(2) BJ 5/311 Records of Meteorological Office. Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects, 1968 - 1970.

This file is due for release January 2001. It contains more than 280 enclosures, a great majority correspondence with members of the public. Two documents will be of interest to Dr C; (1) S4f(Air) discussion paper, January 1968, concerning revised procedures for dealing with "ufo" reports, and, (2) a submission to PS/USofS(RAF), March 1970, re policies and procedures. The S4f(Air) reference AF/X/58/64 cited in some correspondence is not identifiable in the PRO catalogue, therefore we must conclude that it has not survived the passage of time.

OPTIONS:



- a. to sanitise the file of the names and addresses of members of the public would, I suggest, be excessive, particularly as accelerated opening action would take around three months ie prepare submission to the Lord Chancellor seeking closure for one month (legally the shortest period permitted that triggers early opening) and then subsequent administrative action by staff at Kew. By which time the file would be freely available to researchers at the PRO, or
- b. to permit Dr C access to the files in advance of the normal release, subject to his agreement to treat the information as "in confidence" until 1 January 2001. Such action would normally be confined to researchers engaged on "official" histories ie whose work receives the support of the Cabinet Office, or
- c. with the files imminent release to advise him to "bide his time" until January.

(3) AIR 2/18564 Air Ministry/MOD. UFO Report: West Freugh, 1957 - 1971.

File in PRO custody, due for release January 2002. A file of two parts: (1) a DDI Tech file from Feb 1957 to August 1958, concerning "Flying Saucers, Parliamentary Questions", specifically West Freugh; (2) a S4f(Air) segment from May - Sept 1971, concerning the former OiC West Freugh's attempt to obtain permission to discuss the West Freugh incident with a researcher.

OPTIONS:

- a. although release not due until Jan 2002, on this occasion, we could be helpful to Dr C by:
 - (i) providing him with a photocopy of the file, about 12 pages out of the approximately 50 pages would need to be sanitised to maintain consistency with our commitment to protect the name and addresses of members of the public until normal release at the 30-year point, or
 - (ii) the file could be sanitised but arrangements could be made to accelerate the opening of the file, subject to the Lord Chancellor's approval, and thus available to all at the PRO sometime early in the New-Year (see above for timings). In this case I believe this the stronger option.

(4) AF/3459/75 UFOs: Policy and Policy Statements 1970. This file plus additional policy files 1968 - 1981.

File recovered from Hayes, covers the period 1970-1975. It includes, policy documents, some published articles and pamphlets and an exchange with a college engaged in research (perhaps six pages to be sanitised).

No other "ufo" policy files for the period up to 1981 identified at Hayes.

OPTIONS:

- a. provide Dr C with a photocopy of the file, a few pages will need to be sanitised,
or
- b. the file could be prepared for release in advance of 30-years, as per item 3 above, but on this occasion action could take longer than six months ie the cataloguing along could take a significant time just being processed by the staff at Kew.

NOTE:

Outstanding to the enquiry, policy files that cover the period up to 1981!

(5) AIR 20/12556 (?) UFO reports January 1974 (additionally AIR 2/18873 may contain information relevant to reports in this month).

Not with standing Dr C's interest in policy matters he appears to have an interest in incidents (or an incident) that took place in January 1974. He identified from the PRO catalogue AIR 2/18873 as covering that period and speculates that AIR 20/12556 might also (piece 12555 relates to December 1973).

Although PRO class AIR 20 currently extends from piece 12566 to 12673 no "ufo" files appear within this number range! S4f(Air) file AF/584 UFO Reports January 1974 has been located and requisitioned from Hayes. The file contains 24 folders each relating to a different report (approximately 100 enclosures). This file together with 33 other files requisitioned from Hayes are due (or in a few cases overdue) for review. At the conclusion of this exercise cataloguing action and subsequent transfer to the PRO will take place with a view to release at the normal 30-year point.

AIR 2/18873 has been requisitioned from the PRO. The piece is due for release 2005, as it covers the period June 1973 – February 1974. It consists of 109 enclosures, all public enquiries,

OPTIONS:

- a. to sanitise (between them more than 200 enclosure), catalogue (AF/584) and the corresponding delay concerning acceptance by the PRO, transfer and then to seek accelerated opening I suggest is not a serious proposition. But rather Dr C could be invited to specify his precise area of interest during this period and checks against both files could be made.

Section 40

Hd DR 1

GSY 1.01 Section 40

38

SEC(AS)2A

From: Hd of DR1
Sent: 25 September 2000 08:02
To: SEC(AS)2A
Subject: RE: Dr Clarke

Section 40

Thanks.

I hope that I will shortly complete a more (!) detailed account of the situation regarding the "historic" "ufo" files Dr C has expressed interest in.

I'll expand on my para 2.

Section 40

-----Original Message-----


From: SEC(AS)2A
Sent: 22 September 2000 08:23
To: Hd of DR1
Subject: Dr Clarke
Importance: High

Section 40

Reference your E-mail 14 Sep 13:42. I have been heavily involved this week in other things but am now turning (after this am) to Dr Clarke.

Your para 2 - what does granting "special" access involve. Who assesses the merits of the case. How long would consideration take.

Speak to you soon. **Section 40**

**SEC(AS)2A**

From: SEC(AS)2A
Sent: 22 September 2000 08:23
To: Hd of DR1
Subject: Dr Clarke
Importance: High

Section 40

Reference your E-mail 14 Sep 13:42. I have been heavily involved this week in other things but am now turning (after this am) to Dr Clarke.

Your para 2 - what does granting "special" access involve. Who assesses the merits of the case. How long would consideration take.

Speak to you soon. **Section 40**

DR. CLARKE PAPERS.

36

SEC(AS)2A

From: Hd of DR1
 Sent: 14 September 2000 13:42
 To: SEC(AS)2A
 Subject: DR CLARKE'S REQUESTS

Section 40

Thanks for forwarding Dr Clarke's most recent letter. This does refine his earlier requests some what.

I believe that we are some way from providing Dr Clarke with a substantive reply.

Dr C's "revised shopping list":

1. The status of this item is the subject of my recent minute to Sec(AS) dated ¹⁶8 September. - Ask.
2. Due for release in January 2001. To release earlier would require identification of correspondence from individuals reporting occurrences and their names and addresses to be deleted. This will take, say a day or two, and then an application to the Lord Chancellor for formal release in advance of 30 years which will take around 3 months. Alternatively, we could allow Dr C "special" access, otherwise he will have to wait until January.
3. I've ordered this from Kew. Assuming no, or relatively few, correspondence from the public early release ie prior to 2002, could be possible.

4 & 5. I've order 24 files from Hayes covering the period 1971 - 76 ie those which for some reason are overdue for review. Item 4 is included in this batch. Item 5 is a request for reports covering the period Jan 74. The PRO catalogue quite clearly reveals that AIR 2/12556 is nothing to do with UFOs, but I note that one file expected from Hayes does cover the period as do two files at Kew AIR 2/18873 & 18874 (the former has also been requested from Kew).

Hope that this is helpful?

Section 40

FOI - when? -

35

LOOSE MINUTE

[REDACTED]
11 September 00

**OMD14
DR1**

UFO FILES - REQUEST BY DR CLARKE

Ref: DR/3/7/8 dtd 6 Sep 00

1. Thank you for the advice in your minute at Reference.
2. We have received another letter from Dr Clarke refining his original request. I attach a copy of this latest letter for your records. I am in the process of looking at your advice and Dr Clarke's most recent request to see if we are now able to give him a substantive reply.

Section 40

DAS 4a (Sec)

MB8243 **Section 40**

Loose Minute

DR/3/7/8

6 September 2000

AD/Sec(AS)2

Copy to:

OMD14

"UFOs" - DR CLARKE'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES

Reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3 dated 24 August 2000

1. As requested I have checked and made a number of amendments to your initial assessment of Dr Clarke's request (see attached).

2. Dr Clarke's clarification of his original request for access to files "for the period 1969 to the present day" has, I suppose, been helpful if we assume that his subsequent letters limits his original request. But it is still a significant "shopping list".

3. So far as the DR element is concerned. The historic records (ie those selected for preservation but are retained in department for reasons of sensitivity) are being reviewed. I note his late inclusion of the closed files in DEFE 44 I do not plan to review the three retained files in this class as they were only reviewed two years ago and have nothing to do with his area of interest.

4. I am though a little concerned that the records flagged-up in the December 1998 PQ dating from the early to mid-1970s have still to appear for review (review at the 25-year point means we should be looking at papers from the mid-1970s!). I am investigating.

5. As the review and other queries are resolved I will update the Annex.

Section 40

A further note on the Dr Clarke request. This needs to be taken into account further reply.

Section 40

6/9 34

Section 40

Section 40

This includes A to address UY (24/8) plus what I have A to address UY (24/8) except DEFE 31/19 (post 1967). I think this is excluded because it has already been accounted for in the Annex.

Section 40

Section 40

Hd DR1

GSY1.01 Section 40

Cited in Dr Clarke's letter:

1. To Sec(AS) 21 June 2000
2. To DR 21 July 2000
3. To Sec(AS) 1 August 2000
4. To DR 7 August 2000
5. To Sec(AS) 11 August 2000

Letter No.	File No. requested by Dr Clarke (former ref)	Subject according to Dr Clarke	No of file parts	Comments
1	All related files for the "period 1969 to the present"	UFOs	?	?
2	DEFE 31/19 (D/DISSEC/20/1/4)	DIS & DSTI intelligence papers (1960-1970)		DR1 Note: File currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of Public Records Act. Is being reviewed by DR.
2	DEFE 31/64 (DISSEC/20/2/14/1)	DIS/DSTI intelligence (1970-1972)		DR 1 Note: File currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of PRA. Is being reviewed by DR.
2	DEFE 44/1	DSTI, later DSTI: Reports and Memoranda; register of JSTI/DSTI/DSI reports and memoranda (1946-1991)		DR 1 Note: File currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of PRA. Is being reviewed by DR.
2	DEFE 21	DSI Registered files (1946-1964)	PRO catalogue records 72 files assigned to this class covering the period 1946-1978.	DR 1 Note: Just over 30 files were released a few years ago (some only after the deletion of sensitive passages). Closed files and extracts (just over 60 files) are currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of PRA. These

				are being reviewed by DR.
3	Subsequent parts to files preserved at Kew under ref. DEFE 31/118 & 119 (former ref. DI55/40/9/1 Pts 1 & 2) covering the period 1968-1981	UFO Policy	No. of parts not known but suspected to extend to at least Pt 32. It is understood that most parts have been destroyed. But five files - DI55/108/15/1 Pts 21-25, UFO incidents - are in DR possession awaiting cataloguing dated 1979 ie for normal release 2010. These appear to mirror Sec(AS) (S4f (Air) as was!) files recording incidents reported by members of the public.	DR 1 Note: A member of DR is liaising with DI to ascertain fate of other files, incl. dates of destruction (if known).
3 & 5	AIR 20/12556 (?)	Sighting reports January 1974		DR 1 Note: AIR 20 currently extends to piece number 12637, after 12555 there are no entries for UFO files. No UFO files are held in GSY waiting cataloguing or review. I note that in December 1998 Sec(AS) forwarded AF584 - 601 (19 files) covering the period Jan 74 - July 75, in addition to AF447 Pt 1 to Hayes. Files are probably due for review around now.

				I will check with Hayes that the files are held.
3 & 5	BJ 5/311 (AF/M396/68 Pt 1)	Unidentified Flying Objects. 1968-1970		DR 1 Note: File, which contains a large number of reports from members of the public in addition to a few policy papers, is due for normal release in January 2001.
3	DEFE 44	Reports and memoranda 1946-1969		DR 1 Note: In all class currently has 118 pieces assigned to it. 109 are open! Of the remaining 9: 3 are closed under S3(4) of the PRA - as these were only last reviewed in '98 and their titles clearly indicate no involvement with ufos I do not plan to review them. 3 are awaiting release at the normal 30-year period; again titles reveal nothing to do with ufos I therefore plan to leave these alone. 1 number not used and 1 piece "WANTING" ie catalogued but without possession of the report. Finally, DEFE 44/1 is already the subject of review action (see above).
5	AIR 2/18564	UFO report: West Freugh 1957		DR 1 Note: Dr Clarke probably obtained information on this piece from PRO

				<p>catalogue. Piece covers the period 1957-1971, thus due for normal release 2002. Arrangements being made to recall piece from PRO to ascertain contents. If there is an absence of letters from members of the public this might be a candidate for early release!</p>
5	AF/3459/75	UFOs: policy and policy statements, 1970		Sec(AS) Note: See note below.
5	A refined request for UFO policy files for the period 1968-1981			Sec(AS) Note: Dr Clarke mentioned D/Sec(AS)12/1 & 64/1 in his letters.
5	D/Sec(AS)/12/1	UFO policy files		Sec(AS) Note: Pt A seems to be the only file. Opened in 1 Feb 85 and is therefore outside the period requested.
5	D/Sec(AS)/64/1	UFO policy files		Sec(AS) Note: Pts A-D exist. Pt A opened 8 Aug 1996 and therefore all parts outside the period requested.
5	D/DS(AS)64/5	Media issues		Sec(AS) Note: Dr Clarke did not give any particular date for this file. Pt A is the only file. It was not opened until 8 Dec 96.
5	D/DS8/75/6	UFO: TV discussion		Sec(AS) Note: This file appears to be a 1996 file. [But see DR additional note below]
5	AIR 2/18873 (AF/7464/72 Pt II)	UFO reports, 1973-1974		DR 1 Note: Due for normal release after

				30 years ie January 2005. I will recall from PRO to see whether early release is possible, but I again suspect that it will be identical to other files containing reports from the public.
--	--	--	--	---

Sec(AS) Note * information extracted from DR1 background note for Lords PQ of 17 December 1998

Additional Notes:

