

# THE U.F.O. Investigator

FACTS ABOUT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena

Vol. III, No. 8

May-June, 1966

## AF ADMITS FAULTY UFO INVESTIGATION

Outside Scientists To Check Unknowns

The Air Force has admitted to a Congressional committee that it has not properly followed up unexplained UFO reports.

This and other surprising disclosures were made at a closed hearing of the House Armed Services Committee, on April 5, 1966. Midway of the session, Chairman E. Mendel Rivers unexpectedly changed to an open hearing. This automatically put all AF statements and submitted documents on public record, including these admissions:

1. Some UFOs the AF publicly claimed were identified actually are unexplained.

2. The AF hypothesis that all UFOs have ordinary explanations may be an error, causing new scientific information to be overlooked.

3. Six prominent scientists, asked by the AF to review the UFO program, criticized the Air Force for not scientifically exploring unexplained sightings. The panel urged that teams of non-AF scientists fully investigate such cases, with detailed reports to Congress and the public.

At first glance, these admissions might appear to indicate an about-face in AF "explain-away" policy. Instead, AF Secretary Harold Brown and his advisers added the usual debunking claims: No evidence of UFO reality, no witnesses ridiculed, no information withheld.

Two conflicting opinions have resulted. The first: The AF could not be expected to end the secrecy and reveal its hidden conclusions all at once, but that its admissions were a sincere first step. The second, opposing opinion: The admissions, expected to be confined to a closed hearing, were only to ward off a full-scale Congressional investigation; that instead of reducing secrecy, the AF will step up its belittling of competent UFO observers to stop the increasing public criticism.

So that NICAP members can judge for themselves, here are the most significant items in the official record:

Chairman Rivers (to AF Secretary): "We can't just write them [UFOS] off. There are too many responsible people who are concerned."

Secretary Brown, in a prepared statement, said UFOs posed no threat, were not extraterrestrial, and were 90% explained. He then put on record an AF memorandum to the AF Scientific Advisory Board, signed by Maj. Gen. E. B. LeBailly, Director of Information, which said ". . . many of the reports that cannot be explained have come from intelligent and technically well qualified individuals whose integrity cannot be questioned." LeBailly asked for a scientific panel to review Project Blue Book.

The six selected scientists were Dr. Bryan O'Brien, member, National Academy of Sciences; Dr. Robert W. Porter, guided missile and satellite authority; Dr. Carl Sagen, astrophysicist, member NASA planetary atmosphere study group (Dr. Sagen has suggested that advanced races have surveyed the earth periodically, may have established a solar-system base); Dr. Lauris S. Carter, former USAF Chief Scientific Adviser; Mr. Jesse Orlansky, industrial psychologist with the Institute for Defense Analysis. Dr. Willis H. Ware—no data. [Names confirmed separately by NICAP.]

The panel's recommendations: Contracts with universities for scientific teams to investigate unexplained UFO cases promptly—perhaps 100 reports a year; AF investigating officers to work with the teams, and one university or non-profit organization to coordinate this research with Project Blue Book; anything suggesting withholding of UFO information to be deleted from Blue Book reports.

Chairman Rivers asked if anyone in authority alleged that UFOs come from other planets.

Secretary Brown said no one in the AF had said this, as far as he knew. (Col. J. Bryan, III, USAFR, Ret., Lt. Col. Howard Strand, a Base Commander in the Air National Guard, and other AF officers have publicly stated this belief.)

Dr. J. Allen Hynek, AF-UFO Consultant, admitting public concern is growing, said for 20 years he had tried to be open-minded though the UFO subject "seemed utterly ridiculous. . ."

[No. 55]

### UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

#### HEARING

BY

#### COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

OF THE

#### HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

EIGHTY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

APRIL 5, 1966



[Pages of all documents printed in behalf of the activities of the House Committee on Armed Services are numbered cumulatively to permit a comprehensive index at the end of the Congress. Page numbers lower than those in this document refer to other subjects.]

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

50-066 0

WASHINGTON : 1966

# THE UFO INVESTIGATOR

Published by  
The National Investigations Committee  
on Aerial Phenomena  
1536 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036

Copyright, 1966, National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP). All rights reserved, except that up to 300 words may be quoted by press media, providing NICAP is credited.

NICAP Staff: Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe, Director & Editor-in-Chief; Richard H. Hall, Assistant Director & Associate Editor; Gordon Lore, Editorial Assistant; Charles C. Turner, Office Manager; Don Berliner, part-time staff assistant.

## BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Dr. Marcus Bach, author, educator, lecturer, Palos Verdes Estate, Cal.; Rev. Albert Baller, minister, Clinton, Mass.; Col. J. Bryan, III, USAFR, Richmond, Va.; Mr. Frank Edwards, TV-radio commentator, author, lecturer, Indianapolis, Ind.; Col. Robert B. Emerson, USAR, research chemist and physicist, Baton Rouge, La.; Mr. Dewey Fournet, Jr., former AF Intelligence major and Monitor of USAF UFO Project; Mr. J.B. Hartranft, Jr., Pres., Aircraft Owners and Pilots Ass'n., Washington, D.C.; Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, physicist, University of Southern California; Rear Adm. H.B. Knowles, USN, Ret., UFO researcher, Eliot, Maine; Prof. Charles A. Maney, professor emeritus of physics and astronomy, Defiance College, Ohio; Dr. Charles P. Olivier, Pres., American Meteor Society, professor emeritus of astronomy, University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Bruce A. Rogers, research engineer, Texas Engineering Experiment Station, College Station, Texas.

However, he added, in the past "matters of great value to science were overlooked, because the new phenomenon simply did not fit the accepted scientific outlook. . ."

