

FACTS ABOUT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena

Vol. IV, No. 5

March, 1968

HYPNOTIZED POLICEMAN REPORTS ENCOUNTER

The first UFO witness to be hypnotized under the auspices of the Colorado Project has reportedly described — while under hypnosis — a fantastic sighting said to involve an extraterrestrial being, communication with this "saucer" occupant, and a paralyzing light beam. The sessions were held on Feb. 14 and 15.

Police Officer Herbert Schirmer (see recent sightings story, this issue) of Ashland, Nebraska, was placed under hypnosis by Dr. Leo R. Sprinkle, psychologist at the University of Wyoming, who is a NICAP member.

The Colorado Project has confirmed that the patrolman was brought to the UFO Study Group at Boulder and hypnotized to recount his story. No conclusions have been released by the Project, but a detailed story was given the Omaha World-Herald by a police officer who was present during the sessions.

During hypnosis, Schirmer told Dr. Sprinkle and the Project officials he saw the object at 2:30 a.m., Dec. 3, 1967, as it hovered close to a road.

Schirmer's Story

"I tried to radio in. . .," the policeman stated. "I had one hand on the mike and the other on my gun. . . but the beam of light that came from the underside of the object kept me from doing anything."

According to notes taken by Ashland Police Chief William Wlaschin, during the hypnotic experiment, Schirmer said that as the beam flooded his cruiser with light, a small human form, four or five feet tall, came from beneath the craft and approached him. He also said that the figure "in some manner" communicated with him. There were also other beings aboard the craft, Schirmer stated while in a deep trance.

"They are not from any planet we are familiar with. . .," Schirmer reported during the hypnotic session. "They came from a neighboring galaxy. . . though they have bases on Jupiter and Mars. . . They told me that this was the first of three meetings I would have with them. . . The next two are supposed to come about before the end of 1968."

Schirmer also said the UFO "was operated against gravity" and was extracting electricity from a nearby power line to set up a force field that "could stop anything from interfering with them at this time."

Investigation Continuing

NICAP is investigating this case as thoroughly as possible. We hope to obtain a full account of the hypnotic experiments, even though the Colorado conclusions probably cannot be released until Dr. Condon's final public report.

As explained elsewhere in this issue, it is NICAP's position that any alleged "contact" case must be fully authenticated before we can accept it as true. Otherwise, we would be criticized — and rightly — as departing from our long-standing policy of careful, factual investigation. So far, we know of no contact case which has met the test. Most of the alleged witnesses have been obviously unreliable or unstable. There have been a few exceptions, mainly in so-called "encounter" cases (no communication claimed) where witnesses of good reputation have reported seeing supposedly extraterrestrial beings near or aboard UFOs. Even here, honest errors of identification are quite possible. We know of no case proved beyond all reasonable doubt, though we feel that a distinction should be made between such reported "encounters" and the majority of unacceptable "contactee" tales.

NEW CLOSE-UPS, PACINGS

New sightings of UFOs which maneuvered or hovered at low altitudes, paced vehicles and shot out beams of light have been reported in the U.S. and other countries during recent months.

Witnesses included a Civil Air Patrol colonel and numerous police officers.

A rash of sightings came out of the Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, area on January 12 and 13, 1968. All cases are being investigated by NICAP's Pennsylvania Subcommittee No. 4.

During the early morning hours of January 12, Colonel Robert Willingham, of the Civil Air Patrol, a member of the Subcommittee, was alerted by Chairman George Cook to a UFO seen by a police dispatcher near Camp Hill.

Glowing Object

Col. Willingham sighted the orange-and-white glowing object at an altitude of not more than 150 feet, as it traveled toward North Mountain. The UFO appeared to be between 30 and 40 feet in diameter. The former jet pilot followed the object by car until it disappeared behind trees in the mountain section.

At 9:30 p.m. the same day, Mrs. Gertrude Purdue, of Summerdale, and other citizens sighted a "very large red-orange ball as bright as the sun" hovering at tree-top level. It moved slowly with an up-and-down motion only 30 or 40 feet above the rooftops. After the UFO "turned off" its red-orange light, three or four blinking lights appeared. When the object moved away it made a distinct high-pitched whine and left a small vapor cloud.

An hour later, the Reverend Richard Morris, of Bowmansdale, Pa., also a Subcommittee member, sighted a white object with "rugged edges." The UFO appeared to be 40 or 60 feet in diameter and hovered some 1,000 feet above the ground.

"The white light expanded and stretched itself out," the report stated, "then gave the very distinct impression of exploding." There was no noise.

At this point, the minister and his wife witnessed six smaller pulsating red lights circling around the main light source. Then the large white object faded out and the red lights disappeared behind trees.

"Pancake-Shaped"

Also on Jan. 12th, two Carlisle, Pa., nurses, Mrs. Gladys Lehman and Mrs. Charles Little, were paced by a 30-foot "pancake-shaped" object. After pacing them on the right side for two miles, the UFO then swerved in front of the car and remained there, flying just above the road for another two miles before turning away.

The following morning, at 6:30, the same nurses and 17 other employees of the Cumberland County Nursing Home reported a white UFO which changed color to red, red-orange and back to white.

The witnesses reported seeing "what definitely appeared to be a door opening." The large white object, which they estimated to be 40 to 50 feet round, emitted five small red objects which spaced themselves evenly on a 45-degree downward slant and fell behind trees. The large object discharged five white objects before it disappeared.

The Harrisburg area was once again the site of a UFO incident at 9:15 p.m., January 20, as four policemen in two patrol cars gave chase to a round whitish-orange object which glowed "like a dull fluorescent light tube."

The cars converged on the object from different directions after a five-minute chase. The UFO, at an approximate altitude of 200 feet, flew south and disappeared behind a hill.