Number of file parts	Comments
<p>Sec(AS) input: The following files have been identified that might be relevant to the "all ufo policy files 1968-1981"</p> <p>1. File: AF/X58/64 UFO policy & policy statements (Pt I - file opened 22 Feb 1968)</p> <p>2. File: AF/X58/64 UFO policy & policy statements (Pt II - file opened 31 March 1970)</p> <p>3. File: D/DS8/75/1 UFO policy & policy statements (Pt A - file opened 18 Jan 1979)</p> <p>4. File: D/DS8/75/1 UFO Policy & policy statements (Pt B - opened 4 Dec 1979)</p>	<p>Sec(AS) Note: There seems to be a gap between this one and the one listed next. I cannot identify from records here relevant series of numbers.</p>
<p>At the time of the PQ December 1998 a trawl was made through the most appropriate records stored at Hayes for files relating to UFOs (search was in effect limited to Sec(AS) and predecessors branch files). A large number of files were identified.):</p> <p>1 File: AF/419 BBC2 Man Alive Programme - UFOs Dec 71</p> <p>2 File: AF/S4f(a)/422 UFOs BBC Radio Oxford Programme Dec72</p> <p>3 File: AF 447 Pt 1 Reports (!) Aug 75-Jun 76</p> <p>4 File: AF/S4f(air)U/506 Statistical analysis of UFOs (1967-1973)</p> <p>5 Files (19): AF 584-602</p>	<p>DR Note: Currently DR should be reviewing records at the second review stage dating from the mid-1970s. It follows that it would appear that the absence of some of these files from the PRO catalogue and their absence from the various review and cataloguing processes in GSY suggests that they have been overlooked for review! This is being investigated.</p>

D/58/75/6

(24)

- 5.
- 26 Reports (!) Jan 74-July 75
Files (2): AF/607 & 608
UFO reports Dec 75 & Jan 76
 - 30 Files (4): AF/610 - 613
UFO reports Mar 76 - Jun 76
 - 34 Files (4): AF/616-619
UFO reports Sept 76-Dec76
 - 35 File: AF/3459/75
UFOs Policy & policy statements 1970
 - 36 File: D/DS8/25/3
UFO Parliamentary Correspondence 1978
 - 42 Files (6): D/DS8/75/2/1
UFO reports, correspondence
Pts A & B 1977
Pt C 1978
Pt F 1979
Pts G & H 1980
 - 54 Files (12): D/DS8/75/2/2
UFOs reports - Edited copies
Pts A-D 1977
Pts E & F 1978
Pts G & H, J & K 1979
Pts L & M 1980
 - 60 Files (6): D/DS75/2/3
UFO reports Pts D - H & J 1978
 - 63 Files (3): D/DS/75/2/4
UFO reports Pts A, B & D 1979
 - 65 Files (2): D/DS8/75/2/5
UFO reports Pts A & B 1980
 - 66 File: D/DS8/75/2/5
UFO - TV discussion Pt A 1979
 - 67 File: D/DS8/75/6
UFO - TV discussion Pt A 1979
 - 68 File: D/DS/75/7
UFO - Satellite debris Pt A 1979
 - 75 Files (7): D/DS/10/209
General briefs and reports, UFO
correspondence
Pts A & B 1981
Pts C & D 1982
Pt E 1983
Pt F & G 1984
 - 78 Files (3): D/DS8/10/209/1
General briefs and reports, UFO
correspondence reports
Pts A 1983 (?)
Pt B 1984
Pt C 1985

Total 78

Cited in Dr Clarke's letter:

1. To Sec(AS) 21 June 2000
2. To DR 21 July 2000
3. To Sec(AS) 1 August 2000
4. To DR 7 August 2000
5. To Sec(AS) 11 August 2000

Letter No.	File No. requested by Dr Clarke (former ref)	Subject according to Dr Clarke	No of file parts	Comments
1	All related files for the "period 1969 to the present"	UFOs	?	?
2	DEFE 31/19 (D/DISSEC/20/1/4)	DIS & DSTI intelligence papers (1960-1970)		DR1 Note: File currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of Public Records Act. Is being reviewed by DR.
2	DEFE 31/64 (DISSEC/20/2/14/1)	DIS/DSTI intelligence (1970-1972)		DR 1 Note: File currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of PRA. Is being reviewed by DR.
2	DEFE 44/1	DSTI, later DSTI: Reports and Memoranda; register of JSTI/DSTI/DSI reports and memoranda (1946-1991)		DR 1 Note: File currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of PRA. Is being reviewed by DR.
2	DEFE 21	DSI Registered files (1946-1964)	PRO catalogue records 72 files assigned to this class covering the period 1946-1978.	DR 1 Note: Just over 30 files were released a few years ago (some only after the deletion of sensitive passages). Closed files and extracts (just over 60 files) are currently retained in accordance with S3(4) of PRA. These

				are being reviewed by DR.
3	Subsequent parts to files preserved at Kew under ref. DEFE 31/118 & 119 (former ref. DI55/40/9/1 Pts 1 & 2) covering the period 1968-1981	UFO Policy	No. of parts not known but suspected to extend to at least Pt 32. It is understood that most parts have been destroyed. But five files - DI55/108/15/1 Pts 21-25, UFO incidents - are in DR possession awaiting cataloguing dated 1979 ie for normal release 2010. These appear to mirror Sec(AS) (S4f (Air) as was!) files recording incidents reported by members of the public.	DR 1 Note: A member of DR is liaising with DI to ascertain fate of other files, incl. dates of destruction (if known).
3 & 5	AIR 20/12556 (?)	Sighting reports January 1974		DR 1 Note: AIR 20 currently extends to piece number 12637, after 12555 there are no entries for UFO files. No UFO files are held in GSY waiting cataloguing or review. I note that in December 1998 Sec(AS) forwarded AF584 - 601 (19 files) covering the period Jan 74 - July 75, in addition to AF447 Pt 1 to Hayes. Files are probably due for review around now.

				I will check with Hayes that the files are held.
3 & 5	BJ 5/311 (AF/M396/68 Pt 1)	Unidentified Flying Objects. 1968-1970		DR 1 Note: File, which contains a large number of reports from members of the public in addition to a few policy papers, is due for normal release in January 2001.
3	DEFE 44	Reports and memoranda 1946-1969		DR 1 Note: In all class currently has 118 pieces assigned to it. 109 are open! Of the remaining 9: 3 are closed under S3(4) of the PRA - as these were only last reviewed in '98 and their titles clearly indicate no involvement with ufos I do not plan to review them. 3 are awaiting release at the normal 30-year period; again titles reveal nothing to do with ufos I therefore plan to leave these alone. 1 number not used and 1 piece "WANTING" ie catalogued but without possession of the report. Finally, DEFE 44/1 is already the subject of review action (see above).
5	AIR 2/18564	UFO report: West Freugh 1957		DR 1 Note: Dr Clarke probably obtained information on this piece from PRO

				<p>catalogue. Piece covers the period 1957-1971, thus due for normal release 2002. Arrangements being made to recall piece from PRO to ascertain contents. If there is an absence of letters from members of the public this might be a candidate for early release!</p>
5	AF/3459/75	UFOs: policy and policy statements, 1970		Sec(AS) Note: See note below.
5	A refined request for UFO policy files for the period 1968-1981			Sec(AS) Note: Dr Clarke mentioned D/Sec(AS)12/1 & 64/1 in his letters.
5	D/Sec(AS)/12/1	UFO policy files		Sec(AS) Note: Pt A seems to be the only file. Opened in 1 Feb 85 and is therefore outside the period requested.
5	D/Sec(AS)/64/1	UFO policy files		Sec(AS) Note: Pts A-D exist. Pt A opened 8 Aug 1996 and therefore all parts outside the period requested.
5	D/DS(AS)64/5	Media issues		Sec(AS) Note: Dr Clarke did not give any particular date for this file. Pt A is the only file. It was not opened until 8 Dec 96.
5	D/DS8/75/6	UFO: TV discussion		Sec(AS) Note: This file appears to be a 1996 file. [But see DR additional note below]
5	AIR 2/18873 (AF/7464/72 Pt II)	UFO reports, 1973-1974		DR I Note: Due for normal release after

				30 years ie January 2005. I will recall from PRO to see whether early release is possible, but I again suspect that it will be identical to other files containing reports from the public.
--	--	--	--	---

Sec(AS) Note * information extracted from DR1 background note for Lords PQ of 17 December 1998

Additional Notes: (70254)

Dest. 1.
Dest. 2.
Dest. 3.
Dest. 4

Number of file parts	Comments
<p>Sec(AS) input: The following files have been identified that might be relevant to the "all ufo policy files 1968-1981"</p> <p>File: AF/X58/64 UFO policy & policy statements (Pt I - file opened 22 Feb 1968)</p> <p>File: AF/X58/64 UFO policy & policy statements (Pt II - file opened 31 March 1970)</p> <p>File: D/DS8/75/1 UFO policy & policy statements (Pt A - file opened 18 Jan 1979)</p> <p>File: D/DS8/75/1 UFO Policy & policy statements (Pt B - opened 4 Dec 1979)</p>	<p>Sec(AS) Note: There seems to be a gap between this one and the one listed next. I cannot identify from records here relevant series of numbers.</p>
<p>DR1 input: At the time of the PQ December 1998 a trawl was made through the most appropriate records stored at Hayes for files relating to UFOs (search was in effect limited to Sec(AS) and predecessors branch files). A large number of files were identified.):</p> <p>File: AF/419 BBC2 Man Alive Programme - UFOs Dec 71</p> <p>File: AF/S4f(a)/422 UFOs BBC Radio Oxford Programme Dec72</p> <p>File: AF 447 Pt 1 Reports (!) Aug 75-Jun 76</p> <p>File: AF/S4f(air)U/506 Statistical analysis of UFOs (1967-1973)</p> <p>Files (19): AF 584-602</p>	<p>DR Note: Currently DR should be reviewing records at the second review stage dating from the mid-1970s. It follows that it would appear that the absence of some of these files from the PRO catalogue and their absence from the various review and cataloguing processes in GSY suggests that they have been overlooked for review! This is being investigated.</p>

D/DS8/75/1

1
2
3
4
5
(24)

	Reports (!) Jan 74-July 75	
26	Files (2): AF/607 & 608 UFO reports Dec 75 & Jan 76	
30	Files (4): AF/610 - 613 UFO reports Mar 76 - Jun 76	
34	Files (4): AF/616-619 UFO reports Sept 76-Dec76	
35	File: AF/3459/75 UFOs Policy & policy statements 1970	
36	File: D/DS8/25/3 UFO Parliamentary Correspondence 1978	→ No Record sheet. Poss 75/3 Part A?
42	Files (6): D/DS8/75/2/1 UFO reports, correspondence Pts A & B 1977 Pt C 1978 Pt F 1979 Pts G & H 1980	→ Parts D, E & J destroyed 1990. → No record sheets for other parts.
54	Files (12): D/DS8/75/2/2 UFOs reports - Edited copies Pts A-D 1977 Pts E & F 1978 Pts G & H, J & K 1979 Pts L & M 1980	→ No record sheets.
60	Files (6): D/DS75/2/3 UFO reports Pts D - H & J 1978	→ Part F sent to Archives. 23-5-1996 → Parts H & J sent to Archives 23-5-1996
63	Files (3): D/DS/75/2/4 UFO reports Pts A, B & D 1979	→ Part C destroyed 22.3.90
65	Files (2): D/DS8/75/2/5 UFO reports Pts A & B 1980	→ Part B sent to Archives 23-5-1996
66	File: D/DS8/75/2/5 UFO - TV discussion Pt A 1979	→ No record sheets for part A → Part F, J & H Archived 23/5/1996
67	File: D/DS8/75/6 UFO - TV discussion Pt A 1979	
68	File: D/DS/75/7 UFO - Satellite debris Pt A 1979	
75	Files (7): D/DS/10/209 General briefs and reports, UFO correspondence Pts A & B 1981 Pts C & D 1982 Pt E 1983 Pt F & G 1984	→ Closed 1981 - Held in Archives → Closed 1984 - Held in Archives → Closed 1983 - Held in Archives → Closed 1984 - Held in Archives → Closed 1984 - Held in Archives
78	Files (3): D/DS8/10/209/1 General briefs and reports, UFO correspondence reports Pts A 1983 (?) Pt B 1984 Pt C 1985	→ Closed 23/10/1983 - Held in Archives? → Held in Archives → Held in Archives?

Total 78

Loose Minute

DR/3/7/8

6 September 2000

AD/Sec(AS)2

Copy to:

Section 40 A further note on 33
re Dr Clarke request. This
needs to be taken into account
for the reply. Section 40

6/9

Section 40



REDACTIONS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT

Reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3 dated 24 August 2000

1. As requested I have checked and made a number of amendments to your initial assessment of Dr Clarke's request (see attached).

2. Dr Clarke's clarification of his original request for access to files "for the period 1969 to the present day" has, I suppose, been helpful if we assume that his subsequent letters limits his original request. But it is still a significant "shopping list".

3. So far as the DR element is concerned. The historic records (ie those selected for preservation but are retained in department for reasons of sensitivity) are being reviewed. I note his late inclusion of the closed files in DEFE 44 I do not plan to review the three retained files in this class as they were only reviewed two years ago and have nothing to do with his area of interest.

4. I am though a little concerned that the records flagged-up in the December 1998 PQ dating from the early to mid-1970s have still to appear for review (review at the 25-year point means we should be looking at papers from the mid-1970s!). I am investigating.

5. As the review and other queries are resolved I will update the Annex.

Section 40

Hd DR1

GSY1.01 Section 40

SEC(AS)2

From: OMD14
Sent: 25 August 2000 10:45
To: SEC(AS)2; Hd of DR1
Subject: RE: Dr Clarke

32

Section 40

I think the absolute limit for Dr Clarke's request should be the number of hours we spent on the Section 40 (14 hours). I agree that we should compile a list of the number of file parts requiring editing. We can then work out roughly how many files we can edit within the 14 hour limit, and then ask Dr Clarke to pick the files he wants within that limit. We would, obviously, have to seek his prior consent for the charge we would levy (£150) before we did any work. I suspect that Dr Clarke won't be very satisfied, but, as you say, we have to draw the line somewhere.

Regards,

Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: SEC(AS)2
Sent: 24 August 2000 17:10
To: OMD14; Hd of DR1
Subject: Dr Clarke

<< File: DrClarke@Code.Request.3.doc >>

cos
OMD
14
admi
updat

Loose Minute

D/Sec(AS) 64/3

24 August 2000

OMD 14

DR1

'UFOs' - DR CLARKE'S REQUEST FOR ACCESS TO FILES

1. At our meeting earlier this week I said that I would look at Dr Clarke's letters and try and compile a list of the files I think he wants to see so that we might gauge the size of the request overall. This is attached at Annex. In compiling the list I checked the details of the Lords PQs mentioned in his last letter to Sec(AS) and looked at the background notes drafted at the time. As you will see, I have been unable to complete the task; I should be grateful if DR1 could check, amend and complete the list.