Hynek also said the AF "working hypotheses"—that all UFO reports were errors, hallucinations or hoaxes—had been "very successful" but might be a roadblock to research, for "if one digs too intently for coal he is apt to miss diamonds. . . And in dealing with truly puzzling cases, we have tended either to say that, if an investigation had been pursued long enough, the misidentified object would have been recognized, or that the sighting had no validity to begin with."



Dr. Hynek

Hynek also admitted he had told the AF that Project Blue Book was not fully investigating UFO unknowns: ". . . enough puzzling sightings have been reported by intelligent and often technically competent people to warrant closer attention than Project Blue Book can possibly encompass. . ."

Questioned by Congressman William H. Bates, Mass., Hynek said he knew of no competent scientists who would say UFOs come from outer space. (Several well-known scientists are on record, including Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, biophysicist, Univ. of Calif.)

Congressman Bates put on record extensive evidence in the Exeter, N.H. case, Sept. 3, 1965, sent to him by Raymond E. Fowler, Chairman NICAP Massachusetts Subcommittee, including: Reports by the Exeter police witnesses, a letter by Lt. Col. J. P. Spaulding (an AF spokesman) admitting the Exeter police sightings were unexplained (despite an earlier AF claim), and a letter to the police officers by the Project chief, Major Hector Quintanilla, blaming NICAP for stirring up the Exeter publicity.

After Hynek admitted to Chairman Rivers he could not explain the Exeter case, Congressman Bates asked him about "20 puzzling cases" from above average observers which he had mentioned earlier. Hynek cited a report by two university students and other witnesses who said a UFO with four red lights and one large white light had closely approached their car.

"I questioned these people for some two hours," Hynek stated. "They were very intelligent. . ."

After appearing to accept their report, Hynek reversed himself and rejected it: "Why would they be the only four people to see this? . . . Was this some sort of a strange psychic projection, or something these people were particularly prone to? . . . I find it most difficult to ascribe a physical tangibility that there was an actual craft here. I would rather seek some other scientific explanation."

Congressman Lucien N. Nedzi, Mich., asked if the AF and foreign countries coordinated UFO reports. Secretary Brown said that neither the U.S. nor foreign nations had any scientific UFO information to exchange.

Congressman Nedzi to Hynek: "Has there ever been any evidence in any of these unexplained sightings that would indicate that there is some kind of extraterrestrial intelligence involved?"

Hynek: "I have not seen any evidence to confirm this. . . however, the possibility should be kept open as a possible hypothesis. I don't think we should ever close our minds to it."

Chairman Rivers then put several items on the record, including: (a) A letter from Congressman Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader, protesting the "swamp gas" answer in two Michigan sightings, stating the American people are entitled to better explanations, and naming a retired AF colonel who had seen a UFO and was ready to testify. (b) A syndicated article by Roscoe Drummond, citing NICAP evidence and urging a "more credible and detached appraisal of evidence." (c) Six articles by news correspondent Bulkley S. Griffin, who after long investigation declared the AF was publishing incorrect explanations and withholding facts from the public. (d) A letter to Chairman Rivers by AF Col. D. W. Covell, Congressional Inquiry Division, denying there ever was a Top Secret conclusion that UFOs were interplanetary [this conclusion was confirmed by Capt. E. J. Ruppelt, former Project Blue Book chief]. (e) Two letters to Chairman Rivers from John R. Gray, aerospace engineer, strongly supporting NICAP and criticizing AF secrecy. (f) A LIFE article quoting Maj. Quintanilla as agreeing it is impossible to prove flying saucers do not exist, and that the AF will not give up chasing UFOs. "Imagine," Quintanilla was quoted, "what a great help it would be to get our hands on a ship from another planet and examine its powerplant."

## FLORIDA GOVERNOR SIGHTS UFO

A UFO which paced the Florida chief executive's campaign plane for 40 miles over north Florida April 25 also was witnessed by a group of newsmen and officials. Governor Haydon Burns, a candidate for re-election, confirmed the sighting but declined to discuss it. This apparently was his second UFO sighting; a Miami TV station last fall reported, in a documentary, that Gov. Burns had seen a UFO.

Co-pilot Herb Bates first noticed the UFO as the Convair took off from Orlando headed for Tallahassee (state capital). To him, the object or objects appeared as two bright yellow globes side by side. At about 6000 feet altitude in the vicinity of Ocala, everyone on board had been alerted and watched the UFO pace the plane on the starboard side. Some said the two bright lights were crescent shaped, and a dimmer connecting section or column of light was visible between them. The reddish or yellow-orange lights fluctuated in brightness, but were very distinct.

After several minutes, Governor Burns ordered his pilot to turn toward the UFO. The lights quickly began a steep climb, then disappeared. At this point the Capitol bureau chief for the Tampa Tribune, Duane Bradford, said "the thought occurred to me that this UFO business was somewhat less than funny."

In addition to the newsmen on board, witnesses included the governor's executive assistant, Frank Stockton, and Capt. Nathan Sharron of the State Highway Patrol.

Central Bureau Chief Bill Mansfield of the Miami Herald said the press contingent first learned about it when Governor Burns walked back into the cabin and exclaimed, "We have a UFO out there. I'm going to order the pilot to turn into it." Confirming the description of the UFO, Mansfield added, "Something was out there. Something we all saw clearly. Something that is yet to be explained."

## Prominent Physicist Joins NICAP Panel

Mr. Jamison R. Harrison, prominent consulting engineer on physics and electronics, has just joined NICAP's Panel of Scientific Advisers.