(Continued on Page 3)

THE **UFO INVESTIGATOR**

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

Copyright, 1968, National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP)®. All rights reserved, except that up to 300 words may be quoted by daily and weekly newspapers, news-wire services and news broadcasters, provided NICAP® is credited. No material may be reprinted by any book or magazine publishers without written permission from NICAP®. NICAP Editors: Maj. Donald E. Keyhoe, Director, and Gordon I. R. Lore, Jr., Assistant Director.
Trademark "NICAP" Registered

The copyright restrictions indicated above have been forced on us because of: 1. Distorted and out-of-context quotations by editors of sensational news-stand magazines or publishers of several small UFO bulletins who imply NICAP support for their wild claims; 2. Writers of books, magazine articles and UFO-publication items who reprint original NICAP material without credit, for direct profit or to build up the circulation of questionable UFO bulletins. NICAP will continue to cooperate with reputable publishers and writers as much as our facilities permit. Requests for special permission to quote our copyrighted material should be submitted in writing.

THE CONTACTEE PROBLEM

From the beginning of NICAP, we have been urged by small but vociferous groups to accept some contactee claims—or at least to say that some seem to be true. In the last two years, this criticism has increased, though more than 99% of our members continue to back our conservative policy of insisting on proof of such claims before even partial acceptance.

One recently publicized case we were urged to take on trust involved a young Texas farmer named Carroll Wayne Watts, frequently described in news stories as a "pillar of the community." In 1967, Watts publicly reported meetings with gray-clad Martians, hairless beings with eye-sockets extending around to their ears. Watts also reported a trip in the Martians' spacecraft, a physical examination in the nude and being knocked senseless when he tried to snatch a metal object as proof of being aboard. He also claimed conversations by mental telepathy or ESP, in which the Martians told him about their world and invited him to fly back with them.

On Feb. 25, 1968, Watts was given a lie-detector test, arranged by the Houston Post. As reported in a nationwide AP story, Watts broke down and confessed his stories were false—the alleged result of hypnosis by an unnamed con man.

If we had yielded to pressures to accept publicly this wild claim, NICAP's hard-won prestige would have vanished. Official and self-appointed private debunkers would have had a field day tearing us down—and we would have deserved it.

Pink-Haired Martians

Another contactee claim, by a man calling himself Mel Noel, described meeting and flying with pink-haired, platinum-skinned, fish-eating Martians said to be running a Mars-Earth transportation system to introduce Earthlings to Martians. There are scores of even wilder stories.

NICAP has been accused of having a "hard line"—refusing even to look at any contact claims. This is simply untrue. We do not deny that contacts may have been made. We do deny ever having found proof in any reports and we have investigated a large number.

One NICAP Board member, some time ago, visited and interviewed several well-known contactees. He is a man of unusual kindness and long conversations were held without friction. The Board member told NICAP's director that some of the contactees seemed to believe their oft-told stories. "I

actually feel sorry for them," he said. "But I still cannot accept their claims."

This thorny problem has been spotlighted by several letters criticizing our review of "Flying Saucer Occupants," by Carol and Jim Lorenzon, heads of APRO, the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization. Some of the thirty-odd letters seemed to take the review as a personal attack.

Few people know that from the early 50's until 1957 Coral Lorenzon and Major Keyhoe were on excellent terms, in agreement about the UFO situation. In his 1953 book, "Flying Saucers from Outer Space," Maj. Keyhoe favorably reported Mrs. Lorenzon's stand and listed APRO's name and address. Mrs. Lorenzon several times expressed her gratitude for the resultant increase in members.

When Maj. Keyhoe became NICAP's director, he offered Mrs. Lorenzon full cooperation and suggested exchanges of information. Unfortunately, this never materialized. Despite this, NICAP tried to avoid a controversy since we believed we had the same basic aims.

When APRO began to consider seriously contact cases we knew to be of dubious value, questions from members and the public forced us to take a stand.

Our review of "Flying Saucer Occupants" was called "Another Wild Book." This referred to the dictionary terms "not checked; not restrained. . . not in proper control or order. . ." Proper checking and restraint are necessary for convincing scientists and other citizens of UFO reality. It is our honest opinion, based on scientists' comments to us, that this book has not added to such acceptance.

Rev. Baller's Letter

How far our contactee policy is misunderstood was shown by a letter from Rev. Albert H. Baller, NICAP Board Member and a friend of the director. Rev. Baller courteously disapproved of the review and said he felt such publicizing of the occupant cases was needed.

We do not oppose a factual round-up of occupant reports. We would, however, distinguish between typical contacts and "encounters" where witnesses report seeing beings but do not claim conversations, mental messages, UFO flights, etc.

Rev. Baller's letter has led us to a decision. If a long-time Board Member, well-informed on most of the UFO problem, does not realize all the complex factors, it is time to give all members, and the press, a full-scale coverage of the problem. (Most of our members, however, have supported our policies.)

We are already working on this complete discussion, which will include specific reports and claims and developments, and a precise, detailed statement of NICAP's position and operating policy in regard to both contactee and "encounter" claims.

Unless some extremely crucial development crowds it out at the last moment, we shall publish this round-up in the next issue.

SUBCOMMITTEE "SKYNET"

A UFO-observing network of more than 80 persons is being operated by NICAP's California Subcommittee No. 1 in the Los Angeles area.

Called "Skynet", it covers much of Los Angeles and Orange Counties and is linked together by telephone.

During the two years of Skynet's operations, it has enabled Subcommittee persons to identify a number of hoaxes, and to classify quickly easily misinterpreted phenomena such as large weather balloons, missile launchings, etc.

According to Mrs. Ann Druffel, of the Subcommittee and Skynet, "It saves time by cutting down the investigative work previously needed in many sighting cases."

Members include professional and amateur astronomers, engineers, photographers and "average non-technical persons with an interest in watching the sky." Thanks to the cooperation of a Griffith Observatory staff member, UFO reports previously handled by that institution are now being referred to Skynet.

Detailed procedures have been worked out by Skynet officials for direct and relay calls, for fast-moving and slow-moving UFOs, for measurement of sighting parameters and for filing of written reports.

NEW CLOSE-UPS (Continued from page 1)

"We all know we were chasing something very unusual," one of the witnesses told NICAP.