2. It seems to me that we are already spending a great deal of time on this non defence-related task. It has taken me something in excess of two hours to compile the details in the attachment to this minute. With that and the DR staff time in mind, I should be grateful to know from OMD14 how much time would be reasonable to devote to Dr Clarke's 'shopping lists'. Might a completed Annex (in terms of the number of parts of files needing to be reviewed/sanitised) be sufficient to make an initial judgement on whether to proceed further? How many files (based on an average of 100 enclosures per file) might constitute a voluminous request? I am reluctant to devote further resources to this request (recalling files from archives etc) until we have reached that stage.

3. I look forward to hearing from you both.

Section 40

AD/Sec(AS)2

MB 8247 Section 40

31

The Code refers to
"unrecoverable diversion of
assets" Surely the
available resources will
dictate whether the
diversion of assets is
recoverable or not.

Annex A

File Number requested by Dr Clarke	Subject according to Dr Clarke	From MOD Records- Number of file parts	AD/Sec(AS)2 Comments
DEFE 31/118	UFO Policy 1953-63	N/A	Already accessed by Dr Clarke at the PRO
DEFE 31/119	UFO Policy 1967	N/A	Already accessed by Dr Clarke at the PRO
DEFE 31/119	UFO Policy(?) 1968-81		
DEFE 31/19	DIS+DSTI Intelligence Papers 1967-70		
DEFE 31/64	DIS+DSTI Intelligence Papers 1970-72		
DEFE 44/1	DSI (later DSTI) Reports and memoranda Register of JSTI/DSTI/DSI reports and memoranda 1946-91		
DEFE 21	DSI Registered files 1946-69		
DEFE 44	All files 1946-1969		
BJ 5/311	UFOs Meteorological Aspects 1968-70		
Air 20/12556 (?)	Sighting Reports January 1974		Dr Clarke has assumed the file number because Air 20/12555 concerns Dec 1973. But, I am not sure that number existed. Was AF/584 the file reference for Jan 74? (* see Note below)
Air 2/18564	UFO Report - West Freugh 1957	One	I am not sure where Dr Clarke found the file title. Is it a file of reports for

			1957, or one specifically concerning the West Freugh 'incident' (* see Note below)
Air 2/18873	UFO reports 1973-74	One	Dr Clarke says he wants the file because it may contain information about Jan 74 reports. However, I think the file reference might be Air 2/18833 (previously AF 7464 Pt II) (* see Note below)
AF/3459/75	UFOs Policy and Policy Statements 1970	One	(* see Note below)
All files	UFO Policy 1968-1981		Dr Clarke mentioned D/Sec(AS)12/1 and 64/1 in his letters.
D/Sec(AS)12/1	UFO Policy files		Part A seems to be the only file. It was opened 01/02/85 and is, therefore, <u>outside the period requested.</u>
D/Sec(AS)64/1	UFO Policy Files		Parts A-D exist. Part A was opened 08/08/96 and, therefore, all parts are <u>outside the period requested.</u>
	<i>plus sa. →</i>	I have identified the following files that might be relevant in respect of 'all UFO policy files 1968-81'	
		File AF/X58/64 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part I - file	<i>- not in office</i>

*- 5 in Annex 6
LM 6 Sep.*

ignore

ignore

		opened 22/02/68)	
		2. File AF/X58/64 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part II – file opened 31/03/70)	There seems to be a gap between this file and the one listed next. I cannot identify from records here a relevant series of numbers. <i>not in office</i>
		3. File D/DS8/75/1 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part A – file opened 18/01/79)	<i>not in office</i>
		4. File D/DS8/75/1 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part B – file opened 04/12/79)	<i>not in office</i>
D/Sec(AS)64/5	UFO Media Issues		Dr Clarke did not give any particular date for this file. Part A is the only file. It was not opened until 08/08/96.
D/S8/75/6	UFO TV Discussion		This seems to be a 1979 file. (* See Note below)

Note * information extracted from DR1 background note for Lords PQ of 17/12/98

Annex A

File Number requested by Dr Clarke	Subject according to Dr Clarke	From MOD Records- Number of file parts	AD/Sec(AS)2 Comments
DEFE 31/118	UFO Policy 1953-63	N/A	Already accessed by Dr Clarke at the PRO
DEFE 31/119	UFO Policy 1967	N/A	Already accessed by Dr Clarke at the PRO
DEFE 31/119	UFO Policy(?) 1968-81		
DEFE 31/19	DIS+DSTI Intelligence Papers 1967-70		
DEFE 31/64	DIS+DSTI Intelligence Papers 1970-72		
DEFE 44/1	DSI (later DSTI) Reports and memoranda Register of JSTI/DSTI/DSI reports and memoranda 1946-91		
DEFE 21	DSI Registered files 1946-69		
DEFE 44	All files 1946-1969		
BJ 5/311	UFOs Meteorological Aspects 1968-70		
Air 20/12556 (?)	Sighting Reports January 1974		Dr Clarke has assumed the file number because Air 20/12555 concerns Dec 1973. But, I am not sure that number existed. Was AF/584 the file reference for Jan 74? (* see Note below)
Air 2/18564	UFO Report - West Freugh 1957	One	I am not sure where Dr Clarke found the file title. Is it a file of reports for

			1957, or one specifically concerning the West Freugh 'incident' (* see Note below)
Air 2/18873	UFO reports 1973-74	One	Dr Clarke says he wants the file because it may contain information about Jan 74 reports. However, I think the file reference might be Air 2/18833 (previously AF 7464 Pt II) (* see Note below)
AF/3459/75	UFOs Policy and Policy Statements 1970	One	(* see Note below)
All files	UFO Policy 1968-1981		Dr Clarke mentioned D/Sec(AS)12/1 and 64/1 in his letters.
D/Sec(AS)12/1	UFO Policy files		Part A seems to be the only file. It was opened 01/02/85 and is, therefore, <u>outside the period requested.</u>
D/Sec(AS)64/1	UFO Policy Files		Parts A-D exist. Part A was opened 08/08/96 and, therefore, all parts <u>are outside the period requested.</u>
	<i>plus sa. →</i>	I have identified the following files that might be relevant in respect of 'all UFO policy files 1968-81'	
		File AF/X58/64 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part I - file	<i>- 15/11 4/1</i>

*- 5
in Answer to
LM 6 Sep.*

ignore

ignore

		opened 22/02/68)	
	2.	File AF/X58/64 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part II – file opened 31/03/70)	There seems to be a gap between this file and the one listed next. I cannot identify from records here a relevant series of numbers.
	3.	File D/DS8/75/1 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part A – file opened 18/01/79)	
	4.	File D/DS8/75/1 UFO Policy & Policy Statements (Part B – file opened 04/12/79)	
D/Sec(AS)64/5	UFO Media Issues		Dr Clarke did not give any particular date for this file. Part A is the only file. It was not opened until 08/08/96.
D/S8/75/6	UFO TV Discussion		This seems to be a 1979 file. (* See Note below)

Note * information extracted from DR1 background note for Lords PQ of 17/12/98



From: **Section 40** Secretariat (Air Staff)2
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Room 8247, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

29

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
 (Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
 (Fax) **Section 40**

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference

D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date

23 August 2000

Progress
 Report
 By
 6

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your further letter of 11 August setting out in more detail the files you wish to access.

Rather than answering each one of your letters separately, we feel that you will get a quicker and more complete answer if we can provide you with a single consolidated response that addresses all the outstanding requests you have made to MOD for 'UFO'-related information. I note that in your letter of 1 August you say that you have contacted the MOD Record Officer seeking access to files. It would be helpful if you could let me know of any requests you have made to other parts of MOD (in London or elsewhere), so that these can also be covered in our substantive reply.

In the meantime, we are progressing your letters to Sec(AS)2 of 1 and 11 August and to the MOD Records Officer of 21 July and 7 August. This will, however, take some time in view of the fact that the many files requested will need to be retrieved and reviewed. It will involve a considerable amount of staff time which will have to be fitted in around core Defence tasks. I hope, however, to be able to provide you with a progress report by the end of September.

I would also like to address some of the points that you raised in your letter of 1 August. You ask whether individuals contacting the Department have requested that their personal details remain confidential for the 30-year period. I think you may have misunderstood the position. It is not a requirement that individuals should make that request. MOD has an obligation, both in common law and as an employer, to protect the confidentiality of its current and former employees and third parties. This obligation may only be overridden by consent, where there is an overriding public interest, or where statutory law (eg the Public Records Act) allows. It is for this reason that all personal identifying details of members of the public must be deleted before third party access is given to any information held on Departmental files. I should wish to assure you that MOD does not, as a matter of policy, release personal details to the media when contacted about alleged 'UFO' sightings. Rather, it is our experience that some members of the public seek actively to promote their alleged experiences through the media.

You again mention in your letter of 1 August a conversation at the beginning of the year with the MOD Press Office. As **Section 40** said in her letter of 25 July, a number of enquiries were made to MOD by the media and members of the public about 'UFO' files being released at

that time by the Public Record Office. I cannot comment on your recollection of what might have been said during your conversation but I can say that media reports about comments attributed to the then Under Secretary of State for Defence in respect of 'UFO' files were totally unfounded. MOD does take a positive approach to the release of information and works on the presumption that information should be made available. However, for the reasons I have given above about MOD's legal obligations, this is not always possible.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Hidden Copy

DR1

OMD 14

SEC(AS)2

From: Hd of DR1
Sent: 23 August 2000 07:09
To: SEC(AS)2
Cc: OMD14
Subject: RE: Dr Clarke and UFOs

28

Section 40

I am content with your proposed draft as amended by Section 40

Section 40

-----Original Message-----

From: SEC(AS)2
Sent: 22 August 2000 15:31
To: Hd of DR1; OMD14
Subject: Dr Clarke and UFOs

<< File: DrClarke@Code.Request.2.doc >>

From: OMD14
Sent: 22 August 2000 16:41
To: SEC(AS)2; Hd of DR1
Subject: RE: Dr Clarke and UFOs

27

Section 40

Thanks for this. I think you make the points we discussed very well - however I would prefer it if we slightly softened the beginning and made the letter sound more positive.

Can I suggest the following for the 2nd paragraph:

"Rather than answering each one of your letters separately, we feel that you will get a quicker and more complete answer if we can provide you with a single consolidated response that addresses all the outstanding requests you have made to MOD for UFO-related information. I note that in your letter of 1 August you say that you have contacted the MOD Record Officer seeking access to files. It would be helpful if you could let me know of any requests you have made to other parts of MOD (in London or elsewhere), so that these can also be covered in our substantive reply."

Then your 3rd para. Then I would add a para explaining how we are getting on with his request (I think it is better to have this upfront rather than at the end):

"In the meantime, we are progressing your outstanding requests made in your letters to Sec(AS) of . . . and to Defence records of This will, however, take some time, in view of the fact that the many files requested will need to be retrieved and reviewed for disclosure. This will involve a considerable amount of staff time, which will have to be fitted in around core Defence tasks. I hope, however, to be able to provide you with a progress report by the end of September."

Then, "I would like also to address a number of points that you raised in your letter of 1 August. . ." Then your paras 4 and 5.

Regards,

Section 40

-----Original Message-----
From: SEC(AS)2
Sent: 22 August 2000 15:31
To: Hd of DR1; OMD14
Subject: Dr Clarke and UFOs

<< File: DrClarke@Code.Request.2.doc >>

Loose Minute

D/Sec(AS)/64/3

22 August 2000

OMD14

DRI

'UFOs': LETTER FROM THE PUBLIC - DR DAVID CLARKE

1. We met this morning to discuss how we might deal with Dr Clarke's scattergun approach for information in a 'joined-up' way. As agreed, I have drafted an acknowledgement to his latest letter (dated 11 August and copied to you at the meeting) and covered one or two points from the 1 August letter (you already have a copy) to reflect our discussion. This is attached; I should be grateful to know asap that you are content.

2. I shall write separately about what I think his file 'shopping list' comprises!

Section 40

AD/Sec(AS)2

MB 8247 Section 40

26

Draft of Dr Clarke

Thank you for your further letter of 11 August setting out in more detail the files you wish to access.

Section 40 has already acknowledged your letter of 1 August and I accept that you have yet to receive a full reply. However, in that letter you also say that you have contacted the MOD Departmental Record Officer seeking access to files. This fragmented approach to the Department is hampering efforts to make meaningful enquiries about your requests for access to official information. It would therefore be helpful to know as soon as possible whether you have contacted other parts of the MOD in London or elsewhere. It is only with full details that we shall be able to look at the totality of your requests and provide an overall substantive response.

It would also be helpful in any future dealings with MOD about this request to direct all of your correspondence to the above address. Sec(AS)2 is the MOD focal point for dealing with all correspondence relating to 'UFOs' and I can assure you that Sec(AS)2 staff liaise with and discuss all related matters with others in the Department as necessary.

In your letter of 1 August you ask whether individuals contacting the Department have requested that their personal details remain confidential for the 30-year period. I think you may have misunderstood the position. It is not a requirement that individuals should make this request. MOD has an obligation, both in common law and as an employer, to protect the confidentiality of its current and former employees **and third parties**. This obligation may only be overridden by consent, where there is an overriding public interest, or where statutory law (eg the Public Records Act) allows. It is for this reason that all personal identifying details of members of the public must be deleted before third party access is given to any information held on Departmental files. I should wish to assure you that MOD does not, as a matter of policy, release personal details to the media when contacted about alleged 'UFO' sightings. Rather, it is our experience that some members of the public seek actively to promote their alleged experiences through the media.

You again mention in your letter of 1 August a conversation at the beginning of the year with the MOD Press Office. As **Section 40** said in her letter of 25 July, a number of enquiries were made to MOD by the media and members of the public about 'UFO' files being released at that time to the Public Record Office. I cannot comment on your recollection of what might have been said during your conversation but I can say that media reports about comments attributed to the then Under Secretary of State for Defence in respect of 'UFO' files were totally unfounded. MOD does take a positive approach to the release of information and works on the presumption that information should be made available. However, for the reasons I have given above about MOD's legal obligations, this is not always possible.

I am sorry not to be able to give you a substantive response to your letters of 1 and 11 August at this time. Nevertheless, I can assure you that whilst we await information about any additional requests you have made to the Department, Sec(AS)2 and Departmental Records staff will continue with their enquiries on your behalf. We hope to provide a progress report by the end of September.