A graduate of Tufts College and Wesleyan University, Mr. Harrison has held many important positions, including: Head of the Physics Department, Franklin Technological Institute, Boston; Head of the Physics and Radio Communication Department, Tufts College, 1936-1947; Director of the U.S. Army Signal Corps research on Piezo-Electricity, 1943-1947; Member of the Research Committee on Underseas Warfare, National Research Council. Mr. Harrison also is a member of several engineering societies, a contributor to engineering journals, and editor of a horticultural magazine. He is a resident of Bedford, Mass.

*Continued from Page 2 Column 2*

Congressman Richard S. Schweiker, Pennsylvania. "...none of the unexplained objects have been sighted on radar?"

Maj. Quintanilla: "We have no radar cases which are unexplained." [Scores of recorded radar and visual-radar cases have never been explained.]

Congressman Schweiker: "Did you have a report [on the Exeter case] filed to you by Major Griffin and Lt. Brant (Pease AFB)?"

Maj. Quintanilla: "Yes, sir, we did."

Congressman Schweiker: "What were their conclusions?"

Maj. Quintanilla: "They couldn't explain it." (At no time did he admit he had told the press the Exeter witnesses were misled by stars or low-flying aircraft, an answer later retracted.)

Congressman Schweiker then asked if the Beaver County UFO photo was explained. Dr. Hynek implied it was a fake, a double exposure. Quintanilla said the photographer, James Lucci, had refused to submit the negative.

Congressman Schweiker: "On what basis? . . . Maybe these people are a little skeptical about turning over negatives without some assurance. . . the newspaper (Beaver County Times) claims they saw the negatives, examined by their photographic experts, and they are authentic."

## Helicopter Pilot Reveals 1960 Sighting

Writing from the battle zone in Viet Nam, an Army helicopter pilot engaged in combat assault mission has revealed a detailed sighting of a UFO in 1960. His name and serial number are on file, but we are withholding his name to protect him from possible reprimand.

While on flying duty at Fort Bragg, N.C., in August 1960, the pilot saw a shiny saucer-shaped object come of storm clouds and approach at low level.

"The object tilted upward at the front, sliding to a graceful halt almost in the same movement as one would observe in a helicopter while making the same maneuver," he told NICAP.

Viewing the UFO almost horizontally at this point, the pilot noticed a dome on top, somewhat taller than is usually depicted in artist's conceptions of "flying saucers." He carefully observed the UFO for about 30 seconds, as it rocked from side to side, apparently only 1/2 mile away. Assuming that distance, he estimated the craft was 35 feet in diameter, with a rounded dome about 10 feet tall. Small markings like portholes were visible on the dome.

"It looked to be made of some highly polished aluminum alloy similar to some of our high speed jets," he said, "and it glittered in the sun shining through the clouds."

Finally the UFO began ascending into the storm, slowly at first, then gradually accelerating, until it had vanished. The pilot reported the sighting to his superiors, but "nothing official was ever written about it."

## Canadian Parliament Member Urges UFO Study

A plea for a new, serious study of Canada's UFO reports was made by a Member of the Canadian House of Commons on April 21, 1966.

The Hon. William Dean Howe, of Ottawa, stated that we are long past the time when all UFO reports can be written off as hallucinations, hoaxes or alcoholic fantasies.

"Most reports," he said, "come from people of good reputations, whose testimony would be accepted without question under any other circumstances. . . . There is too much unexplained evidence to ignore."

Mr. Howe said that Canadians should be free to report sightings "without fear of ridicule." Though Mr. Howe has reached no conclusions regarding the UFOs, he specifically called for the Canadian Government to assign a department to conduct constant investigations of reports.

Immediately afterward, Canada's Associate Minister of National Defence, the Hon. Leo Cadieux, said he would see that an investigation into UFO reports was initiated "at least as far as the Defence Research Board is concerned."

After adjournment, Chairman Rivers was quoted as being satisfied with AF scientific-team proposals, and that his committee had no plans for a full-scale investigation. But several legislators on the committee, along with other Congressmen, have stated they are not satisfied.

Some are convinced there should be a full-scale investigation. Two Congressmen are considering the use of their own scientists to check on reports by competent observers. Requests for NICAP evidence, from both Congressmen and Senators, are increasing, and arrangements are being made for a private briefing by NICAP.

Though most news coverage of the Armed Service Committee session was brief, this hearing actually was an important advance, and not only because of the AF admissions. It was a hint of what can be brought out in a longer Congressional investigation, by the Senate Space or Armed Services Committees or the House Space Committee.

Influential members of all three have asked for NICAP's evidence, in considering UFO hearings.

Meantime, NICAP will closely watch the official handling of future UFO reports. We shall be glad to cooperate if the secrecy and belittling of competent observers is ended—by the AF or a higher agency which may control the UFO policy.

## Editorials Support UFO Inquiry

Strong evidence of public concern about UFOs has been reflected in newspaper editorials across the country during the current wave of UFO sightings. Prominent editorial writers, including syndicated columnist Roscoe Drummond, have called for serious scientific investigation of UFOs.

In two separate articles, one of which outlined NICAP's aims, Drummond urged the scientific community to open its eyes wide to "the large body of conflicting evidence" on UFOs and to investigate "a thorough and objective investigation." He quoted a statement made at a press conference by the Air Force's UFO investigator, Dr. J. Allen Hynek, to the effect that future scientists "may think us very naive in our denials" of the evidence.

"And why not?" Drummond asked. "History is littered with examples of the most eminent scientists who were dead certain that things couldn't be done, that they would never come to pass — and wrote with great displays of scientific evidence to prove that they couldn't be wrong.

"But they were . . ."