Altogether, Subcommittee Chairman Cook obtained 42 personal statements from witnesses of Harrisburg's sighting flurry.

"These are only the ones I've talked with," Cook stated. "I'm sure there are many more."

On the evening of Jan. 23, two round, glowing UFO's were observed in the Columbus, Ohio, area by numerous witnesses, including sheriffs, city police, photographers and reporters. The two unknown objects, giving off a yellowish glow, hovered for a time, changed places and hovered again. One abruptly climbed away, then rejoined the other UFO. The two flying objects stopped briefly over some towers, then continued their maneuvers for about an hour before their glow was suddenly extinguished.

During the early hours of Jan. 27, seven Knoxville, Tenn., policemen and other witnesses observed an unidentified object with flame shooting out the rear. The UFO's height was estimated as 1500 feet and its speed as 1,000 m.p.h.

More 1967 Cases

Following are several 1967 reports which we were unable to get into the last issue:

Shortly after midnight, Nov. 4, a bright round object, estimated to be 100 feet in diameter, was reported hovering above a farmhouse southeast of Monterey, Calif. The strange object made a sudden, sharp turn, shot out flames and traveled out of sight. The report, forwarded by NICAP's Bay Area Subcommittee, was made by Mrs. James R. Cross and Mrs. Lois Mills, who were driving along Route 101 when the sighting occurred.

On the night of Nov. 5, during the British sighting "flap," a 15-foot oval-shaped object with a round, white projection underneath, was reported at Southhampton by witness Karl Farlow. Mr. Farlow said that his car engine, radio and lights ceased functioning while the UFO was close to his car. The object hovered about 10 feet above the road, he said, then rose to about 40 feet and sped away toward the east. The EM interference effects ceased as the UFO moved away. (Report investigated by Subcommittee Chairman Julian Hennessey.)

At dusk on December 7, near El Paso, Texas, attorney William C. Collins saw a cylindrical, gray, bright object with what appeared to be a landing apparatus, also lights on the bottom. The UFO held position at an estimated 200 feet altitude, then rose quickly, passing out of sight over a mountain.

At 2:30 a.m., Dec. 3, 1967, Police Officer Herbert Schirmer, Ashland, Nebraska, reportedly came upon a bright, aluminum-colored UFO hovering a few feet above the road. Schirmer stated he could see red lights inside the object, which was about 20 feet long.

As his car approached to within 40 feet of the unknown craft, Schirmer said, the object's lights began to flash and the UFO rose to about 50 feet. Then it shot a red-orange beam toward the ground, emitted a shrill beeping noise and vanished straight up.

Later, while under hypnosis at the Colorado Project, Schirmer reported an experience involving an unconfirmed contact with an extraterrestrial being during the time when the UFO was hovering close to the ground. (See separate story.)

Car, Truck Pacing

At 3:30 a.m., October 27, 1967, Mr. Chris Helgesen was collecting milk from farms near Max, North Dakota, when he noticed a "reddish" light approaching from the east. When he started to the next farm, the object took up a position above and to his left, pacing the truck to the next milk house.

As Helgesen left, the round, spinning object was almost directly over his truck. He turned off the motor but heard no sound.

The UFO continued pacing the truck, hovering over nearby fields when the vehicle halted. At the fourth stop, the craft turned a bluish color and raced away.

The sighting was investigated by Donald Flickinger, Chairman, NICAP's North Dakota Subcommittee.

South Dakota was also the site of a vehicle-pacing case.

On January 20, 1968, Robert and Lynn Ballard were paced as they drove into Vermillion. Shortly after 11 p.m., they noticed a red-orange, round object following them. Ballard accelerated to 60 m.p.h. At one point, the UFO "jumped or leaped" over the car and briefly hovered "about three feet above the ground at an intersection."

"Three-Week UFO Solution"

The UFO mystery is solved; all sightings are explained; all the U.S. and foreign investigators can now close up shop—so says Philip J. Klass.

(This is a preliminary comment on a new book by Mr. Klass, entitled "Identified Flying Objects," enlarging on the "solution" he announced in 1966. A review of the book by one or more scientific authorities in the field appears in an early issue. This present item is intended to give members the actual background, which will not be found in the book.)

In the early fall of 1966, Mr. Klass came to NICAP headquarters and made a startling disclosure. In just three weeks, he said, he had completely solved the mysterious sightings which had baffled space scientists and engineers, aviation and electric power experts, hundreds of veteran military and airline pilots, and the USAF and NICAP.

"I've explained everything," Klass told former Assistant Director Richard Hall and Staff Assistant Gordon Lore, Hall's successor. Before August (1966), he said he had never checked on UFO sightings, accepting Dr. Menzel's answers—optical illusions and natural phenomena. But after reading over some of the reports, he found the explanation—ball lightning.

Rejected Theory

Klass published his rejected theory in Aviation Week, of which he is an associate editor. Instead of the reaction he expected—worldwide relief and the thanks of the USAF, the AF ungratefully ignored his answer and continued its investigations. In addition, several authorities in the field of atmospheric physics rejected the explanation (except for perhaps a tiny fraction of relatively minor reports). One of the scientists was Dr. James D. McDonald, Senior Physicist, Institute of Atmospheric Physics, University of Arizona, who has been investigating UFOs extensively for over two years with the approval of his university.

From personal observation, we know Mr. Klass to be a very determined man. Finding himself out on a limb, he launched a campaign to convince disagreeing scientists, the USAF, NICAP, the press and the public that he alone was right.

Once, on the air with Frank Edwards, Mr. Klass offered \$10,000 for documentation of any sighting proving the extra-terrestrial answer. Mr. Edwards responded by immediately offering Klass \$10,000 if he could produce a single UFO report which the AF said was caused by ball lightning. In the months before his death, Frank Edwards publicly repeated the offer, but no such report was forthcoming.