SEC(AS)2A1

From: DC+L(F+S)Legal
Sent: 16 August 2000 14:49
To: SEC(AS)2A1
Cc: OMD14; OMD16; Hd of DR1
Subject: Dr Clarke - addendum

25

See also Annex A of JSP 400 for guidance on access to records less than 30 years old. This amplifies my earlier minute. **Section 40**

D/DC&L(F&S)/29/4/1

29

16 August 2000

Sec(AS)2a1*

Copy to:

OMD14*

OMD16*

DR1*

CODE REQUEST: DR DAVID CLARKE

1. OMD14 has passed us your minute (D/Sec(AS)/64/3) of 7 August in relation to Dr Clarke's request for access to Departmental records on UFOs.

2. First of all, I want to point out that the Data Protection Act 1998 is irrelevant in this context. Dr Clarke is not asking to see what papers we hold on him. The key principle regarding disclosure of these and all other MOD documents continues to be the obligation by the Department, both in common law and as an employer, to protect the confidentiality of its current and former employees (Service and civilian) and third parties. This obligation may only be over-ridden by consent, where there is an over-riding public interest, or where statutory law (e.g. the Public Records Act) allows. As you suspected, it is the latter - the third party angle - that is important here. All personal details will need to be deleted before he can have access to the papers still held by the MOD.

3. However, the historical branches have a special dispensation from the normal disclosure practice to enable privileged access to be given to *bona fide* historical researchers (see JSP 400, paragraph 3.23 located on the Web at "Instructions", then "JSP 400".) Whether Dr Clarke comes into this category I leave to you to decide. It may be material that he does not know that we do not yet have a FOI Act; the Bill is still going through Parliament.



[signed]

Section 40

DDC&L(F&S) Legal

MT3/28 **Section 40**

Fax: **Section 40**

CHOTS: DC+L(F+S) Legal

SEC(AS)2A1

From: OMD14
Sent: 11 August 2000 18:06
To: SEC(AS)2A1
Cc: Hd of DR1; OMD/AD(E+MG); OMD16; DC+L(F+S)Legal
Subject: Code request: Dr Clarke

23



08.00 dr clarke
ufes.doc

PSA loose minute on the above.

Section 40

Section 40

OMD14

NH617

Section 40

LOOSE MINUTE

D/DOMD/2/3

11 August 2000

Sec(AS)2a1

Copy to:
DR1
OMD/AD(E&MG)
DC+L(F+S)Legal
OMD16

CODE REQUEST: DR DAVID CLARKE

Reference:

A. D/Sec(AS)64/3 of 7 August 2000

1. Thank you for seeking our comments (at Ref A) on Dr Clarke's request for information on UFOs. I have the following comments on Dr Clarke's paragraphs:

Paragraph 3

2. As you suggested, this is covered by the Data Protection Act 1998 (DPA 98). Policy on DPA 98 is now the responsibility of DG Info, through **Section 40** and **Section 40**, and I have sought the latter's advice on this case. She shares DR1's view that we do have a duty of confidentiality towards third party information, which Dr Clarke's offer to respect the confidentiality of the information does not waive. Unless DC+L(F+S)Legal disagrees, I therefore think it is our legal duty to redact the personal details from all UFO files released before 30 years.

Paragraph 4

3. I think we need to be a bit careful about using the **Section 40** case as a precedent here. In the **Section 40** case, we only agreed to provide the information as a one-off gesture of goodwill. **Section 40** request was also much more narrowly focused (it was for specific sighting reports) and was therefore easier to handle. We should also take into account the fact that Dr Clarke is requesting other files from Defence Records, which it is taking staff time to handle. I therefore think it is reasonable for us to handle his requests for PRO files first before we offer anything extra.

Paragraphs 6-9

4. We need to ensure that we answer all his requests here in accordance with the Code. Regarding file BJ 5/311, my view is that we should ask the PRO whether the document can be released in advance of January 2001. If not, then we should advise Dr Clarke to wait for the release of the file in January. Rather than citing exemption 10 of the Code, we should simply explain that the process of releasing a document (as

required under the Public Records Act) takes some time and the PRO are not in a position to complete this before January.

5. Lastly, given that Dr Clarke is writing separately to different parts of MOD about this, we may wish to be "joined-up" in our responses to ensure that we are not duplicating work or sending conflicting messages.

6. I hope this is helpful and I am happy to discuss.

Section 40

OMD14

NH617 Section 40

22
Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Section 40

Sec (AS) 2A1/Room 8245
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

11 August 2000

Your ref: D/Sec (AS) 64/3

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your letter of 7 August acknowledging my request for access to MOD files, and for keeping me informed about the time involved in processing my request.

In the meantime my attention has been drawn to a list of 'closed files' provided by Lord Gilbert in a Written Answer to Lord Hill-Norton in the House of Lords on 19 November/17 December, 1998. This information has allowed me to draw up a more specific list of file references which may help you consider my request. These are:

BJ 5/311 UFOs: Meteorological Aspects 1968-70 (closed until 1 Jan 2001)

Air 2/18564 UFO report: West Freugh 1957 (closed until 1 Jan 2002)

AF/3459/75 UFOs: Policy and Policy Statements, 1970

This file plus additional policy files: 1968-1981 which may include:

D/Sec(AS)/12/1 5 parts dealing with policy D/Sec(AS)/64/1 issues.

D/Sec(AS)/64/5 Media Issues

D/DS8/75/6 UFO: TV discussion.

Air 20/12556 (?) UFO reports January 1974

(additionally Air 2/18873 UFO reports 1973-74 may contain information re January 1974 reports).


Thanks for your help. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40


Section 40

SEC (AS) 2A1
Room 8245
MAIN BUILDING,
WHITEHALL
LONDON SW1A 2HB.



Postage
Mail Centre
07:26 PM
29932395

Please
use the
Postcode



Loose Minute

DR/3/7/8

8 August 2000

Sec(AS)2a1

Copy to:

AD/E&MG OMD

CODE REQUEST - PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

Reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3 dated 7 August 2000

1. Thank you for your minute and for a copy of Dr Clarke's latest letter to you clarifying further his request for information relating to MOD's interest in "unidentified flying objects".
2. Before turning to the questions you have raised you will be interested to learn that Dr Clarke sought to clarify his earlier request to this office concerning the re-review of a large number of files closed in accordance with S3(4) of the Public Records Act of 1958 (Annex A). Originally thought to be in the region of 30 closed files, subsequent research has identified a further 43. The latter being sensitive extracts taken from the files to permit release at an earlier review. So far as his latest letter is concerned I have simply acknowledged his letter and for thanked him for clarification of his original request and that it is still my intention to provide him with a progress report of our review of these files towards the end of September.
3. Now your minute:

Dr Clarke's Para 3

I endorse your comments. As your papers will reveal the earlier advice was taken after obtaining Legal input and was based on the belief that the 30-year rule removed from the department continuing obligations on confidentiality. This was of course, before the Data Protection legislation of 1998 came into force. It is my understanding the recent change in Data Protection still provides for a duty of confidentiality and that our position should be unchanged. AD/E&MG OMD may be able to give further advice.

Para 6

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
- 9 AUG 2000

21

DEFE 31/119 (together with *118*) was one of two files that came to light during DR's ongoing review of record holding in DIS. They were discovered by my staff during 1997 and following review transferred to the PRO. So far as *119* is concerned the complete file has not been released. One sentence, unrelated to the subject of "ufos" continues to be retained on intelligence grounds. I have asked my staff to investigate with DIS whether subsequent parts survive. You should note from the attached (Annex B) I suspect not! I will let you know the outcome in due course.

Para 8

I can confirm that *BJ 5/311* is at the PRO waiting release at the normal point ie January 2001. The Public Records Act permits the release of records in advance of the 30-year point. Administrative action takes normally three or four months and specifically requires the Lord Chancellor's formal agreement (Section 5(1) of the Act applies). I would not normally suggest we take such action at such a late stage in the year, it is just possible the PRO would take the line that in view of its imminent release in just over four months no useful purpose would be served. Alternatively, the MOD could recall the record from Kew and permit Dr Clarke to view it in department. This would of course set an interesting precedent at least so far as Dr Clarke is concerned. A final option, would not exemption 10 apply "publication and prematurely in relation to publication."?

Para 9

Dr Clarke's request for the release of *DEFE 44/1* and *DEFE 21* is being handled by this branch. I very much doubt that *DEFE 44/1* will be released. It is solely a list of DSI/DSTI reports etc created from 1946, something in the region of 2,000 entries. The register is intelligence sensitive simply by virtue of a majority of the titles. Reports that survive ie have been passed to Defence Records and have been selected for preservation are identifiable in the PRO catalogue. To date this category consists of just 117 reports.

4. I hope that this is helpful.

Section 40



Hd/DR1

Section 40



LOOSE MINUTE

20

D/Sec(AS)64/3

7 August 2000

**AD/E&MG OMD
DR1**

CODE REQUEST – PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

1. Please see attached a copy of a letter we received this morning from Dr Clarke who, as you will be aware, had previously requested access to MOD files from 1969 onwards on 'unidentified flying objects'. We have refused his request under Exemption 9 of the Code of Practice (voluminous or vexatious request) and Exemption 12 (Privacy of an individual). We did however, say that if he could be more specific about dates, we would be happy to see what could be released, hence the letter attached. We have acknowledged receipt of Dr Clarke's letter and propose to put together a reply but would be grateful for your advice as follows;

Para 3 – DR1

We consider that all members of the public who contact the department, whether in writing or by telephone, have a right to expect that we will respect their privacy and not disclose their details to a third party. We do not specifically ask them if they wish us to keep this confidentiality. I do not know if this comes under any kind of formal rule (Maybe the Data Protection Act). I would welcome your views.

Para 4 – AD/E&MG OMD

We thought we might offer Dr Clarke copies of files for a period of 1 year (similar to the case of **Section 40**) and ask him to choose a year. We could retrieve the appropriate files from archives, copy them and remove all the personal details. We believe it could amount to 8 or more files depending on the year he chose. Do you think this is a reasonable offer to make to him?

Para 5

We are not proposing to offer any advice or comment on this paragraph.

Para 6 – DR1

Please could you advise on Dr Clarke's request for access to DEFE 31/119 between 1968 and 1981.

Para 7

We could look at this in addition to the year offered at paragraph 4 if he chooses another year.

Para 8 – DR1

Do you know where Meteorological Office files are kept and who would need to contact them about access (Dr Clarke?, Sec(AS)? you?).

Para 9 – DR1

I would welcome your comments concerning Dr Clarke's request to have access to files in the DEFE44/1 and DEFE21 series from 1946 to 1969.

2. If you have any comments on anything in Dr Clarke's letter that I have not specifically asked for your advice on, please feel free to offer your thoughts.

Section 40

Sec(AS)2a1


MB8245 Section 40

PANUX A

19

Dr David Clarke
Section 40
[Redacted]

Section 40
Room 1.01
Ministry of Defence
3-5 Great Scotland Yard
London SW1A 2HW



7 August 2000

Your Reference: DR/3/7/8

Defence Intelligence Staff: Registered Files

Dear Section 40

Thank you for your letter 31 July, in reply to my application for the release of certain Defence Intelligence and predecessor departments records in the DEFE class.

Thanks also for clarifying the position with regards to the status of the records within DEFE 31/19, 64 and DEFE 44/1, which are currently retained in department in accordance with Section 3(4) of the Public Records Act 1958.

I very much appreciate your intention to arrange for a rereview of the closed records to which I requested access, and I hope I can provide some additional information which may help this process. Could I point out that of the 30 files concerned, I am solely interested in locating those records or minutes which relate to the subject of 'unidentified flying objects' which may also be referred to as 'aerial phenomena', 'unidentified aircraft' 'flying saucers' or 'anomolous radar tracks.' This may help save you time and effort in your rereview, and I hope the information in this letter will help you locate the specific records to which I refer.

I am led to believe it was the Air Ministry's policy, until 1962, to routinely destroy records relating to unidentified flying objects at five yearly intervals. This practice was ended following Parliamentary Questions and all files have been preserved by the MOD since 1967. However, a number of Air Ministry UFO records from the 1950s, especially where these relate to Parliamentary Questions, have survived and are available for viewing at the PRO. The location of Intelligence records relating to UFOs, generated by DST/DSI, remains a mystery but there are clues which suggest at least some did survive and are still retained by the MOD under Section 3(4) above.

Check. ←

There are references in some of the PRO files which relate to Intelligence papers on UFOs generated by the DSTI staff during this period. For example, I'm enclosing a copy of a loose minute found in PRO file **Air 2/18117** sent to Department S4 (Air) by J.E. Dickison of DI55 on 13 December 1967. It describes how staff had "recovered" ^{all but} two Intelligence files on UFOs for the period 1951-52, and refers to one of these specifically as "report DSI/JTIC Report No. 7 – Unidentified Flying Objects." This is good evidence that at least some Intelligence files on UFOs did survive from this period.

From an examination of the PRO catalogue, it would appear these files – if they still exist – should be listed under the **DEFE class 44/1** which is a register of JSTI/DSTI/DSI reports and memoranda for the period from 1946 onwards. DEFE 31/19 and 64 may also contain Intelligence reports on UFOs for the period 1967-1972 which should have been retained under the 1962 policy referred to above.

I hope this information assists in your rereview of the documents I have described and I look forward to hearing from you in due course,

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40

DW Clarke

AIR 2/18117

File

MFB/3

AF/PS 427/67
Unidentified Flying Objects
Wg Cdr Sir Eric Bullus, M.P.
Julian J. A. Hennessey, Esq.

E180

M8

S4 (Air) MOD (Mr. W. P. Cassell)

1. Further to your M7, we have recovered all but two of the 'Metropole' (ie Intelligence) files on UFOs for the period 1951-2.

2. The files examined indicate that Topcliffe-Meteor incident, which occurred during the NATO Exercise MAINBRACE, was typical of reports about such aircraft at that time. (The Meteor was being extensively operated in a variety of roles and was the first UK jet to be so deployed).

3. As regards the particular incident the 'object' only appeared to come from the aircraft. There is no specific evidence in the files examined so far, that the object tracked or came from the aircraft. In fact, the trajectory of the apparent object was not established in absolute terms and thus typical questions such as true range have not been answered.

4. We consider that the report DSI/JTIC Report No 7 Unidentified Flying Objects covers the situation as a whole, ~~and~~ such activity at that time. Similar remarks apply to the observed radar anomalies which occurred at that time.