The columnist also stated that many scientists have long spoken with confidence of the impossibility of scientific achievements that are "now almost routine."

In a typical editorial urging an end to UFO secrecy, the Houston Chronicle [March 30] stated "it's about time for Congress to hold a public investigation of this mystery." Despite numerous sightings by airline and jet pilots, radar technicians, and other specialists, the editorial continued, "the Air Force is (still) adamant: everybody is imagining things." The Chronicle's editors recognized "the existence of a great deal of public puzzlement which Air Force explanations have been unable to dispel."

A few days after the March 20, 1966, sighting at Dexter, Michigan, The Richmond News Leader [March 23] admonished the Air Force for suppressing "any hard evidence relating to such phenomena" and attempting "to discredit the testimony of witnesses."

The Aurora, Ill., Beacon-News [March 30] called for "full public disclosure" and said, "The time is long overdue for a candid disclosure of findings."

The Dallas Morning News [March 30] commented that a serious UFO investigation "might earn great dividends for this nation."

The Indianapolis News [March 31] while stating that there is no evidence UFOs are extraterrestrial, nevertheless said that a "well-conducted congressional inquiry can help establish the facts and quiet needless public alarm."

While the tone of a Detroit News' editorial on possible Congressional hearings was political and negative on the whole subject of UFOs, a bit farther west in Iowa, the Sioux City Journal [March 31] took quite a different tack. ". . . from our own experience it must be conceded that space travel is possible because we have done it, and that it requires vehicles far better than what we now have, to do all the things in space we would like to do. Although we have no firm evidence of other life in space, that does not mean it isn't there . . ."

Well-known columnist Sidney Harris, in the Detroit Free Press [March 28], expressed the sage view that if there are intelligent extraterrestrials about, they could hardly be expected to make contact with a people who treat each other as we do.

In the Cincinnati Enquirer [April 2], an editorial writer observed, "If there is any substantial evidence that any of the sightings can be attributed to objects either intra- or inter-planetary, the Air Force should reveal it to us. It is man's nature to be curious about that which goes on about him. It is also man's nature to fear the unknown."

A few newspapers, however, still remain openly skeptical. The Chicago Tribune [March 27] placed UFOs in the same class as such springtime frivolities as "water fights" and "panty raids." Apparently disregarding the numerous sightings by competent, trained witnesses, the paper stated that "surely members of Congress have something better to do than to listen to a parade of credulous believers and hardshell skeptics utter their inconclusive ideas about UFOs."

The New York Times [March 23] pooh-poohed the entire subject, implying that scientists did not take it seriously. The edi-

## CASE BOOK

(Note: Case Book is a special feature which will report older UFO cases showing important patterns, correlations or other special features, for the record. Often we obtain full details of substantial cases months or years after they occur. They are no longer current "news," but they are important as evidence. When space permits, significant cases will be printed in future issues regardless of when they occurred).

### Pilot Observes Maneuvering UFO

A former Air Force pilot sighted a UFO May 18, 1964, adding to the long list of reports from experienced aerial observers (See Section V, "The UFO Evidence.")

Robert L. Smith, Jr., currently employed as a Project Administrative Engineer for Sylvania in Waltham, Mass., is also a rated U.S. Army Aviator and a member of the Mass. National Guard. About 10:15 p.m. he was checking the tie-down ropes of a National Guard aircraft at Lawrence Airport, Mass., when he saw a fast-moving light in the distance at low elevation. Thinking it was an aircraft landing light, he did not pay much attention at first. But when the light turned 360 degrees without the intensity or relative size changing, he realized it was not an airplane.

The UFO approached from the NNW at about 200-300 m.p.h. It was a yellow-white pulsating high intensity light about four times the apparent size of Venus. The UFO once passed behind some radio towers five miles away, indicating it was a very large or very brilliant object. After completing its turn, the UFO accelerated to an estimated speed of over 1000 m.p.h. Smith and others at the airport kept it in sight for 8-10 minutes.

In a signed report to NICAP, obtained by Member Raymond E. Fowler, Smith said, "I have used meteorological balloons obtaining weather data for both aviation and artillery gunnery purposes. This was not a Rawinsonde balloon."

Venus was also visible in the sky, setting about 11:15 p.m. It was not the UFO, which circled across about 20 degrees of sky at an elevation of about 10 degrees above the horizon within 10 minutes.

### DISC CHASES JETS

On the afternoon of Oct. 11, 1964, a large disc pursuing two jet aircraft was seen near Brockton, Mass. The three witnesses included David Hanson, a mechanical engineer, who was convinced the UFO was a controlled craft.

During interviews by the Massachusetts-NICAP Subcommittee, the observers gave the following details:

The sighting occurred about 4 p.m., EDT. The two jets were approaching from the north, at an estimated altitude of 30,000 feet, leaving contrails. The disc was seen to close rapidly behind the jets, its apparent size considerably larger than the two aircraft. A bright point of reflected light near its center was noted when it made a turn.

At a point close behind the jets, the UFO slowed and descended toward Brockton. (There was no indication that the pilots saw the disc.) After leveling off briefly, the UFO flew toward the south, then climbed vertically, vanishing from sight in one to two seconds.

### SATURN-SHAPED UFO

A Saturn-shaped UFO hovered near a drive-in theater in Yuma, Arizona during April 1952. (See Type 3 UFO, "The UFO Evidence," p. 144). The object was illuminated top and bottom by a reddish-yellow light emanating from a central ring. After hovering in plain sight for about a minute, the UFO changed color and sped away.

Miss Sally Ann Diggs (now Mrs. Robert L. Tench) and her escort, an Air Force pilot, were watching a movie at the drive-in

*Continued on Page 5*

torial was answered effectively by a research associate at Princeton in a subsequent letter to the editor.