Ignored Evidence

There are thousands of verified, unexplained cases on record—including reports by scientists fully capable of resolving any possible explanation of ball lightning. Cases include reports by pilots, control tower operators and other well qualified observers of daytime UFO formations, in which extremely large objects were seen in precise maneuvers, including changes of formations—from V to T, to echelon, to circles. Ball lightning is extremely small, of short duration—usually under a minute—and neither ball lightning nor any other "plasma" explanation could remotely approach these verified UFOs in size, description or maneuvers.

Mr. Klass' book is a repetition of his 1966 three-week explanation, with material added to bolster up this widely-rejected answer. There are numerous errors in many of the cases he quotes, as well as in his theory. However, these will be fully discussed in our forthcoming scientific review.

The chief purpose of these preliminary comments is to advise our members of the general background, in case persons uninformed about UFOs argue with them that the Klass theory is "the" answer. It is also to give members a chance to wait and read the later scientific review before purchasing.

As they went on toward Vermillion, the pulsating object caught up with them and flew at telephone-pole height.

Ballard increased his speed to 100 m.p.h. and the UFO still kept pace, following them into town. Then it ascended and disappeared to the east. The entire incident lasted five to seven minutes.

THE QUESTION OF SUBMERGING UFO'S

Within the last two years, there has been a gradual increase in reports of UFOs alighting on rivers, lakes, or the sea. In a few cases, the objects were said to have submerged; others were reported to have emerged from underwater and taken off.

The idea of flying objects operating under water has generally been ridiculed — even by many who fully accept UFO reality. NICAP's abstaining from a full discussion has been mainly because of the sparsity of reports, especially cases with enough details for even a preliminary investigation. There is still a lack of convincing evidence, but in line with our policy of considering all phases of the UFO problem we are presenting a roundup of such reports and discussing what might be alternate meanings PROVIDED the reports should prove true.

Actually, it is not unreasonable to believe that UFOs can alight on water. Flying-boats and amphibians have been doing this for 50 years, and our space capsules regularly "splash down" at sea. Submerging by UFOs might seem more of a problem, but a sealed device, such as the usual flying discs seem to be, could also be provided with equipment for submerging and emerging, like submarines.

This is not to claim that such operations definitely have happened, but one fairly recent case, reported by Canadian officials, appears to support the idea. The main points were given in Vol. IV, No. 3, the Nov.-Dec. 1967 issue.

On the evening of Oct. 4, 1967, an unknown flying object was sighted by a large number of residents at Shag Harbor, Nova Scotia. Though the exact shape of the UFO was not discernible, its movements were indicated by a series of bright lights which slanted down toward the harbor. In full view of the witnesses, the lights were seen to glide into the water and disappear.

Official Search

Within 20 minutes, several constables of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police were at the scene, attempting to reach the spot where the UFO appeared to have submerged. A Coast Guard vessel and eight fishing boats also joined in the search.

A large patch of yellowish foam and bubbling water was revealed by the searchers' lights, unlike anything ever seen in the area. Navy divers continued the search for two days, but according to reports to the press no trace of the UFO was found.

This incident touched off the disclosure of a special UFO investigation department.

A spokesman for the Royal Canadian Air Force, Squadron Leader Bain, stated that the RCAF received hundreds of UFO reports every week. "But the Shag Harbor incident," he said, "is one of the few where we may get something concrete on it."

NICAP has asked the RCAF for details on this case, and its conclusion if available. Meantime, a study of the report suggests these possibilities if a UFO actually was involved:

A. A surface landing was intended but the UFO accidentally sank and went to the bottom. In this event, it would seem the Navy divers should have located it.

B. The UFO had operating trouble, crashed in attempting an emergency landing and sank. This still does not explain why the divers found no traces.

C. The submerging was deliberate, a controlled operation. Under these circumstances, it could conceivably maneuver under water to a position miles away and emerge unseen.

No Secret Weapon

The only apparent alternative is that some secret earth-made flying-and-underwater device submerged at Shag Harbor, intentionally or by accident. It is NICAP's opinion that the massive factual evidence against the "secret Earth device" explanation for UFOs rules this out completely.

Whether you accept or reject this case, there are other reports to be considered. NICAP's records go back to the early 19th century and on up to late 1967, covering reported landings in oceans, rivers, lakes, creeks and even reservoirs. In some cases, observers were said to be badly frightened.

"The Diary of Andrew Bloxam," published in 1925 by the Bernice P. Bishop Museum, Honolulu, has an account of a strange object rising from the sea, a hundred years before:

"About half past 3 o'clock this morning (Aug. 12, 1825) the middle watch on deck was astonished to find everything around them suddenly illuminated. Turning their eyes to the eastward they beheld a large, round, luminous body rising up about seven degrees apparently from the water to the clouds, and falling again out of sight, and a second time rising and falling. It was the color of a red-hot [cannon] shot and appeared about the size of the sun. . . It gave so great a light that a pin might be picked up on deck."

On June 18, 1845, the British brig "Victoria" was lying almost becalmed in the Mediterranean, about 100 miles north of Malta. Suddenly, strong gusts of wind began to batter the ship. As quickly as it had come, the wind subsided. Shortly afterward, the captain and the crew saw three shiny discs rise from beneath the surface of the sea. After hovering briefly half a mile from the ship, the three discs ascended vertically and went out of sight. (Source: The Malta Times.)

One evening in May, 1880, two large, luminous rotating "wheels" were observed close to the British India Company steamer "Patna." The strange objects, apparently just below the surface of the sea, appeared singly and together on both the port and starboard sides of the vessel. (Source: A published account reprinted by Charles Fort.)

Since these early reports cannot be rechecked, there is no way of knowing whether the stories are accurate. But in a number of the 20th century reports there have been careful investigations, including long interviews with witnesses and checking of their reliability.

Most Detailed Case

The most detailed of these cases involved a large UFO seen in 1945 by crew members of the U.S. Army Transport "Delarof," which had been hauling munitions and supplies to Alaska. The reporting witness, recently interviewed, was Robert S. Crawford, now a consulting geologist with the Indiana Soil Testing Laboratory, Griffith, Ind. Crawford is a graduate of the University of North Dakota, and while at the college he reported the sighting to Prof. N. N. Kohanowski, Dept. of Geology, who is a NICAP adviser. In 1967, Mr. Crawford was interviewed by Dr. James E. McDonald, a scientist at the University of Arizona, who under a university grant has personally investigated numerous UFO reports.