(J. C. DICKISON)
DI55
ROOM 4/58 EXT 5230
Metropole Building
13th December 1967

Memorandum

TRANS

To: Defence Records 1 – Sensitivity

From: Defence Records 1
Room 1.01
Great Scotland Yard

Date: 08 August 2000

Tel: Section 40

Your Ref:

Our Ref: DR/3/7/8

Section 40

Subject: ENQUIRY FROM A MEMBER OF THE PUBLIC: DEFENCE INTELLIGENCE FILES

Reference: My memos dated 31 July and 1 August 2000.

1. I attach a photocopy of Dr Clarke's response to my letter acknowledging his request for the review of a large number of DI files recorded as retained in department in accordance with S3(4) of the PRA.
2. In an attempt to be helpful he further expands on his area of interest – "ufos" – notwithstanding this limited area of interest please ensure that the 64 files (approx) are reviewed with the view to possible release. Please advise of any that might fall into his area of interest, whether releasable or not. I am of course aware of the reference to "ufos" in *DEFE 44/1 DSI/JTIC Report No 7 – Unidentified Flying Objects*. Of which no copy is known to have survived. I believe that there are no other references in this piece to this particular phenomena, but confirm.
3. Finally, Dr Clarke has written separately to Sec(AS) about access to a variety of files including those that continue the run preserved at the PRO as *DEFE 13/118 & 119*. Former reference DI/55/40/9/1 Parts 1 & 2. Please ask Section 40 to bring me up to date on his review of DI material in general and specifically DI55 material. I seem to recall that 3 or 4 years ago, when visiting DI 55, he became aware that, other than these two files, no other "ufo" files survived until the late 1970s or was it the late 1980s (?). He also saw documentary evidence recording the destruction of these parts. Can he provide dates of destruction for each file part and the dates covered by each file (or better still copies of the destruction certificates).

Clarke

Section 40

Rank: C2

Name in Block Letter Section 40

18



From: **Section 40** SEC(AS)2A1
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8245, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
(GTN) *

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)64/3
Date
7 August 2000


Dear Dr Clarke

Thank you for your letter dated 1 August concerning your request for access to MOD files.

We are giving your request carefully consideration and consulting other branches where necessary. As you are aware, we aim to send a substantive reply to all letters within 20 days of receipt and if it looks as if we will be unable to meet this deadline we will write to you again.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40



Dr David Clarke

Section 40

17

1 August, 2000

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3

Dear Section 40



Many thanks for your detailed letter of 25 July with reference to my request to view MOD files relating to 'unidentified flying objects.'

Firstly, I realise your staff have many other more pressing defence-related duties and I apologise if my request has added to that burden. I contacted the Freedom of Information office on 20 July inquiring as to what had become of my original request, simply because I was concerned that my letter had gone astray, or had been sent to the wrong department, as I had not at that stage received an acknowledgement. Almost immediately I received your acknowledgement in the post, and would like to make it clear that I have always been satisfied with the helpful and detailed responses received from the MOD's Secretariat (Air Staff) on the occasions I have contacted your department in the past.

With regards to my request to view files, I accept that my request for access to files covering the period 1969 to present was a little ambitious in terms of staff time. From your response, it appears that the main obstacle preventing the use of these files for research projects such as my own is the Exemption 9 in the Code of Practice which relates to Privacy of the individual. You say you receive up to 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters, but I wonder if you could specify how many of the individuals who contact the department in any one year have requested that their personal details should remain confidential for 30 years? From cursory viewing of the files which are available at the PRO relating to the period before 1969, I cannot recall finding one single request of this kind, and indeed many of the sightings and letters relate to events which are already in the "public domain", for example have already been reported in newspapers and other media.

While I would question the basis upon which my request has been refused, I do not wish to add to your administrative burden by asking for a review or involving my MP at this stage. I would be more happy to take up your offer of help to locate "a more limited amount of material" which might fall within the terms of your Code of Practice for Access to Government Information. I would be happy to be guided by yourself as to what you feel would be a reasonable request for access to a "limited amount" of material.

Further to your offer, firstly I would like to point out that my research is not specifically concerned with the details of individual "UFO sightings" reported by

individuals to the MOD. I am more interested in studying the evolution of how the old Air Ministry, and later the MOD, dealt with these kind of inquiries, how policy on this subject was formulated, and how that policy has been influenced by specific incidents, Government policy, Parliamentary questions, scientific opinion and the media.

To this end, I have found the material in the Defence Intelligence Staff registered files particularly of interest. Of the two files currently available at the PRO, DEFE 31/118 (UFO policy 1953-63) and DEFE 31/119 (UFO Policy 1967) contain precisely the category of information I am seeking: for example internal memorandums, draft policy documents etc. There is little, if any, correspondence from the public contained within these files which fall within Exemption 12 (Privacy) or the exemptions relating to national security. Further to this detail, I would like to apply for access to the sequence of files which follow DEFE 31/119 and which presumably relate to UFO policy, between the years 1968 and 1981. This request relates to specific files, falling within a specified period of time, so you may feel it would be worthwhile employing a more focussed search to retrieve and scrutinise these papers on my behalf.

In terms of Air Staff files relating to sighting/s reported by the general public, the one specific file I wish to view relates to UFO/unidentified aircraft sightings reported to the MOD during the month of January 1974. Following the file sequence at the PRO I suspect this file would be found at the reference Air 20/12556 (Air 20/12555 relates to December 1973).

I would also like to apply for access to a file produced by the Meteorological Office for the MOD, reference BJ 5/311 titled "Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects" which relates to the period 1968-1970. This file is due to be opened at the PRO on 1 January 2001.

From my research into historical files at the Public Record Office, I suspect there may also be memoranda and reports relating to UFOs in the 1950s hidden within the Defence Intelligence Files, class numbers DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21, and I have contacted the MOD Departmental Record Officer separately with a request for access to this material. DEFE 44 contains papers from as far back as 1946, but these remain classified because the file also contains material from 1991. I would like to request access to the block of files and memoranda which relate to the period 1946 to 1969, which should be available for scrutiny under the Freedom of Information Act.

I hope you will feel it is possible to allow me to have access to at least some of the material specified in this letter, for use in what is a bona fide academic research programme. I would be happy to meet any reasonable costs incurred as a result of this application, and would be willing to sign any undertakings related to Data Protection or Official Secrets which you might feel appropriate. In addition, I will be happy to provide the MOD with a copy of my completed research paper, which I plan to publish via the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition at the University of Sheffield.

In making this request, I am simply responding to the Government's and the MOD's own stated manifesto pledge to "establish a general statutory right of access to official records and through culture change throughout the public sector" (MOD website). This laudable aim will only be seen to working in practise if reasonable requests for

access to non-sensitive material, a category I feel my request falls within, are successful. This touches upon the discussion I mentioned I had with the MOD/RAF Press Office in January this year, when I tried to follow up a story in the national Press which suggested that *all* files relating to UFOs were soon to be released to the PRO. I was told at that time by the duty Press Officer that the former minister Peter Kilfoyle had indeed expressed the opinion that there was no good reason for keeping files related to UFOs restricted for 30 years. He said release of UFO data was likely to be a priority following "a review of the files." There was, I was told, "a general move within the department to give out information that is not security sensitive and take away the myth of secrecy that surrounds this subject."

I hope we will be able to reach an agreement on access to the limited amount of files specified in this letter, and that this application will not be too onerous upon your department's time.

I am copying this reply to **Section 40** at OMD/AD, Room 617, Northumberland House, so that he is aware that I am happy with the expeditious and helpful way you have dealt with my inquiry.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40

DW Clarke

1) We will acknowledge together
2) propose to put reply
+ need advise as follows

Section 40

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
SEC (AS) 2
- 4 AUG 2000

Dr David Clarke
Section 40

16

1 August, 2000

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your detailed letter of 25 July with reference to my request to view MOD files relating to 'unidentified flying objects.'

Firstly, I realise your staff have many other more pressing defence-related duties and I apologise if my request has added to that burden. I contacted the Freedom of Information office on 20 July inquiring as to what had become of my original request, simply because I was concerned that my letter had gone astray, or had been sent to the wrong department, as I had not at that stage received an acknowledgement. Almost immediately I received your acknowledgement in the post, and would like to make it clear that I have always been satisfied with the helpful and detailed responses received from the MOD's Secretariat (Air Staff) on the occasions I have contacted your department in the past.

With regards to my request to view files, I accept that my request for access to files covering the period 1969 to present was a little ambitious in terms of staff time. From your response, it appears that the main obstacle preventing the use of these files for research projects such as my own is the Exemption 9 in the Code of Practice which relates to Privacy of the individual. You say you receive up to 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters, but I wonder if you could specify how many of the individuals who contact the department in any one year have requested that their personal details should remain confidential for 30 years? From cursory viewing of the files which are available at the PRO relating to the period before 1969, I cannot recall finding one single request of this kind, and indeed many of the sightings and letters relate to events which are already in the "public domain", for example have already been reported in newspapers and other media.

advise
Section 40

While I would question the basis upon which my request has been refused, I do not wish to add to your administrative burden by asking for a review or involving my MP at this stage. I would be more happy to take up your offer of help to locate "a more limited amount of material" which might fall within the terms of your Code of Practice for Access to Government Information. I would be happy to be guided by yourself as to what you feel would be a reasonable request for access to a "limited amount" of material.

would propose 1 year
3 files or perhaps more

is it a reasonable offer to make to him

Further to your offer, firstly I would like to point out that my research is not specifically concerned with the details of individual "UFO sightings" reported by

- not proposing to offer any advice / comment on this para

Aim

individuals to the MOD. I am more interested in studying the evolution of how the old Air Ministry, and later the MOD, dealt with these kind of inquiries, how policy on this subject was formulated, and how that policy has been influenced by specific incidents, Government policy, Parliamentary questions, scientific opinion and the media.

To this end, I have found the material in the Defence Intelligence Staff registered files particularly of interest. Of the two files currently available at the PRO, DEFE 31/118 (UFO policy 1953-63) and DEFE 31/119 (UFO Policy 1967) contain precisely the category of information I am seeking: for example internal memorandums, draft policy documents etc. There is little, if any, correspondence from the public contained within these files which fall within Exemption 12 (Privacy) or the exemptions relating to national security. Further to this detail, I would like to apply for access to the sequence of files which follow DEFE 31/119 and which presumably relate to UFO policy, between the years 1968 and 1981. This request relates to specific files, falling within a specified period of time, so you may feel it would be worthwhile employing a more focussed search to retrieve and scrutinise these papers on my behalf.

Section 40

In terms of Air Staff files relating to sighting/s reported by the general public, the one specific file I wish to view relates to UFO/unidentified aircraft sightings reported to the MOD during the month of January 1974. Following the file sequence at the PRO I suspect this file would be found at the reference Air 20/12556 (Air 20/12555 relates to December 1973).

JK

could look at this in addition to a year if he chooses to want add year

I would also like to apply for access to a file produced by the Meteorological Office for the MOD, reference BJ 5/311 titled "Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects" which relates to the period 1968-1970. This file is due to be opened at the PRO on 1 January 2001.

Section 40

From my research into historical files at the Public Record Office, I suspect there may also be memoranda and reports relating to UFOs in the 1950s hidden with the Defence Intelligence Files, class numbers DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21, and I have contacted the MOD Departmental Record Officer separately with a request for access to this material. DEFE 44 contains papers from as far back as 1946, but these remain classified because the file also contains material from 1991. I would like to request access to the block of files and memoranda which relate to the period 1946 to 1969, which should be available for scrutiny under the Freedom of Information Act.

Section 40

I hope you will feel it is possible to allow me to have access to at least some of the material specified in this letter, for use in what is a bona fide academic research programme. I would be happy to meet any reasonable costs incurred as a result of this application, and would be willing to sign any undertakings related to Data Protection or Official Secrets which you might feel appropriate. In addition, I will be happy to provide the MOD with a copy of my completed research paper, which I plan to publish via the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition at the University of Sheffield.

Research →

In making this request, I am simply responding to the Government's and the MOD's own stated manifesto pledge to "establish a general statutory right of access to official records and through culture change throughout the public sector" (MOD website). This laudable aim will only be seen to working in practise if reasonable requests for

may be comment

access to non-sensitive material, a category I feel my request falls within, are successful. This touches upon the discussion I mentioned I had with the MOD/RAF Press Office in January this year, when I tried to follow up a story in the national Press which suggested that *all* files relating to UFOs were soon to be released to the PRO. I was told at that time by the duty Press Officer that the former minister Peter Kilfoyle had indeed expressed the opinion that there was no good reason for keeping files related to UFOs restricted for 30 years. He said release of UFO data was likely to be a priority following "a review of the files." There was, I was told, "a general move within the department to give out information that is not security sensitive and take away the myth of secrecy that surrounds this subject."

I hope we will be able to reach an agreement on access to the limited amount of files specified in this letter, and that this application will not be too onerous upon your department's time.

I am copying this reply to **Section 40** at OMD/AD, Room 617, Northumberland House, so that he is aware that I am happy with the expeditious and helpful way you have dealt with my inquiry.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40

DW Clarke

1) we will acknowledge together
2) propose to put reply
+ need advise as follows

Section 40

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
SEC (AS) 2
-4 AUG 2000

Dr David Clarke
Section 40

16

1 August, 2000

Your reference: D/Sec(AS)64/3

Dear Section 40

Many thanks for your detailed letter of 25 July with reference to my request to view MOD files relating to 'unidentified flying objects.'

Firstly, I realise your staff have many other more pressing defence-related duties and I apologise if my request has added to that burden. I contacted the Freedom of Information office on 20 July inquiring as to what had become of my original request, simply because I was concerned that my letter had gone astray, or had been sent to the wrong department, as I had not at that stage received an acknowledgement. Almost immediately I received your acknowledgement in the post, and would like to make it clear that I have always been satisfied with the helpful and detailed responses received from the MOD's Secretariat (Air Staff) on the occasions I have contacted your department in the past.