But the trend is definitely against the skeptics. As indicated by the editorials cited above and numerous others, the press has finally become convinced that there is enough reliable evidence to warrant serious investigation of the continuing mystery.

## What One Member Can Do

To show how much one NICAP member can accomplish, consider the efforts of John Laval, Matawan, N.J. For months, Mr. Laval has written "Letters to Editors" to scores of papers here and abroad, telling about our investigation and publicizing "THE UFO EVIDENCE" Report. As a result, we have heard from hundreds of persons—some requesting information, some ordering the Report, some joining NICAP. In addition, Mr. Laval has conducted surveys of embassies, police forces and other agencies to test their attitude toward the UFO subject. Many interesting facts and leads developed from the response. Needless to say, we deeply appreciate the time, money and effort Member Laval has given to this project.

There are other members to whom we are equally grateful, who are working hard, single-handed or with groups, to help keep our investigations going, and make them successful. Unfortunately, they represent only a very small percent of the membership.

We'll admit it's easy, when you're asked for a little extra assistance, to say "Let George do it." But there aren't enough "Georges" in NICAP... If you'd like to be a substitute, we can certainly use your help.

## NEW UFO BOOK

A new book on UFOs, "Flying Saucers — Serious Business," by Frank Edwards, will be published in June or July by Lyle Stuart, N.Y. The 375-page book (40 pages of illustrations) will sell for \$6.00. Besides his regular broadcasts, Mr. Edwards also will have a five-minute syndicated radio program on UFOs. (Watch for local listings.)

Saturday Review columnist John Fuller's book, "Incident at Exeter," based on the 1965 Exeter, N.H., sightings, will be published in the fall by G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Membership in NICAP, including six copies of The UFO Investigator and a NICAP membership card, is \$5.00.

*Continued from Page 4 Column 2*

theater on the outskirts of the city in the direction of Yuma Air Force Base. It was a calm, hot evening with a cloudless sky. The time was about 9:00 p.m.

As she stepped out of the car midway of the first feature, Miss Diggs noticed a bright light in the sky to the right of the screen. Then she saw that it was a brightly illuminated Saturn-shaped object, seemingly nearby. She called to her escort, who got out of the car and observed the UFO.

"The shape was that of two gently sloping bowls, each with rims to the other and bottoms circular and flat... the center rim or ring housed the yellow and rose red pastel lights which completely bathed the object in light," Mrs. Tench told NICAP. As they watched it, the object's lights became pale green. Then it "moved steadily and smoothly up and down twice" and flew away rapidly.

Startled by the experience, the couple left the theater and returned to Miss Digg's motel where her family was staying prior to finding a house. Her father, an Air Force Colonel, was on orders to take over as Commanding Officer of the Yuma Air Force Base. Colonel Diggs phoned the base and an Air Force Captain came to interview the witnesses.

NICAP contacted Colonel Diggs, now retired, who recalled that "the sighting appeared to have caused quite a stir among those present at the drive-in theater at the time." Colonel Diggs said the date was approximately April 16 or 17, 1952.

The report was obtained for the Bay Area NICAP Subcommittee by NICAP member Don Beerman, San Jose, California. Mrs. Tench now resides in Newark, California.

## Col. Joseph Bryan

Col. Joseph Bryan, Member of the NICAP Board of Governors, has had a distinguished career in three fields—as an Air Force officer, editor and author.

During his military service, he was a Special Assistant to the Secretary of the Air Force (1952-3), and later had several assignments on the staff of General Lauris Norstad, at NATO. Colonel Bryan has the Air Medal with two gold stars.

Books by Colonel Bryan include "Mission Beyond Darkness," written with P. Reed (1945), and "Admiral Halsey's Story," written with Adm. Halsey in 1947.



Born at Richmond, Va., Bryan graduated from Princeton in 1927. From 1928 to 1931, he was a reporter for the Richmond News Leader, then the Chicago Journal. Afterward he became Managing Editor of PARADE, Managing Editor of TOWN AND COUNTRY, and an Associate Editor of the SATURDAY EVENING POST. In 1940 he became a free-lance writer for the POST, READERS DIGEST, LIFE, HOLIDAY and other leading magazines.

After he became a NICAP Board Member, Col. Bryan put the following statement on record:

Dear Major Keyhoe:

I am aware that hundreds of military and airline pilots, airport personnel, astronomers, missile trackers and other competent observers have reported sightings of UFOs (Unidentified Flying Objects). I am also aware that many of these UFOs have been observed maneuvering in formation, and that many were tracked by radar simultaneously. It is my opinion that:

The UFOs reported by competent observers are devices under intelligent control.

Their speeds, maneuvers and other technical evidence prove them superior to any aircraft or space devices now produced on earth.

These UFOs are interplanetary devices systematically observing the earth, either manned or under remote control, or both.

Information on UFOs, including sighting reports, has been and is still being officially withheld. This policy is dangerous, especially since mistaken identification of UFOs as a secret Russian attack might accidentally set off war. Unless the policy is changed, a Congressional investigation should be held to reduce or eliminate this and other dangers.

Very truly yours,

(Signed) J. Bryan, III  
Colonel, USAFR (Ret.)

## NICAP OPERATION COSTS

In talking with a group of members recently, we found that very few realized what it costs to operate NICAP. Also, most of them thought—as we did at first—that the membership increase from nationwide publicity would end our financial troubles, giving us funds for the extra staff workers we so badly need.