The Delarof incident occurred in the summer of 1945, while Crawford was serving as one of the Army radiomen aboard. The ship, heading back to Seattle, was in the open sea past Adak. It was about sunset, and Crawford was on the port side, near the radio room, when he heard shouts from some of the crew. He turned and saw a large round object which had just emerged from the sea. (Several crewmen saw the UFO actually appear from underwater, an estimated mile or so from the "Delarof.")

The unknown craft, showing darkly against the setting sun, climbed almost straight up for a few moments, then it arced into level flight, and began to circle the ship. All the observers were convinced it was a large object. Comparing it with the width of a finger held out at arm's length, Crawford estimated the UFO to be 150 to 250 feet in diameter.

As it circled the Delarof, the flying object was in easy range of the ship's guns. But the gun crews held their fire, though on the alert for any sign of hostility.

The UFO circled the vessel two or three times, moving smoothly and with no audible sound. All the witnesses felt it was self-propelled; otherwise, the strong winds would have visibly affected its movements.

After several minutes, the flying object disappeared to the south or south-southwest. Suddenly the crew saw three flashes of light from the area where it had vanished. The Delarof captain posted an extra watch as the ship moved through that sector later, but nothing was seen.

At Seattle, 14 crewmen signed a summary of the sighting. Attempts are being made to locate the report, mainly so as to interrogate other witnesses and perhaps learn more details.

(Continued on page 5, col. 1)

(Continued from page 4, col. 2)

Following are several reports, from 1950 through 1967. The Wanaque cases were investigated by NICAP; The others — mainly foreign reports — are on record, but can not be fully evaluated unless more detailed evidence becomes available:

Fall of 1950; a round object skimmed over a stream at Solway Firth, Scotland, hit with a splash, then slanted upward and went out of sight.

July 22, 1955, Santa Maria, Cal.; witnesses reported that a long silvery object emerged from the water.

Sept. 15, 1962, Oradely, N. J. Oval-shaped UFO reported splashing into reservoir, then quickly taking off. (Other UFOs were reported hovering over the reservoir in 1966; witnesses included the mayor and police officers.)

July 20, 1965. Sydney, Australia. A glowing 20-foot disc was reported by a businessman as having put down near a stream: "The rim. . . was glowing greenish blue, while the top and bottom halves were a dullish silver gray. As it took off, a yellow or orange glow came from underneath."

Year of 1966; date deleted. An AF active-duty jet pilot with the rank of captain, who is also a NICAP member, came to our offices and reported that a group of Service pilots had seen a large disc-shaped object rotating under the surface of the Atlantic Ocean. The sighting was at night, while the pilots were on a routine mission, and the UFO was clearly visible because of its brilliant blue-green glow. (Because of the active-duty status of the AF captain and the other pilots, names, the date and identifying details have to be omitted.)

June 3, 1967, Ontario, Canada. Shortly after 10 p.m., a Lake Kipissing buoy tender observed green and white lights between two small islands. Thinking another boatman might be in trouble, the buoy tender headed toward the lights. He was about 100 feet away when the lights rose from the water "with a whoosh" and sped off into the night.

South American Cases

In August, 1967, two Venezuelan sightings were reported. On Aug. 4, Dr. Hugo Sierra Yopez was fishing from his boat, north of Arrecife. Suddenly he felt a vibration, and the sea "began to boil in big bubbles, in a . . . circle about six meters in diameters."

A gray-blue, flat globe then emerged, Dr. Yopez stated. As it hovered close to the surface, dripping water, he noticed a revolving section with triangular windows. The UFO, he said, ascended in a curve, then shot upward into space.

At 5 p.m., Aug. 25, "three huge plate-shaped discs" were reportedly sighted by witness Ruben Norato, who was on the beach at Catia La Mar, Venz. Norato said he first saw a "precipitous movement of the water," out of which the discs appeared, then streaked out of sight.

On Oct. 13, nine days after Canadian divers searched for the UFO at Shag Harbor, frightened residents of Oympep, India, reported that a round UFO had landed in a stream. The object was described as 20 to 30 feet in diameter, and according to witnesses it "sucked and churned the water" with loud explosions before it took off over Lum Swer Forest. (Reported in Vol. IV, No. 3.) Conclusions of an India Air Force investigation have not been released.

Though the cases listed are but a fraction of the thousands of other UFO reports, there are enough well-qualified witnesses in at least a few cases to indicate an apparent UFO interest in our world's bodies of water. But we can only speculate as to possible reasons.

Using the surfaces of seas, lakes and rivers for landings does not seem unreasonable. Most of our planet is covered with water, offering far more landing areas than the rest of the globe. Freedom from observation also would be easier to secure. There have been a few reports — all but one unconfirmed — which indicate a possible selection of ocean areas for rendezvous purposes.

But the reports of submerging are puzzling. If we assume temporarily these reports are true, what could be the motives?

Obviously, submerging could offer quick and easy concealment if for some reason the UFO controllers desired to suspend aerial operations. If any sizeable number of UFOs were involved, this might seem a logical place for hiding, as compared with any large-scale landings on the ground. Even barren deserts

would not be free from observations by military or airline pilots.

But going on to the idea of large underseas UFO bases — claimed in a few wild rumors — is a big leap with no real foundation. The scanty submerging reports do not indicate even a small-scale base operation. It is not utterly impossible, but without solid, massive evidence, most serious students of UFOs will reject any such current stories as fiction.

Another suggestion — pure speculation — is that an advanced race surveying the Earth would study all kinds of life, including the many forms of marine life in our seas, lakes and rivers.

If UFOs actually are submerging as reported, there may well be an explanation beyond our comprehension. The sightings on record may turn out to be errors, or to have non-UFO explanations. But we shall continue to seek more evidence — pro or con — and to report any new developments.