With regards to my request to view files, I accept that my request for access to files covering the period 1969 to present was a little ambitious in terms of staff time. From your response, it appears that the main obstacle preventing the use of these files for research projects such as my own is the Exemption 9 in the Code of Practice which relates to Privacy of the individual. You say you receive up to 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters, but I wonder if you could specify how many of the individuals who contact the department in any one year have requested that their personal details should remain confidential for 30 years? From cursory viewing of the files which are available at the PRO relating to the period before 1969, I cannot recall finding one single request of this kind, and indeed many of the sightings and letters relate to events which are already in the "public domain", for example have already been reported in newspapers and other media.

advise
Section 40

While I would question the basis upon which my request has been refused, I do not wish to add to your administrative burden by asking for a review or involving my MP at this stage. I would be more happy to take up your offer of help to locate "a more limited amount of material" which might fall within the terms of your Code of Practice for Access to Government Information. I would be happy to be guided by yourself as to what you feel would be a reasonable request for access to a "limited amount" of material.

would propose 1 year
3 files or perhaps more

is it a reasonable offer to make to him

Further to your offer, firstly I would like to point out that my research is not specifically concerned with the details of individual "UFO sightings" reported by

- not proposing to offer any advise / comment on this para

Acad

individuals to the MOD. I am more interested in studying the evolution of how the old Air Ministry, and later the MOD, dealt with these kind of inquiries, how policy on this subject was formulated, and how that policy has been influenced by specific incidents, Government policy, Parliamentary questions, scientific opinion and the media.

To this end, I have found the material in the Defence Intelligence Staff registered files particularly of interest. Of the two files currently available at the PRO, DEFE 31/118 (UFO policy 1953-63) and DEFE 31/119 (UFO Policy 1967) contain precisely the category of information I am seeking: for example internal memorandums, draft policy documents etc. There is little, if any, correspondence from the public contained within these files which fall within Exemption 12 (Privacy) or the exemptions relating to national security. Further to this detail, I would like to apply for access to the sequence of files which follow DEFE 31/119 and which presumably relate to UFO policy, between the years 1968 and 1981. This request relates to specific files, falling within a specified period of time, so you may feel it would be worthwhile employing a more focussed search to retrieve and scrutinise these papers on my behalf.

Section 40

In terms of Air Staff files relating to sighting/s reported by the general public, the one specific file I wish to view relates to UFO/unidentified aircraft sightings reported to the MOD during the month of January 1974. Following the file sequence at the PRO I suspect this file would be found at the reference Air 20/12556 (Air 20/12555 relates to December 1973).

JK

could look at this in addition to a year if he chooses to want add year

I would also like to apply for access to a file produced by the Meteorological Office for the MOD, reference BJ 5/311 titled "Unidentified Flying Objects: meteorological aspects" which relates to the period 1968-1970. This file is due to be opened at the PRO on 1 January 2001.

Section 40

From my research into historical files at the Public Record Office, I suspect there may also be memoranda and reports relating to UFOs in the 1950s hidden with the Defence Intelligence Files, class numbers DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21, and I have contacted the MOD Departmental Record Officer separately with a request for access to this material. DEFE 44 contains papers from as far back as 1946, but these remain classified because the file also contains material from 1991. I would like to request access to the block of files and memoranda which relate to the period 1946 to 1969, which should be available for scrutiny under the Freedom of Information Act.

Section 40

I hope you will feel it is possible to allow me to have access to at least some of the material specified in this letter, for use in what is a bona fide academic research programme. I would be happy to meet any reasonable costs incurred as a result of this application, and would be willing to sign any undertakings related to Data Protection or Official Secrets which you might feel appropriate. In addition, I will be happy to provide the MOD with a copy of my completed research paper, which I plan to publish via the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition at the University of Sheffield.

Research →

In making this request, I am simply responding to the Government's and the MOD's own stated manifesto pledge to "establish a general statutory right of access to official records and through culture change throughout the public sector" (MOD website). This laudable aim will only be seen to working in practise if reasonable requests for

any other comment

access to non-sensitive material, a category I feel my request falls within, are successful. This touches upon the discussion I mentioned I had with the MOD/RAF Press Office in January this year, when I tried to follow up a story in the national Press which suggested that *all* files relating to UFOs were soon to be released to the PRO. I was told at that time by the duty Press Officer that the former minister Peter Kilfoyle had indeed expressed the opinion that there was no good reason for keeping files related to UFOs restricted for 30 years. He said release of UFO data was likely to be a priority following "a review of the files." There was, I was told, "a general move within the department to give out information that is not security sensitive and take away the myth of secrecy that surrounds this subject."

I hope we will be able to reach an agreement on access to the limited amount of files specified in this letter, and that this application will not be too onerous upon your department's time.

I am copying this reply to **Section 40** at OMD/AD, Room 617, Northumberland House, so that he is aware that I am happy with the expeditious and helpful way you have dealt with my inquiry.

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



DW Clarke



From: Section 40 Room 1.01

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE

3-5 Great Scotland Yard, London SW1A 2HW

Section 40

fu info.

15

Section 40

Tele: (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

Section 40
020 7218 9000

Section 40

Dr D Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference

DR/3/7/8

Date

31 July 2000

Section 40

Defence Intelligence Staff: Registered Files

Thank you for your letter dated 21 July 2000 concerning the status of records - *DEFE 31/19, and 64, DEFE 44/1 and DEFE 21* - selected for preservation at the Public Record Office that are retained in department in accordance with Section 3(4) of the Public Records Acts, 1958, and your wish for these records to be released.

As you may be aware all government departments are required to review their records in accordance with the terms of the Public Records Act, 1958 and 1967. Records selected for permanent preservation are transferred into the custody of the Public Record Office (or some other suitable institution) where they generally become available to the public after 30 years ie the "30-year rule". Records not selected for permanent preservation are destroyed.

The very few records that are too sensitive for release at the normal 30-year point may be closed by either being retained in department (Section 3(4) of the Act) or by being placed on extended closure for a period between 40 and 90 years (Section 5(1)). Retained records are closed under the authority of the Lord Chancellor, but are subject to a rereview at least once every 10 years until release into the public domain is possible. Records closed under the extended closure arrangement are transferred to the PRO for release at the future designated date. The status of whole files either retained or subject to extended closure is noted on the PRO catalogue. Where pages from files are subject to a similar process a "dummy" or a photocopy of the redacted pages are appropriately endorsed.

However, the White Paper on *Open Government*, Cm 2290, published July 1993 set out a number of initiatives that, subject to resources, would see the release of records hither to closed for more than 30 years. For example, greater use of the extraction and redaction techniques

whereby sensitive papers or passages could be removed thereby permitting the release of some part of a file, and to consider *ad hoc* requests from researchers of records closed for longer than 30 years. As a result of these and other initiatives the Ministry of Defence has released in excess of 11,750 records originally closed for longer than 30 years.

So far as your request for the release of certain Defence Intelligence and predecessor departments records is concerned *DEFE 31/19, 64 and DEFE 44/1* are all retained in department in accordance with Section 3(4) of the Public Records Act, 1958. From a cursory examination of the PRO catalogue on the Internet I note that 34 of the 72 records assigned to class *DEFE 21* are open and available to the public.

In keeping with the MOD's commitment to greater openness I am prepared to arrange for the rereview of the closed records you have expressed an interest in. You will appreciate that our review programme for the year is well established thus the review of more than 30 additional files will have an impact on my scarce resources. But I plan to give you a report on our progress in about two months.

Section 40



Deputy Departmental Record Officer

Section 40



Dr David Clarke

Section 40



**Departmental Record Officer
Defence Records
Room 7/40
Metropole Building
Northumberland Avenue
London WC2N 5BL**

21 July 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,

Defence Intelligence Staff: Registered Files

The Enquiry staff at the Public Record Office have suggested that I write to you in order to follow up an enquiry concerning the status of a group of MOD files which are currently "retained by the Department under section 3 (4) of the Public Record Act 1958."

The files in question all appear to have been deposited at the Public Record Office. They fall under the class reference DEFE and contain papers generated by the work of the MOD Defence Intelligence Staff. They include:

DEFE 31/19 DIS and DSTI Intelligence Papers 1967-1970

DEFE 31/64 DIS/DSTI intelligence 1970-1972

DEFE 44/1 DSI, later DSTI: Reports and Memoranda; Register of JSTI/DSTI/DSI reports and memoranda, 1946-1991.

DEFE 21 DSI Registered Files 1950-1964

I understand from the PRO that records would be retained under the 30 year rule until the latest date in the sequence covered by the file, in which case DEFE 31/19 above should be available for public scrutiny on 1 January 2001. Could you confirm if that is the case?

More...

As for DEFE 44/1, although this file contains material more than 50 years old, it might not be released until 2021 because it also contains material dating from 1991. In the case of files held under class DEFE 21, these apparently contain files created by both the old Directorate of Scientific Intelligence between 1950-1964, which should be open; however, they also contain later material from the DSTI relating to the period 1964-1991, which under the terms of the 1967 Act would remain closed until 2021.

In these circumstances, would it not be possible to make an exception and allow access to the reports and memoranda contained within those files which specifically relate to the period 1946-1969, which would fall under the terms of the 30 year rule?

I understand that under the Freedom of Information Act all Government records – other than those created by the Security and Special Services - should be made available for public scrutiny unless it can be demonstrated their disclosure would *clearly cause harm* to “national security, defence and international relations...the internal discussion of Government policy [and/or] personal privacy.”

I understand from the FOI unit that individual departments do have the power to make exceptions and allow access to ‘closed’ material for research purposes in certain circumstances. In my case, I am researching the UK MOD’s involvement in the study of Unidentified Flying Objects, both in terms of the Air Staff and Defence and Scientific Intelligence, within the context of a sociological study based in an established academic department. The research is supported by the University of Sheffield, where I have an Honorary Research Fellowship from the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition, School of English.

I wish to apply for access to the files specified above under the Freedom of Information Act, and I would appreciate any information you can provide with regards to their current closure status under the current Access to Public Records Act, 1967.

I hope you are able to help and look forward to hearing from you,

Section 40

DW Clarke



From: **Section 40** OMD/AD(Efficiency & Machinery of Government)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 617, Northumberland House, Northumberland Avenue,
London WC2N 5BP

14

Telephone (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

Section 40
020 7218 9000
Section 40

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference

D/DOMD/2/3/2

Date 27 July 2000

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter of 20 July to **Section 40**. I have recently taken over from **Section 40** in this post and am now responsible for implementing MOD's policy on Open Government. I am sorry for the delay in replying but your letter was routed to **Section 40** MOD internal mail system and was only delivered to me yesterday.

Your letter asked why you had not received an acknowledgement or a substantive reply to a letter written on 21 June requesting access to a series of files relating to UFOs and UFO policy. I have checked with the MOD officials in the MOD's Secretariat(Air Staff), who handled your request, and you may find it helpful to know the background to dealing with your request. Your letter of 21 June was received in the Secretariat(Air Staff) on 23 June and they set about researching your request (which involved looking through a sample of the very many files concerned). In the event, this took rather longer than they expected and, when they realised that they were not going to be able to reply within the 20 working day deadline, I understand they wrote to you explaining this and promising a substantive reply as soon as possible. This interim reply was sent on 20 July, which was 19 working days after they had received your letter but 21 working days after you had posted it. A substantive reply was subsequently sent to you on 25 July, ie: 22 working days after they received your letter, which I hope you have now received.

In retrospect, it would have been better if you had been sent an acknowledgement as soon as your letter had been delivered to the MOD official who was dealing with your case, and the Secretariat(Air Staff) accept this.

I understand you are also in correspondence with MOD's Departmental Records Officer over a request to view some Defence Intelligence files. I have asked that your request is processed as soon as possible.

I hope this explains the position. If you have any other problems with requesting information from the MOD, either with the time taken to receive a reply or with the information provided, please let me know.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

SEC(AS)2

From: Hd of DR1
 Sent: 26 July 2000 08:16
 To: SEC(AS)2
 Subject: DR DAVID CLARKE

file

26/7

13

Section 40

eeeeek!

You would wish to be aware that following his approach to you for access to "ufo" files Dr Clarke's has now written to this office about 60 plus "intelligence" files identified on the lists at the PRO that are retained by the department that he wishes to see released.

As with similar requests for the release of records more than 30 years old that are closed in accordance in the terms of the Public Records Act I will initiate a review of the records. As an interim measure I will acknowledge his letter and further advise him that the review is likely to take several months.

You may also wish to note that he claims in his letter that his research is supported by the University of Sheffield where he has an Honorary Research Fellowship from the National Council for English Cultural Tradition, School of English(!).

Section 40

Dr Clarke is asking if 60 files which are over 30 years old are going to be released to the PRO.

All the file numbers he quotes are Defence Intelligence files and 30 of them have been released to the PRO. Of the remaining 30 Section 40 team will review them to see if they can be released to the PRO or if the material on them is still sensitive and they need to remain closed.

Dr Clarke only mentions UFO's at the very end of his letter to Records and has not asked if these files contain material about UFO's, only if the files will be released.

As Records have to review the files at least once every 10 years to see if they can be released, they will not be charging Dr Clarke for this review which may take several months to complete.

Section 40

26/7/2000-



From: **Section 40** OMD/AD(Efficiency & Machinery of Government)
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Room 617, Northumberland House, Northumberland Avenue,
 London WC2N 5BP

12

Telephone (Direct dial)
 (Switchboard)
 (Fax)

Section 40
 020 7218 9000
Section 40

Dr David Clarke

Section 40



Section 40

*This is the reply -
 now sent - to
 Dr Clarke who
 complained said*

Your Reference

Our Reference

Date 26 July 2000

*not had a reply in
 20 days. It seems
 OK - its factually correct.*

Section 40



3/7

Thank you for your letter of 20 July to **Section 40**. I have recently taken over from **Section 40**'s post and am now responsible for implementing MOD's policy on Open Government. I am sorry for the delay in replying but your letter was routed to **Section 40** by the MOD internal mail system and was only delivered to me today.

Your letter asked why you had not received an acknowledgement or a substantive reply to a letter written on 21 June requesting access to a series of files relating to UFOs and UFO policy. I have checked with the MOD officials in the MOD's Secretariat(Air Staff), who handled your request, and you may find it helpful to know the background to dealing with your request. Your letter of 21 June was received in the Secretariat(Air Staff) on 23 June and they set about researching your request (which involved looking through a sample of the very many files concerned). In the event, this took rather longer than they expected and, when they realised that they were not going to be able to reply within the 20 working day deadline, I understand they wrote to you explaining this and promising a substantive reply as soon as possible. This interim reply was sent on 20 July, which was 19 working days after they had received your letter but 21 working days after you had posted it. A substantive reply was subsequently sent to you on 25 July, ie: 22 working days after they received your letter, which I hope you have now received.

In retrospect, it would have been better if you had been sent an acknowledgement as soon as your letter had been delivered to the MOD official who was dealing with your case, and the Secretariat(Air Staff) accept this.