We still hope this will happen. But temporarily, at least, added costs still exceed our increased income. Answering the flood of mail requires a huge amount of postage, plus extra printing costs for NICAP literature, forms and envelopes. Phone bills (three trunk lines) have tripled—long distance calls to arrange press and broadcast coverage, for investigations of important sightings, etc.

Costs Per Month	
Postage (not including UFO Investigator mailing)	\$1750.00
Printing of envelopes, literature, letterheads, etc.	385.00
Rent of stamp meter	45.00
Rent of offices (increased help, overflow of files, etc. forced us to lease added space)	390.00
Telephone bills, three lines, frequent long distance calls	210.00
UFO Investigator: Set-up on Justwriter; make-up; printing, stuffing, and mailing including postage, \$1990 per issue. Pro-rated per month (The issue is sent first-class because third-class mailing has repeatedly resulted in hundreds of losses or long-delayed arrivals)	995.00
Pro-rated taxes: FICA and property taxes, per month	180.00
Expenses for investigations, publicity trips	210.00
Office supplies	65.00
Janitor cleaning supplies	10.00
Pay for six regular staff members, one part-time, one part-time janitor	2665.00
Monthly average, past two months	6620.00
Unusual expenses in past two months:	
Press conference at National Press Club, Washington, resulting in nationwide coverage: Charges by Press Club	220.00
Expenses of Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, Board Member, to present scientific information (round trip from Los Angeles, and expenses in Washington)	354.50
Purchase of work tables, chairs, two typewriters for additional workers	435.00
Total unusual expenses	\$1009.50
Pro-rated per month	\$ 504.75

Even ignoring the "unusual expenses," the monthly rate of \$6620.00, if this kept up, would equal \$79,840 per year. NICAP membership is approaching 9000. Even if we have 100% renewals, added 1000 more members this year, and sold 1000 copies of *THE UFO EVIDENCE*, (some at the reduced combination price) we would still be about \$25,000 in the red.

Obviously, we cannot continue at the present rate of outgo without a large increase in members. We expect a sizable increase from the literature already mailed. Nationwide publicity set for the near future will bring another flood of queries and should net us still more members.

If each NICAP member would try hard to get us new members, we would not only be able to cover all necessary costs but secure at least a few urgently needed staff assistants.

At present, we cannot even meet average Washington pay scales. (We have just lost our office manager, who resigned to take a much better paying position). The lowest-grade typist in the Pentagon gets more than we can offer an experienced stenographer or file clerk. Most employees and executives in organizations comparable to NICAP get double or triple our salaries.

This is not a complaint; no one forces us to stay on this demanding job. But it would be a big help if we had enough people to handle all urgent projects. We'll be grateful for your support.

## MEMBER HELP

Several members with special skills have offered us their services, directly or through nearest subcommittees. We are now preparing to utilize these offers, and we would greatly appreciate hearing from other members with special training or experience—as, for instance, in investigations, analyses, publicity, etc.

Consultants in scientific and technical fields could be of great help; also communications specialists, library and research experts; detectives (for special investigations); artists; legislators, pilots and other aviation experts.

If you wish to offer such services, please submit the necessary information on a 3 x 5 file card for easy handling. In the upper left corner, please list the service offered (artwork, clerical, chemical analysis, radar analysis, investigations (through a NICAP Subcommittee), etc. In the upper right corner, please name your state, with your name, address, telephone number below. At the bottom, you can add whatever additional information you think necessary.

We are grateful to all the members who have asked how they can help promote the UFO investigation.

## EARTH LAWS AND SPACEMAN

*Because of the increasingly close encounters and reported shootings at UFOs, we believe the following statements from an earlier issue are very timely.*

According to a Justice Department spokesman, space men probably would not be protected by earth laws unless they were human in form. The statement was made by Assistant Attorney General Norbert A. Schlei, Office of Legal Counsel, replying to this hypothetical question from NICAP member Larry M. Bryant:

"If a human being killed a space man, in a moment of panic and fear, would this be murder? Or could the person defend his action on the legal ground that he had not committed homicide since the being was not 'human'?"

On July 11, 1963, Assistant Attorney General Schlei answered as follows:

"This is in reply to your letter. . . asking whether private citizens would be criminally liable if, alarmed in the presence of a vehicle of extra-terrestrial origin, they were to make an unprovoked attack killing the hominoid members of its crew."

Emphasizing that the Department of Justice could give legal opinions only to the President and heads of Government departments, Mr. Schlei added:

"However, as a matter of information, it does not seem likely that present criminal laws against homicide would play a primary role in restraining attacks by excited citizens if the situation you describe were to arise. Since criminal laws are usually construed strictly, it is doubtful that laws against homicide would apply to the killing of intelligent, man-like creatures alien to this planet, unless such creatures were members of the human species. Whether killing these creatures would violate other criminal laws — for instance, the laws against cruelty to animals or disorderly conduct — would ordinarily depend on the laws of the particular state in which the killing occurred. If further laws were to prove necessary, they could be enacted, but until it is clearer what problems of safety, health or commerce such creatures might bring, there is little basis for describing the kinds of laws which might prove appropriate."

Replying to the same question, Professor James P. Whyte, School of Law, College of William and Mary, agreed with Assistant Attorney General Schlei.

Assuming for discussion that UFO's are occupied, he said, the question is whether they are occupied by human beings sufficiently similar to "homo sapiens."

"The intelligence of these occupants might or might not be a factor," said Professor Whyte. "It is just as much homicide to kill an idiot as it is to kill a genius."

NICAP: It is interesting to note that this hypothetical question, which a decade ago probably would have been ignored or treated as a joke, was considered seriously by the Department of Justice and a distinguished professor of law.