We shall appreciate it if members who know of such sightings, or hear of such reports from witnesses who seem sincere, will forward the information to us or tell us where we can secure details.

Board Member on Crane Show

A positive change of attitude toward UFOs and praise for NICAP were recently voiced by famed moderator Les Crane on his nationwide television show. Crane strongly modified his previously negative stand by stating that NICAP was composed of serious, fact-finding scientists who were in no way to be grouped with the "contactees" that had previously appeared on his program. He also indicated that some reports defied natural explanations.

Guests on the positive side were NICAP Board Member Dr. Leslie K. Kaeburn, University of Southern California biophysicist and Los Angeles Subcommittee member, and Donald Hazelman, another Subcommittee member, who is also a pilot. The negative stand was expressed by two astronomers from Griffith Observatory: — Ronald Oriti, Curator of Meteorites, and Gerald Waxman, a graduate student.

Dr. Kaeburn and Mr. Hazelman emphasized the positive opinions of notable scientists and stressed the quality of good, solid reports by well trained, qualified personnel, such as airline pilots. Oriti claimed that pilots were no better witnesses than anyone else, and that some have even swerved their aircraft to avoid collisions with meteors hundreds of miles away. He failed to explain how veteran pilots who spend thousands of hours scanning the skies of the world, and who are trained to recognize natural aerial phenomena, could be so easily fooled. Nor was there any mention made of the hundreds of solid, detailed objects, reported by military and airline pilots, that easily outclassed the performances of meteors or any devices built on Earth.

Assistant Director on TV Program

A half-hour news special on UFOs that stressed NICAP's involvement was recently taped in Baltimore by Assistant Director Gordon Lore. The color program, entitled "UFO — An Aerial Phenomenon?", will be aired several times over WMAR, Channel 2.

The South Hill, Virginia, case of April 21, 1967, which Mr. Lore personally investigated with Staff Member Don Berliner and Adviser Lee Katchen, was discussed in detail. Close-up views were taken of one of the three holes left by the inverted tank-shaped object when it landed on a lonely country road in that tiny community near the North Carolina border.

The Assistant Director discussed briefly the historical aspects of UFOs. The history of NICAP was also traced, as well as our involvement with the Colorado Project and the Russian Commission.

Slides were also shown, including the Heflin and Beaver County photographs of August, 1965.

* * * * *

Please notify us of any change of address. After each issue mailing, dozens of copies are returned marked "Moved, left no address."

RUSSIAN SCIENTIST CONFIRMS IMPORTANT CASES

Bluntly rejecting the usual debunking explanations, Dr. Felix Zigel, a top-ranking member of the Soviet UFO Commission, has just released additional verified evidence of UFO operations over Russia. Dr. Zigel, who is also a professor at the Moscow Aviation Institute, made the information public in the February, 1968, issue of the magazine *Soviet Life*. Publication of the confirmed sightings was obviously approved by the Kremlin.

One of the cases, occurring on Aug. 2, 1967, involved officers of the Soviet vessel "Izhevsk," which was crossing the Norwegian Sea. At 11:30 p.m., Capt. Markov, First Mate Bazhashin, Senior Engineer Ivanov and Navigator Sysoyev saw a round-shaped object heading south.

"A few minutes later," Bazhashin wrote in his report, "a bright spot flared up high in the sky. . . It rushed headlong from west to east. . . getting much larger. Suddenly it came to a stop and with a play of bright rainbow colors. . . began throwing off sparks. . ."

The UFO continued south, then stopped again, turning over so that it was seen as oval or egg-shaped, with the thicker end upward. A powerful white jet then "squirted" from the lower end, enveloping the object in white mist as it resumed its southward course.

Six days later, a huge crescent-shaped UFO was sighted above the Academy of Sciences Mountain Astrophysical Station, near the Caucasus town of Kislovodsk. Astronomer Anatoli Sazanov, who logged the sighting at 8:40 p.m., estimated the UFO's size as "no less than 500 feet across." Several of the station's scientific workers also observed the strange object as it sped across the sky.

Repeating a previous statement urging a world-wide scientific investigation, Dr. Zigel said:

"The hypothesis that UFOs originate in other worlds, that they are flying craft from planets other than Earth, merits the most serious examination. . . the important thing now is for us to discard any preconceived notions about UFOs. . ."

Scientific Debunkers Challenged

"It goes without saying that the phenomenon attracts, and will unfortunately continue to, all sorts of publicity seekers," Dr. Zigel remarked. "But we do not stop using money because there are counterfeiters."

The best known of the debunking scientists, Dr. Donald H. Menzel, former Director of Harvard Observatory, was also brought to task. The astronomer's belief that "flying saucers are optical phenomena in the Earth's atmosphere. . . does not hold water" and "nothing intelligible will emerge" from such blanket explanations, Dr. Zigel said.

Zigel also stated that the "ball lightning. . . explanation does not hold up either." He pointed out that the diameters of ball lightning average no larger than four or five inches, as compared to the hundreds of feet reported in some UFO cases.

Soviet Book Scheduled

Sometime this year, the U.S.S.R. Academy of Sciences is to publish a book entitled *Populated Outer Space*, edited by the Academy's Vice President, Boris Konstantinov. A special UFO section will include contributions by such U.S. scientists as Drs. James E. McDonald, J. Allen Hynek, Jacques Vallee and Frank Salisbury.

Zigel also stated that he received a large response from a UFO article he wrote for another Russian magazine, "Smena." Many of the letters came from people who had sightings to report.

As a result of this and other growing interest in the Soviet Union, a "group of scientists, the military, writers and public figures" met with the idea of conducting a scientific study of these reports. This group, officially organized in October, is called the UFO Section of the All-Union Cosmonautics Committee, headquartered in Moscow's Central House of Aviation and Cosmonautics, but is more commonly known as the Russian Commission.

"We have already collected some dozens of well-documented reports and accounts," Zigel wrote. Three examples follow:

In 1964, a large bright metal disc sped under the belly of a TU-104 aircraft, above Bologoye. Assistant Professor Vyacheslav Zaitsev said the UFO then turned and flew parallel with the plane. A cabin-like structure was seen on the disc. After pacing the plane, the UFO turned sharply and disappeared.