I understand you are also in correspondence with MOD's Defence Records division over a request to view some Defence Intelligence files. I have asked that your request is processed as soon as possible.

I hope this explains the position. If you have any other problems with requesting information from the MOD, either with the time taken to receive a reply or with the information provided, please let me know.

SEC(AS)2

From: OMD/AD(E+MG)
Sent: 26 July 2000 18:35
To: SEC(AS)2
Subject: Dr Clarke

Section 40 any comments on the attached draft? I don't want to be critical of Sec(AS), but am looking forward also to our probable appeal with the Ombudsman! OK with my para 3?

Section 40



From: Section 40 SEC(AS)2A1
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8245, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) Section 40
(GTN) *

Dr D Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)64/3
Date
25 July 2000

Dear Dr Clarke

Thank you for your letter of 21 June seeking access to MOD files from 1969 onwards on 'unidentified flying objects' for examination, note taking and copying as necessary for your post doctoral research in to the socio-psychological aspects of belief in aerial phenomena.

The Ministry of Defence already operates in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. It responds positively to any requests for information and no categories are automatically excluded. Each request is considered on its merits.

As you say, MOD files are subject to the provision of the Public Records Act of 1958 and 1967 and remain closed for 30 years after the last action on the file has been taken. We have, however, looked carefully to see whether earlier release of the files containing papers relating to 'UFO' issues might be possible. The Department receives about 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters from members of the public, some of which may also contain sighting reports. The information is filed manually in the form it is received on Branch files and therefore contains the personal details of all those contacting and corresponding with the Department. MOD has a duty to protect this third party confidentiality and the 30-year period is deemed appropriate for this purpose. Before access could be given to the material, staff would need to be diverted from their essential defence-related tasks to retrieve the material from archives and scrutinise and remove all of the personal information from many thousands of documents. The latter action would be necessary because the alternative, to contact everyone providing the information to secure their agreement to the release of their personal details, would be unworkable. Your request is therefore refused under Exemption 9 of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (voluminous or vexatious requests and Exemption 12, Privacy of an individual). We would, of course, be happy to look to see what information might be made available if you could be more specific about dates. This would then enable us to consider whether a more focussed effort on a limited amount of material might be possible.

I am sorry if any information provided to you by staff in the MOD Press Office has caused a misunderstanding. At the beginning of the year the department received a number of enquiries about the release of, and access to, 'UFO' files for 1969. These files were opened in the Public Record Office in January and it may be that the MOD press officer at the time you made contact was confused on this particular point.

Finally, I should say that if you are unhappy with the decision to refuse your request for access to MOD files and wish to appeal, you should write in the first instance to the Ministry of Defence, DOMD, Room 619, Northumberland House, Northumberland Avenue, London WC2N 5BP requesting that the decision be reviewed. If following the internal review you remain dissatisfied, you can ask your MP to take up the case with the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (the Ombudsman) who can investigate on your behalf. The Ombudsman will not, however, consider an investigation until the internal review process has been completed.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

Loose Minute

DR/3/7/8

21 July 2000

Sec(AS)2

Copy to:

OMD/AD(E&MG)

CODE REQUEST – ACCESS TO FILES

Reference: A. D/Sec(AS)/64/3 dated 20 July 2000

B. D/DOMD/2/3 dated 20 July 2000

1. Thank you for sight of the correspondence from Dr Clarke and your proposed response to him.
2. Paragraph 3 of your draft reply continues to represent the advice previously given by this branch and endorsed C+L(F&S)Legal1 following Lord Hill-Norton's approach to the Department a few years ago. Dr Clarke's request for access does not, in my view, support the need for this advice to be reconsidered.

Section 40

Hd DR1

MTA8/3 Section 40

LOOSE MINUTE

D/DOMD/2/3

20 July 2000

Sec(AS)2

Copy to:

DR1

CODE REQUEST - ACCESS TO FILES

Reference: D/Sec(AS)/64/3 dated 20 July 2000

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposed reply to Dr Clarke's request to examine all MOD files containing information on UFOs.

2. I agree that Exemption 9 is a valid exemption in this case. In explaining this to Dr Clarke, it might also be worth quoting Exemption 12 (privacy of an individual).
3. If Dr Clarke suggests that he provide an undertaking that he would not to submit a more focussed request, that would have no bearing on our position - the duty on MOD is to not release the information. My understanding is that allowing a third party to view personal information is as much releasing it as if we gave them a copy. Subject to a change in the Public Records Act or the Data Protection Act, the only way I can see MOD being able legally to grant access to these records without anonymising them would be to ask every person mentioned whether they were happy to have their data released.
4. It may be worth explaining this to Dr Clarke to help him formulate a request which does not break these key principles.

[signed]

Section 40
OMD/AD(E&MG)
NH617 **Section 40**


MODE = MEMORY TRANSMISSION

START=20-JUL 11:47

END=20-JUL 11:52

FILE NO.= 160

STN NO.	COM	ABBR NO.	STATION NAME/TEL.NO.	PAGES	DURATION
001	OK	8	Section 40	005/005	00:01'47"
002	OK	8		005/005	00:01'47"



-SECRETARIAT (AIR STAFF) -

***** -

- ***** -

Section 40

Loose Minute

D/Sec(AS)/64/3

20 July 2000

AD/E&MG OMD

Copy to:

DR1

CODE REQUEST - PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

1. We spoke this morning about a letter we have received from a member of the public who is seeking access to 'UFO' files from 1969. I attach a copy of the letter and our proposed response.

2. We have found Dr Clarke to be tenacious when corresponding on other 'UFO'-related issues and I have some concerns about how he might respond to a refusal to grant his request. What might we say if he replies that he is prepared to give an undertaking that he would not record or use any personal details contained in the files? He could claim that he was only interested in aggregating the data and therefore the personal confidentiality argument would not arise.

3. If a decision was to be made now or in future to grant access without the material being sanitised, how might this be done so as to ensure personal information was not extracted? It is likely that agreement to Dr Clarke's requests would prompt others (ufologists with 'UFO' research-related interests and/or the media) to seek similar access and a strategy would need to be developed for dealing for dealing with this. I am copying this note and attachments to Section 40 for any advice he might have on these aspects.

4. We have acknowledged Dr Clarke's letter and advised him that we will provide a substantive response shortly.



Sec(AS)2

MB 8247

Section 40

→Telefax

To: AD/E&MG OMD
Fax: Section 40

→Telefax

To: DR1
Fax: Section 40
From: Sec(AS)2
Date: 20/7/00
Pages: 5

Loose Minute

D/Sec(AS)/64/3

20 July 2000

AD/E&MG OMD

Copy to:

DR1

CODE REQUEST – PUBLIC CORRESPONDENCE

1. We spoke this morning about a letter we have received from a member of the public who is seeking access to 'UFO' files from 1969. I attach a copy of the letter and our proposed response.
2. We have found Dr Clarke to be tenacious when corresponding on other 'UFO'-related issues and I have some concerns about how he might respond to a refusal to grant his request. What might we say if he replies that he is prepared to give an undertaking that he would not record or use any personal details contained in the files? He could claim that he was only interested in aggregating the data and therefore the personal confidentiality argument would not arise.
3. If a decision was to be made now or in future to grant access without the material being sanitised, how might this be done so as to ensure personal information was not extracted? It is likely that agreement to Dr Clarke's requests would prompt others (ufologists with 'UFO' research-related interests and/or the media) to seek similar access and a strategy would need to be developed for dealing for dealing with this. I am copying this note and attachments to **Section 40** for any advice he might have on these aspects.
4. We have acknowledged Dr Clarke's letter and advised him that we will provide a substantive response shortly.

Section 40

Sec(AS)2

MB 8247 **Section 40**

↗ Telefax

To: AD/E&MG OMD
Fax: Section 40

7669

↗ Telefax

To: DR1
Fax: Section 40
From: Sec(AS)2
Date: 20/7/00
Pages: 5

Read-it Notes 7669

Draft

Thank you for your letter of 21 June seeking access to MOD files from 1969 onwards on 'unidentified flying objects' for examination, note taking and copying as necessary for your post doctoral research in to the socio-psychological aspects of belief in aerial phenomena.

The Ministry of Defence already operates in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. It responds positively to any requests for information and no categories are automatically excluded. Each request is considered on its merits.

As you say, MOD files are subject to the provision of the Public Records Act of 1958 and 1967 and remain closed for 30 years after the last action on the file has been taken. We have, however, looked carefully to see whether earlier release of the files containing papers relating to 'UFO' issues might be possible. The Department receives about 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters from members of the public, some of which may also contain sighting reports. The information is filed manually in the form it is received on Branch files and therefore contains the personal details of all those contacting and corresponding with the Department. MOD has a duty to protect this third party confidentiality and the 30-year period is deemed appropriate for this purpose. Before access could be given to the material, staff would need to be diverted from their essential defence-related tasks to retrieve the material from archives, and scrutinise and remove all of the personal information from many thousands of documents. Your request is therefore refused under Exemption 9 of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (voluminous or vexatious requests). We would, of course, be happy to look to see what information might be made available if you have a more specific date in mind as it would require a more focussed effort on a limited amount of material.

I am sorry if any information provided to you by staff in the MOD Press Office has caused a misunderstanding. At the beginning of the year the department received a number of enquiries about the release of, and access to, 'UFO' files for 1969. These files were opened in the Public Record Office in January and it may be that the MOD press officer at the time you made contact was confused on this particular point.

Finally, I should say that if you are unhappy with the decision to refuse your request for access to MOD files and wish to appeal, you should write in the first instance to the Ministry of Defence, DOMD, Room 619, Northumberland House, Northumberland Avenue, London WC2N 5BP requesting that the decision be reviewed. If following the internal review you remain dissatisfied, you can ask your MP to take up the case with the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (the Ombudsman) who can investigate on your behalf. The Ombudsman will not, however, consider an investigation until the internal review process has been completed.

7

SEC(AS)2A1**From:** ICL-TECH-COORD**Sent:** 05 July 2000 10:13**Subject:** UNCLASS - Additional Guidance - Parliamentary Enquiries (PEs) and Parliamentary Questions (PQs)Parliamentary Enquiries (PEs)

Despite the fact that the PE Unit's guidance clearly asks that drafts be cleared by a named official at Grade 7 level or above, increasingly we find that checks have to be made to ensure that replies have been so approved. In future, could all drafts please include a 'Drafted by/Authorised by' declaration as per Parliamentary Questions.

Parliamentary Questions (PQs)

The disproportionate cost threshold for answering PQs has been increased to £550.

You should take this new cost into account when recommending to Ministers a 'disproportionate cost' reply.

PARLIAMENTARY CLERK

Section 40

It might be worth
checking with
i.e. some low the figure of
£550 is calculated

Section 40



From: **Section 40** SEC(AS)2A1
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Room 8245, Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

6

Telephone (Direct dial) 020 7218 2140
(Switchboard) 020 7218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**
(GTN) #

Dr D Clarke

Section 40
[Redacted]

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)64/3
Date
20 July 2000

Dear Dr Clarke

I am writing to acknowledge receipt of your letter of 21 June concerning access to MOD files relating to 'unidentified flying objects'.

We aim to reply to such letters within four weeks from the date of receipt. However, owing to current administrative difficulties it may not be possible to reply to you within this timescale.

Nevertheless, you may be assured that you will receive a substantive reply as soon as is practicable.

Your sincerely,

Section 40
[Redacted]

Thank you - two points:

- What would we say if Clarke gives an undertaking that he would not record or use any personal details contained in our files? He could claim that he is only interested in aggregating the data and therefore the personal confidentiality argument would not arise.
- would it be worth sounding out DMO to see if they would be likely to support us over the use of Exemption 9?

DG info

Q189 Barry Gardiner had asked PUS whether he accepted that EDS-SCICON had discovered 56 category one anomalies. This might be checked.

A189- The 56 Cat 1 anomalies found by EDS Scicon had no particular significance to safety. EDS-Scicon in their feasibility study into Options for FADEC Verification Report dated June 1994, acknowledged this by saying that they were "confident that Cat 1 anomalies relating to software and documentation can be mitigated. However, mitigation may ultimately require changes to the object code, although none of the mitigation that are proposed under this study require changes to the object code". The definition of a Cat 1 anomaly is that "EDS-Scicon has a high of confidence that the anomaly relates to real error in the code or a discrepancy between the code and the documentation". However, this does not mean that it necessarily has any safety implications, it may not even affect the overall operation of the system. **Section 4.2.1** check whether the quote also includes the last sentence?

Lead of Sec (AS)
This needs your "O.K."

Section 40

Thank you for your letter of 21 June seeking access to MOD files from 1969 onwards on 'unidentified flying objects' for examination, note taking and copying as necessary for your post doctoral research in to the socio-psychological aspects of belief in aerial phenomena.

The Ministry of Defence already operates in accordance with the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information. It responds positively to any requests for information and no categories are automatically excluded. Each request is considered on its merits.

As you say, MOD files are subject to the provision of the Public Records Act of 1958 and 1967 and remain closed for 30 years after the last action on the file has been taken. We have, however, looked carefully to see whether earlier release of the files containing papers relating to 'UFO' issues might be possible. The Department receives about 400 sighting reports each year and a similar number of letters from members of the public, some of which may also contain sighting reports. The information is filed manually in the form it is received on Branch files and therefore contains the personal details of all those contacting and corresponding with the Department. MOD has a duty to protect this third party confidentiality and the 30-year period is deemed appropriate for this purpose. Before access could be given to the material, staff would need to be diverted from their essential defence-related tasks to retrieve the material from archives, and scrutinise and remove all of the personal information from many thousands of documents. Your request is therefore refused under Exemption 9 of the Code of Practice on Access to Government Information (voluminous or vexatious requests). We would, of course, be happy to look to see

what information might be made available if you have a more specific date in mind as it would require a more focussed effort on a limited amount of material.

I am sorry if any information provided to you by staff in the MOD Press Office has caused a misunderstanding. At the beginning of the year the department received a number of enquiries about the release of, and access to, 'UFO' files for 1969. These files were opened in the Public Record Office in January and it may be that the MOD press officer at the time you made contact was confused on this particular point.

Finally, I should say that if you are unhappy with the decision to refuse your request for access to MOD files and wish to appeal, you should write in the first instance to the Ministry of Defence, DOMD, Room 619, Northumberland House, Northumberland Avenue, London WC2N 5BP requesting that the decision be reviewed. If following the internal review you remain dissatisfied, you can ask your MP to take up the case with the Parliamentary Commissioner for Administration (the Ombudsman) who can investigate on your behalf. The Ombudsman will not, however, consider an investigation until the internal review process has been completed.