## The Gallup Poll

# Five Million Say They've Seen Saucers

More than five million Americans claim to have seen something they believed to be a "flying saucer." And, about 10 times as many people—or nearly half of the U.S. adult civilian population—believe that these frequently reported flying objects, while not necessarily "saucers," are real and not just a figment of the imagination.

More than 150 Gallup Poll interviewers have been out questioning typical Americans—men and women, people of all ages in all educational levels and in every region of the nation. Tabulation of their statements and views reveals the following:

**FIRST**, almost everyone (96 per cent) has at least heard or read something about flying saucers. For something so highly publicized as these objects, this finding may, at first, not seem unusual.

However, in terms of the history of the public's awareness of other incidents or events, this figure is extraordinarily high.

In fact, this awareness score is one of the highest in the 30-year history of the Gallup Poll.

Further analysis of these data show that flying saucer sightings are not necessarily a phenomenon of certain population groups. Similar proportions of college educated persons, and those who have not gone beyond grade school claim to have seen them.

**ARE** flying saucers real or imaginary? We asked this question, with surprising results.

Although the Air Force claims that nearly all of the reported "saucer" sightings are easily explained, as meteors, weather balloons, swamp gasses, planets,



"PEOPLE IN THEIR CUPS OFTEN SEE SAUCERS"

etc., more Americans think they are "real" than believe they are "imaginary."

Forty-six per cent (or about half of the U.S. adult population) hold this opinion, while 29 per cent describe them as "a figment of the imagination." The rest cannot make up their minds.

**THIS REPRESENTS** quite a change in public attitudes toward the credibility of "flying saucers" since a Gallup survey conducted almost 20 years ago.

At that time—shortly after the flying saucers were first noted—four out of every ten called the saucers either a hoax or the product of some overheated imagination.

In 1950, another Gallup survey showed that attitudes had begun to change. More persons that year held the view that the saucers were a reality.

**IN WEIGHING** what evidence there is about the credibility of flying saucers it is important to note that while most of the reported sightings have been explained, according to Air Force reports, there are still many sightings without explanation.

Persons with college training are more likely to believe in the reality of flying saucers than are persons with a high school background, or less.

Among those persons who believe flying saucers have an explanation, (that is, those who think they are "real"), here is how they describe them:

- (1) Experimental projects, Air Force tests
- (2) Actual vehicles, from outer space
- (3) Burning gas, "swamp gas"
- (4) Meteors, shooting stars
- (5) Weather balloons
- (6) Supernatural revelations

Those who believe they are from outer space account for 6 per cent.

## CLOSE APPROACHES FRIGHEN OBSERVERS

Shortly before midnight on April 18, 1966, a Lancaster, Ohio, motorist almost struck a UFO which had landed on a highway. The report, by Paul Friend, is being evaluated by NICAP.

Friend was driving at high speed when he sighted the brightly lighted UFO, directly in front of him. He slammed on his brakes, passed within 20-30 feet of the object, almost blinded by several brilliant white lights. As he went by, he also noticed a number of intense red lights.

Still thinking it might be some kind of car, Friend turned around and headed back toward the device. When he got about 150 feet away, the UFO pivoted and took off through a cornfield, briefly illuminating some trees. Then the lights blinked off and he did not see the object again.

The witness was careful to point out that he could see no distinct shape or body; he experienced no interference with radio or ignition; nor did he hear any sound from the UFO.

Next morning, Friend discovered, his eyes were extremely bloodshot and sore. Although he is the manager of Fairfield Opticians, Lancaster, he did not indicate that any special eye examination was conducted to determine the nature of the irritation.

### Domed Craft

A UFO with a transparent bubble-type dome was reported maneuvering over Dorchester, Mass., April 24, by a woman

resident and her daughter. According to Mrs. Jeanne Kalnicki and her daughter, the object was seen at a low altitude about 10:30 p.m. It was described as having blinking red lights around the edge of what they assumed to be the main body. It had a bubble-like dome, with a bright yellowish light on top, which flashed alternately with the red lights. When the top light went out, the sky could be seen through the dome top, despite a glow from within.

As the UFO moved between the Kalnickis' apartment and a neighboring one, the witnesses could hear a low humming sound. The object headed toward the ocean and went out of sight, but several hours later Mrs. Kalnicki's daughter saw the same UFO or a similar one hovering near the apartment.

As in the other sighting, it had a yellow light on top; below it was a silver-gray disc encircled by red lights on spokes or shafts. When the yellow light went off, the dome glow and red lights appeared.

The UFO oscillated back and forth, slowly, then faster. Then according to Miss Kalnicki's report, there was a thud or bang which rattled the windows. All the house lights went out. Later, the power company explained that the entire area had been blacked out briefly, because of a burned cable.

Before this UFO disappeared, it was also seen by Mrs. Kalnicki and her son, and two neighbors. It appeared as a glowing elongated object as it receded. (Case investigated by Walter N. Webb, special NICAP investigator.)

*Continued on Page 8*

## COLUMNISTS HIT CBS DOCUMENTARY

The strongly slanted CBS "documentary" of May 10, 1966, fell far short of its obvious intent—to demolish UFOs—according to numerous press comments. One of the sharpest comes from Bob MacKenzie, of the Oakland, Calif., Tribune. In his May 12 column, MacKenzie said:

"CBS Reports" stacked the deck against flying saucers Tuesday night. The special was titled "Flying Saucers: Friend, Foe or Fantasy?" but it was clear the CBS News had already decided: saucers were figments.

MacKenzie made it clear he is no "believer," but he objects to such a *distorted report*: "CBS" pretense of being objective was transparent and pretty annoying. Walter Cronkite's patronizing smile was two shades this side of a sneer, and the filmed evidence seemed rather carefully hand-picked to foster the "fantasy" point of view.