Astronomers' Sightings

At 9:35 p.m., July 26, 1965, Latvian astronomers Robert and Esmeralda Vitolniek and Yan Meldersis were observing the sky through a telescope at an observation station at Ogra when they saw a lens-shaped UFO "estimated to be about 325 feet across." Three similar but smaller spheres were rotating around the larger object. After 15 or 20 minutes, the smaller objects moved away from the large disc and all disappeared in the distance.

During the summer of 1965, Lyudmila Tsekanovick, a geodetic astronomer, saw a UFO that "made a swift maneuver over the sea, then headed for the mountains" near Sukhumi in the Caucasus. The witness observed that the disc-shaped object was emitting light from holes or windows along its side.

Jet Crew Reports

"In 1965, engaged in strategic ice reconnaissance in a TU-4 plane in the area of Cape Jesup (Greenland)," reported Valentin Akkuratov, the "chief navigator of Soviet polar aviation," "we dropped down from the clouds. . . and suddenly noticed an unknown flying craft moving. . . parallel to our course. It looked. . . like a large pearl-colored lens with wavy, pulsating edges."

The pilot then entered another cloud cover. Upon reemerging, he saw that the UFO was still with the reconnaissance group. He decided to maneuver his aircraft closer to the object to get a better look and the UFO "followed suit and moved parallel at our speed."

Between 15 and 20 minutes later, the unknown craft "sharply altered its course, sped ahead of us and rose quickly until it disappeared. . ."

In the *Soviet Life* article, Dr. Zigel also supported the outer-space explanation for the Tungusky "meteorite" which in 1908 fell with a shattering and frightening impact on the surface of northern Russia.

". . . (this) seems to have been an artificial flying craft from some other planet," the prominent Russian scientist commented. He further stated that a 1967 edition of "The USSR Academy of Sciences" includes studies that prove "the Tungusky body could not be a meteorite or a comet." He added that an article published last summer by the Joint Institute of Nuclear Research at Dubna concluded "that the Tungusky blast left considerable residual radioactivity."

"Finally," the Soviet scientist concludes, "as recently as 1966, after analyzing the sum total of observations on the Tungusky body's flight, this writer showed that before the blast the Tungusky body described in the atmosphere a tremendous arc of about 375 miles in extent (in azimuth), that is, [it] carried out a maneuver."

NICAP: Disclosure of the documented Russian sightings by specially trained observers should be an important help in combating new debunking efforts in the United States. We hope this added evidence, along with Dr. Zigel's rejection of typical debunkers, will encourage American observers to release any sightings they may be holding back for fear of ridicule.

European Subcommittee Formed

NICAP's first European Subcommittee has been formed in London by member Julian J. A. Hennessey, who has conducted important investigations for NICAP.

European Unit No. 1 members include Captain F. E. C. Underhill, an airline pilot with over 25 years flying experience. (Captain Underhill sighted a cone-shaped UFO over the Pyrenees on Sept. 10, 1967, as it passed beneath his plane at high speed); a physics/chemistry professor at the Free University of Brussels, in Belgium; B. A. A. Smye-Rumsby, Director of the Smye-Rumsby Engineering Co., Ltd., who was involved in secret uses of radar application during World War II; and R. H. B. Winder, a research engineer who is also a consultant to the "Flying Saucer Review" and Vice President of the British UFO Research Association.

THE SEARCH FOR HIDDEN REPORTS

Hundreds of good UFO sightings, probably thousands, are still kept from the public because the witnesses fear that ridicule will endanger their business and social standing.

Our minimum estimate of "hundreds" is based on the number of signed reports submitted to us confidentially and other withheld sightings we have verified but cannot publicly identify because the witnesses are in the military services or are prevented for other reasons from speaking out.

The hidden reports of which we know go from World War II to 1968. Many of the earlier cases have special value, helping to indicate patterns or confirm key sightings which have been officially denied or debunked. We especially need significant early sightings to help offset current official attempts to get rid of all the solid evidence in World War II and the following several years.

AF Reversal

One flagrant example of this "burying" policy concerns the famous 1948 Eastern Airlines case. Most members will recall that a large rocket-shaped UFO with a flaming exhaust was encountered by Capt. C. S. Chiles and First Officer John B. Whitted during a flight over Alabama. The UFO veered away, its exhaust blast rocking the airliner. For years, the AF admitted the object was unidentified. This was repeated by an AF spokesman on the Armstrong Circle Theater show in 1958, by other spokesmen until about a year ago. Then, after 19 years, and without the slightest new evidence, the AF suddenly explained this UFO as a fireball. The long-standing "unknown" labels in other key cases have similarly been reversed, and the sightings listed as "explained."

Although NICAP stands ready to expose these newly-contrived answers, the disclosure of strong, hidden cases by responsible observers will greatly weaken, if not destroy the "burying" policy.

In the last year or so, we have received a number of previously withheld reports, most of them as a result of two TRUE Magazine articles by NICAP's director, which asked for hidden cases and gave our address. Though the examples below are not "block-busters," they add important evidence, hinting at a gold mine of hidden sightings waiting to be uncovered.

World War II Reports

On a morning in April, 1945, James V. Byrnes was manning his aerial gunner's position in a B-24 bomber over Linz, Austria, when he saw a solid, bright object like a "crystal ball." It flew at the same apparent speed and altitude of the 456th Bomb Group and kept pace with the plane about 30 or 40 feet from the waist gunner's window.

"This object was . . . definitely no hallucination," Byrnes said. "I remember thinking at the time it somehow might be connected with German anti-aircraft on the ground because it paced us during the bomb run. (This was fully disproved in an evaluation of many WW II cases.) But to this day it has remained a mystery and I have never forgotten it."

The weight of evidence supporting numerous UFO sightings during World War II is steadily increasing. Called "foo-fighters," these objects were frequently seen pacing planes and ships. Thus, the "modern era" of UFO reports actually began with the World War II sightings, rather than with the famous Kenneth Arnold incident of June 24, 1947, which set off the worldwide UFO publicity.