Yours sincerely,


Hidden copy
with original
request to OMD 14
concerning 1* level
clearance.

4

MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
SEC (AS) 2
23 JUN 2000
FILE

Dr David Clarke

Section 40



Ministry of Defence
Main Building
Whitehall
London SW1A 2HB

21 June 2000

Dear Sir/Madam,



Freedom of Information – Access to MOD files relating to aerial phenomena

I am undertaking post doctoral research into the socio-psychological aspects of belief in the aerial phenomena popularly known as ‘unidentified flying objects’, as an Honorary Research Fellow at the National Centre for English Cultural Tradition, University of Sheffield.

In particular, I am examining the role played by the mass media in the creation and transmission of beliefs and rumours about UFOs, and how these have been reflected in the Ministry of Defence’s public policy towards this subject from 1950 to the present.

While a certain amount of useful information can be obtained from the study of Press reports, the proceedings of Hansard and the records of private researchers, a study of this kind is reliant upon access to official records such as those available at the Public Record Office.

Currently access to records kept by the MOD relating to UFO phenomena, including those relating to the formulation of official policy, are covered by the Access to Public Records Act, 1967. This has meant that the vast majority of records relating to this subject are made available for public inspection when they are 30 years old. As a result, a number of MOD air files relating to UFO reports and policy issues relating to the period 1953-1969 have already been released and are available for study at the PRO.

However, at present records dating from 1969 to the present day remain closed under the terms of the 1967 Act. Despite this fact, during the past decade the MOD *have* released information relating to UFOs in response to individual requests from the public which, strictly speaking, continue to remain closed under the 30 year rule.

Under the definitions used by the Draft Freedom of Information Act (1999) all Government records – other than those created by the Security and Intelligence Services – should be available for public scrutiny unless it can be demonstrated their disclosure would *clearly cause harm* to “national security, defence and international relations...the internal discussion of Government policy [and/or] personal privacy.”

Since the 1950s, the UK Government’s public position has been that reports of ‘unidentified flying objects’ have *no* implications for defence or national security. As a result, there would appear to be no reason, other than protection of personal privacy, why records maintained on this subject should not be made available for study purposes such as the one I am proposing.

Indeed, in January this year I contacted the RAF Press Office who confirmed that the Ministry of Defence, in response to the published aims of the draft Freedom of Information Bill, were considering a proposal to allow access to UFO related files – currently closed under the 30 year rule – for what were described as “bona fide researchers.” This was on the proviso that any proposed future access did not compromise confidential personal data supplied to the MOD by members of the public and/or endanger national security.

A preliminary examination of the MOD air files on UFOs from 1953-1969 which are available at the PRO has demonstrated their value as a rich source of historical and social data relevant to my proposed study. For example, a Defence Intelligence briefing from 1966-67 released to the Public Record Office last year (DEFE 31/119) demonstrates how MOD staff were aware of the importance of these social and psychological factors, specifically the role played by the mass media, in the wax and wane of interest surrounding UFO reports..

These records have hitherto never been the subject of a properly funded academic research project. The value of such a study to the UK Government, in terms of the development of public policy in future, should also be taken into account when this request is considered. An independent study of this historical material might also help to dispel the popular myth of “secrecy” and “cover-up” which continues to surround the MOD’s public statements on the subject of UFOs.

I am currently in receipt of an award from the British Academy to study the creation and transmission of rumours in the context of popular beliefs which spread through Britain during the First World War, based upon records preserved at the Public Record Office. Later this year I intend to apply to another funding body for an additional award which would allow me to study the development of popular beliefs about UFOs and how these have been reflected by MOD policy from the 1950s to the present. As it stands, the proposed study would have to be based upon the MOD air files which are currently available, and relate to the period 1953-1969.

I wish to make a formal application via the Freedom of Information Unit of the MOD for access to MOD Air files relating to UFOs and UFO policy for the period 1969 to the present day. I would define access as having the opportunity to examine all relevant files relating to UFO reports and UFO policy, making notes and copies of relevant material where necessary. I appreciate a project of this kind could take time and would incur costs, but these could easily be incorporated into my application for a research award.

I would welcome to opportunity to discuss this proposal informally with a representative from the Ministry of the Defence and/or the Freedom of Information Unit and look forward to hearing from you,

Yours Faithfully,

Section 40



Dr D.W. Clarke



From: **Section 40** Secretariat(Air Staff)2a, Room 8245
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
 Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

3 1

Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
 (Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
 (Fax) **Section 40**

Dr D W Clarke
Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
 D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
 4 January 2000

Dear Dr Clarke,

enc 80 64/3 pt R

I wrote to you on 15 December 1999 and apologise for the delay in providing you with a full reply to your letter of 19 November 1999.

Taking each of your points in turn, I can confirm that the RAF Police tasked to investigate the incident concentrated their enquiries on whether a military aircraft had been in the area concerned on the date in question. Once they had established that military activity was not involved they made no further enquiries to determine what might have caused the noise. The MOD is satisfied that on the date in question, there was no threat to the UK Air Defence Region from hostile military activity.

RAF Police reports are classified documents. They contain material gathered as part of a Police investigation and, as such, are confidential to that investigation. The reports themselves are not available for public scrutiny but we are happy to provide a summary of the conclusions reached. I have consulted my colleagues in the Branch who dealt with this particular RAF Police Investigation and, as explained in **Section 40** letter of 1 October 1999, can confirm that no RAF or NATO aircraft were found to be operating in the area at the time. *enc 15 64/3 pt R*

Finally, as I said in my previous letter, I can confirm that MOD received no reports of unidentified aerial phenomena for the period 19:00 hours 24 March 1997 - 01:00 hours 25 March 1997.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Section 40

Can we have some help with the attached please.

Dr Clarke is a persistent 'ufologist'. In his October letter he wanted information about low flying complaints etc for a particular day in March 1997 and an alleged sonic boom on the same day. Section 40 checked with Sec(AS)1a and was able to say that there had been an RAF Police investigation into an alleged sonic boom but found that no RAF or NATO aircraft were operating in the area concerned at the time.

Dr Clarke has asked further questions about the sonic boom. What should we say in response to (1) – that the RAF Police investigation ruled out any military involvement and it was not, therefore, for them to make any further investigations as to the cause? And, what do we say for (2)? For (3), would it be something on the lines of 'RAF Police Reports are classified documents because they contain material gathered as part of a Police investigation and are, therefore, confidential to that investigation'? Finally, I assume there is no other part of MOD involved with sonic booms?

We have acknowledged the letter but would like to send a substantive response before Christmas.

Section 40

15/12/99

As I explained in my last letter, an RAF Police investigation was carried out into the alleged sonic event over Sheffield on 24 March 1997. Although their report is an internal document, its conclusions are made available to the public in the same way as I am doing here.

The RAF Police found that neither a military or a civilian aircraft could have caused the alleged incident on that night. The radar tapes for the area showed a single civilian aircraft landing at Manchester airport.

As far as possible explanations for this incident are concerned, I can only suggest that a sonic boom may have been caused by a satellite or meteor re-entering the earth's atmosphere. We sometimes receive reports of loud explosions, initially thought to have been caused by military aircraft, being generated by industrial operations at steel factories.



From: **Section 40** Secretariat(Air Staff)2a, Room 8245
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

2 80
Section 40

Dr D W Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3 ✓
Date
15 December 1999

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter dated 19th November. Your questions relating to the alleged sonic boom incident on 24 March 1997 have been passed to the relevant branch in MOD and you should receive a response shortly.

With regard to your last question, I can confirm that MOD received no reports of 'UFO' sightings for 24th or 25th March 1997 from anywhere in the UK.

I would like to apologise for the delay in replying.

Yours sincerely

Section 40

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

19 November 1999
Your ref: D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Section 40

**Secretariat (Air Staff) 2a, Room 8245
Ministry of Defence
Whitehall,
London SW1A 2HB**

Dear Section 40

Thankyou for your letter of 1 October and for taking the trouble to answer my questions regarding complaints about low-flying aircraft and sonic booms reported on 24 March 1997.

I realise that you have limited time to deal with enquiries such as mine, and I do appreciate your efforts to provide the answers I am seeking with regards the events of the evening in question. I wonder if I could trouble you once more with a small number of supplementary questions.

1) I note that RAF police did investigate the incident, and that RAF or NATO aircraft were found not to be responsible for the sonic booms recorded by the British Geological Survey in the Sheffield area at 2152 and 2206 GMT on 24 March 1997. This leads me to ask, therefore, if military and civilian causes were ruled out, did the RAF Police reach any other conclusion as to the source or origin of these sonic events?

2) If these booms were not generated by friendly aircraft, then by definition they merit further investigation to determine whether their source, following the MOD's own terminology, posed "any potential threat to UK airspace."

3) Additionally, and in light of the current proposals for Open Government, is the RAF Police report on the incident and/or its conclusions available for public scrutiny?

4) If you are unable to answer specific questions with regard to sonic events such as those reported on 24 March 1997, could you refer me to a relevant branch of the Ministry of Defence who might be able to provide more detailed information?

A final question I would like to ask is this: did the Ministry of Defence receive any reports, whether from a military or civilian source, of unidentified aerial phenomena from any part of the United Kingdom, for the period 7pm on 24 March 1997 to 1 am on 25 March 1997, and if so from which specific location/s?

I do hope you are able to answer these questions, and I look forward to hearing from you.

Many thanks for your assistance in this matter,

Yours Sincerely,

Section 40



Dr David Clarke




From: **Section 40** Secretariat(Air Staff)2a, Room 275
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial)
(Switchboard)
(Fax)

0171-218 2140
0171 218 9000

Section 40



Dr D W Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
1 October 1999

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter regarding complaints about low flying military aircraft and sonic booms. Your letter concerns correspondence between myself and your colleague, **Section 40**

In the letter sent to **Section 40** I advised that the Ministry of Defence had received no complaints about military low flying on 24 March 1997 from Sheffield or the Howden Moors area of the Peak District. You then wrote to me stating that you had found that the MOD received thirteen complaints of military low flying on the date in question. I can confirm that the MOD did indeed receive thirteen complaints for 24 March 1997, however, none of the reports originated from Sheffield or the Peak District. **Section 40** original question asked if there had been any complaints about low flying military aircraft from two specific areas, and my reply was tailored to his question.

On the matter of the alleged sonic boom on 24 March 1997, you are correct in stating that military aircraft may only fly at supersonic speeds over the sea and to fly supersonic overland is in breach of flying regulations. We take reports of sonic booms overland very seriously and you will be reassured to learn that the RAF Police did investigate the incident. Their investigation found that no RAF or NATO aircraft were operating in the area at the time and that civil aircraft in the area were travelling too slow to have generated a sonic boom.

I would like to apologise for the delay in replying.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

SEC(AS)2A1A

From: SEC(AS)1A1
Sent: 01 October 1999 11:32
To: SEC(AS)2A1A
Subject: Sonic Booooooom
Importance: High

D/Sec(AS)/56/1

Section 40

We spoke about the alleged sonic boom over Sheffield on 24 March 1997. A nice little paragraph follows:

"On the matter of the alleged sonic boom on 24 March 1997, you are absolutely correct that military aircraft may only fly at supersonic speeds over the sea and to fly supersonic overland is indeed in breach of flying regulations. We take reports of sonic booms overland very seriously indeed and you will be reassured to learn that the RAF Police did investigate the incident. Their investigation found that no RAF or NATO aircraft were operating in the area at the time and that civil aircraft in the area were travelling too slow to have generated a sonic boom."

Howz that? If you want to refer any further questions Dr Clarke may have on the matter to me (either by phone or by post), please do.

Any probs, give me a ring.

Section 40



From: **Section 40** Secretariat(Air Staff)2a, Room 8245
MINISTRY OF DEFENCE
Main Building, Whitehall, London, SW1A 2HB

Telephone (Direct dial) 0171 218 2140
(Switchboard) 0171 218 9000
(Fax) **Section 40**

Dr D W Clarke

Section 40

Your Reference

Our Reference
D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Date
21 June 1999

Dear Dr Clarke,

Thank you for your letter of 4 May. I apologise for the delay in responding to your letter; I am looking into the matter and will reply when I have the information available.

Yours sincerely,

Section 40

Dr David Clarke

Section 40

4 May 1999

Your ref: D/Sec(AS)/64/3

Dear Section 40

I refer to your letter dated 6 April, in reply to my colleague Section 40 who had written to AS2 asking for information concerning "UFO" and low-flying aircraft incidents reported to the MOD on March 24, 1997, from the Sheffield area.

In your reply you stated that the RAF/MOD had no records of any complaints concerning low-flying aircraft from that particular night.

However, as a result of questions on my behalf by MP Helen Jackson in Parliament on March 25, 1998, Defence Minister John Spellar admitted that the RAF had received 13 complaints concerning low-flying military aircraft from different locations in the UK for March 24, 1997.

Mr Spellar said these complaints stemmed from a pre-booked training exercise in the area of the Peak District involving low-flying RAF aircraft which ended at 2135 hrs.

In addition, the British Geological Survey in Edinburgh have stated that their equipment recorded two sonic booms at 2152 and 2206 hours GMT in the Sheffield area which could only have been caused as a result of aircraft breaching the sound barrier.

The BGS said that RAF Flying Complaints were contacted on March 25, 1997, and "were unable to confirm they were caused by military aircraft."

As a result of the above could you answer the following questions:

Did RAF Military Police or any other department of the MOD conduct an internal inquiry/investigation into the source and/or cause of the two sonic booms recorded on March 24, 1997, given the legal stipulation (Military Flying Regulations) that pilots must not break the speed of sound over land/urban areas?

If an inquiry was launched, what was the conclusion reached concerning the source of the sonic booms?

If no such inquiry was launched, why not given the clear breach of military flying regulations these sonic events constituted?

You may be aware that as a result of reports concerning an "explosion" and sightings of a low-flying aircraft by civilians on the border between the Peak District and Sheffield shortly after 2200 hrs on March 24, police and emergency services launched a 15 hour search and rescue operation, without result.

There has been considerable speculation concerning this event during the past two years, and I hope the MOD will be able to provide a definitive answer to the questions above.

Thankyou for your attention to this matter,

Section 40

Dr D.W. Clarke