"CBS interviewed, primarily, two kinds of people; educated experts who do not believe in UFOs, and a motley assortment of juveniles, farmers and crackpots who do believe in them. . . . Military personnel, commercial pilots, law enforcement officers and radar trackers have reported sightings. Why weren't some of these credible observers interviewed?"

"CBS showed three films of saucers in flight. Two were obviously fakes; one resulted from an optical illusion. But there are films in existence showing UFOs flying in formation that still have not been satisfactorily explained away. These films were undoubtedly available to CBS, which smugly declined to show them. . . ."

"I simply feel that 650 unexplained sightings is a lot of unexplained sightings, enough to make a sensible person suspect that there may be something up there. I believe that the average person knows marsh gas from molasses, and that there is no reason to classify all saucer-sighters as fibbers and fools, particularly if they have technical knowledge to back up their judgment.

"CBS interviewed a selection of the quacks and characters who infest the saucer movement . . . including a lady who takes regular trips to Venus. CBS may have felt there was some entertainment value in displaying these gifted folk, but their relevance to the controversy was questionable, to say the least."

"The other side of the case got some attention. Donald Keyhoe, a retired Marine major in apparent control of his mental faculties, stated his belief that 'we are being observed by a highly advanced civilization' . . . . But the pilots and other knowledgeable witnesses who have seen UFOs were significantly absent . . . . CBS did not knock itself out to keep an open mind."

From the number of similar comments by newsmen and broadcasters, the CBS program, apparently under AF guidance if not control, may increase the number of citizens who reject the official explanations.

*Continued from Page 7 Column 2*

Two police officers and several residents of Beverly, Mass., observed a low-flying UFO on the night of April 22, 1966. The device, oval-shaped and flashing vari-colored lights, was first seen by Nancy Modugno, then by her parents and several neighbors.

Three of the adults went to a nearby school yard for a better view, where they saw three brightly lighted objects alternately circling and hovering.

One of the UFOs came toward the group, frightening an observer as it stopped about 20 feet above her. The two police officers, summoned to the scene, also observed the single device as it circled the school, then disappeared in the distance. (Case investigated by Raymond Fowler, chairman of NICAP's Massachusetts Subcommittee.)

NICAP added comments on the CBS program:

Viewers without knowledge of the background of UFOs were left with the definite impression that no UFO had ever been tracked on radar, and that the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory—during satellite trackings—had never photographed a UFO.

Numerous official radar trackings are on record; beginning on page 76 of *The UFO Evidence* is a specific list of radar cases, most from USAF units or jet interceptor radar. Following the April 5 hearings, NICAP Adviser William H. Hall—with many years experience in general electronics and radar, including F-89 and F-94 systems—wrote to the Secretary of the Air Force challenging the statement that all radar cases had been explained. He knew that the "lock-on" cases were especially significant.

Hall submitted a long list of radar cases and asked for specific explanations for them. In its reply, the USAF disclaimed knowledge of nearly half the listed cases—most of which were originally taken from Air Force intelligence reports. For the others, off-the-cuff explanations were given; impossible to evaluate, but often unbelievable on the face of it.

In general, the official explanations for radar sightings have been no more valid than the explanations for good visual sightings. (See Ravenna, Ohio report).

The Christian Science Monitor reported May 3 that the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory said "its lower-power tracking telescopes pick up hundreds of unidentified objects." Most of these they "regrettably" had no time to check out. In 1963, NICAP was given a few photographs taken by the SAO Nunn-Baker cameras, showing trails or objects which did not coincide with known satellites. The source was A. B. Ledwith, former member of the satellite tracking program, who had carefully checked the reports against known objects.

One of the photographs is reproduced on page 181 of *The UFO Evidence*. As stated in the associated story, the analysts, busy on their assigned tasks, often have tended to rationalize away any data which does not tie in directly with their work or which has no obvious explanation. A radar blip which is not of a known object "must be" due to faulty radar; a light or trail on a photograph "must be" a freak of the camera. All that the official claims really prove is the lack of coordinated effort to study UFOs as a phenomenon. If SAO were tied into a net studying UFO reports, then an unusual object caught on film would be cause for initiating some checks with other facilities: Did observers in a nearby airport tower see anything? Did radar sets in the area track anything? Instead, data of potential significance is never properly analyzed.

### BULLETIN

At press time reports on low-level UFO encounters still are coming in, mostly from the northeast U.S., but also from other scattered locations here and abroad.

A detailed close-range sighting by an experienced observer just 30 miles from the Texas LBJ ranch, April 24, has been reported to NICAP. Tom M. Lasseter, an Architect in Austin and a Lt. Cmdr. in the Navy Reserve, while camping along the Pedernales River with his 11 year old daughter, was awakened about 3:30 a.m. by a fluttering sound like "a covey of quail." A disc-like device glowing white, with a row of lights or ports around the rim was hovering at tree-top height. Lasseter and his daughter watched the UFO closely for about a minute, submitting separate sketches to NICAP.

The UFO was rotating counter-clockwise. At about one second intervals, a blue light like an arc welder's torch pulsed around the rim. To Lasseter's daughter Carrie, it appeared that there was a double row of small ports around the center emitting white light. The UFO then gradually picked up speed, to an estimated 80-100 m.p.h., and disappeared beyond an embankment or into the low cloud cover in a southwesterly direction.

Based on the low clouds and angles of observation, Lasseter estimated that the UFO was only about 150-200 feet from him; he computed the diameter to be about 20 feet. The weather was calm, following thunderstorms earlier in the evening. Lasseter reported the observation to Bergstrom Field.