Another WW II report to NICAP came from a former Navy lieutenant serving on the U.S.S. Bradford, in August, 1945. Since he is now a well-known attorney in Atlanta, he asks that his name be withheld. (We hope he will soon release his name, with other such witnesses.)

On the night of the sighting, the lieutenant was acting as Officer-of-the-Deck. The ship was about 600 miles ESE of Kyushu, Japan, when he and another Navy witness saw a glowing reddish-white object moving horizontally at extremely high speed. Having studied astronomy at Princeton, and having watched the skies of the Pacific for three years, he knew this was no known celestial object.

The UFO, still reddish-white in color, crossed the ship's bow. Then it turned right and climbed vertically, changing to bluish-white before it disappeared. The ship's range-finder indicated that the unknown object was travelling far in excess of 3,000 m.p.h. while it was under observation.

Although the incident was logged, the officer did not make a special report because "I was convinced it had nothing to do with the war." In his report to NICAP, he plainly indicated his opinion that the object was extraterrestrial. Its original course had been southerly from the direction of Japan, and he suggested that it might have been "checking on the Hiroshima A-bomb explosion."

A late August, 1949, report concerns an object seen one afternoon near Lindale, Texas. Jarrell M. Oliver, now a Federal Aviation Agency employee at Angelina County Airport, was working as a lineman with the Texas Power and Light Company.

Oliver's report states: "I saw a flash, as from an airplane reflecting the sun. I saw the object traveling in a straight line. . . . It left a puff of vapor where it disappeared."

Oliver said the object was at an estimated 40,000 feet altitude and "at least twice as long as the wing-spread of a B-36." The UFO disappeared at astounding speed.

One evening in the early 1950s, William S. Eberman was on duty at the Ground Observer Corps' observation tower in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, when he saw a "silvery, cigar-shaped" object which was emitting a "greenish fire" from the rear.

Eberman has told NICAP that he reported the incident to the Harrisburg Air Defense Filter Center. But it was "more or less hushed up," he said, "though we were told it was tracked on radar up the eastern coast and into Canada."

Private Pilot

Early in 1956, Don D. Emerson was on a flight in a Piper Apache from Orlando, Florida, to Birmingham, Alabama. It was a clear night, a few hours after sunset. The pilot broke out of the overcast at 9,500 feet, approximately 20 miles northwest of Albany, Georgia.

"To the northeast," the pilot stated in his report to NICAP, "maybe two or three miles away and about 500 feet higher, I was astonished to see three powerful beams of light streaming downward from what appeared to be a stationary object ringed with lighted portholes. It resembled the gondola of a large dirigible. For a moment I thought it was an airliner coming toward me with its landing lights on so I held the lower altitude and tried to figure out which way it was moving. . . . It just seemed to sit there. I turned on my landing lights for identification and the object vanished instantly."

Emerson also stated that he received a "negative" reply upon asking the Albany tower if they had any reported aircraft in his area.

The pilot admitted that he did not report his sighting in the years before his letter to NICAP because such reports usually caused disbelief: "I've only disclosed the incident to close friends who know me 'better' and others seriously interested."

Another 1956 case was reported ten years later to NICAP by Capt. — —. Baumie, a Civil Air Patrol captain and a former pilot, who was then serving as adjutant of the AF Detachment at the Joplin, Mo., Air Defense Filter Center:

". . . one of our observers in a nearby Kansas post reported the sighting of an unusual flying. . . . Our controller on duty contacted the radar site (near Springfield, Missouri) and relayed the information. . . . The radar site reported an unidentified contact at that location and scrambled a flight from Kansas City. The visual and radar contact lasted about 20 minutes. . . . There was no publicity of the incident due to AFR-200."

Canal Zone Photo

Early in 1960, Colonel Robert Rhine was Assistant Chief of Staff G-2 Intelligence for the U.S. Army in the Caribbean when he came into possession of a photograph taken by a young soldier stationed in the Canal Zone. The picture clearly showed a disc-shaped object with a halo hovering over some ships in Guantanamo Bay. Colonel Rhine showed the photo to his Commanding General and submitted a full report to the Department of the Army G-2.

"Later, I received a sort of stupid reply," Colonel Rhine wrote NICAP. "It didn't make much sense. The picture was startling, clear cut and unexplainable."

(Continued on page 8, col. 1)

The Facts On The Dr. Hynek Story

Many such letters have been received from active and retired members of the armed services who have *disagreed* with the official debunking policy.

The following is one of the very few sightings reported directly to NICAP which go back years before World War II:

One summer evening in 1933, Frank Van Keuren, an electronic assembler and former Air Force veteran, was fishing with his father in the inland waterway complex between Tuckerton and Beach Haven, New Jersey.

"All of a sudden we were illuminated by a very brilliant floodlight from an object which couldn't have been more than a thousand feet. . . in the air," Keuren said.

The disc-shaped object was traveling slowly through the dark night sky. After playing the bright light on the witnesses for several minutes, it crossed over and illuminated some radio towers in the distance. Keuren reported that "it didn't have any running lights or make any sound."

Reports Add to Record

The preceding reports are not blockbusters, but they add to the record, and some help offset attempts to sweep all early evidence under the rug.

Actually, NICAP has several very strong hidden or partially hidden reports. In some cases, impressive witnesses have given us the facts but refuse to release their names, which allows debunkers to call the cases fabrications. One case concerns a group of scientists; another is a Navy Commander's report of an extremely close encounter.

Many "holdout" witnesses say they will release their names when ridicule begins to die down, but most of them wait for "the other fellow."

You, as a NICAP member, can help us get hidden reports pouring in. If you know a holdout, urge him to give us his report. If he is reluctant, tell him we will not release his report singly, but will combine it with others by reputable witnesses. If you don't know any holdouts, ask friends likely to have had or heard of sightings — pilots, control-tower operators, radarmen, etc.

If witnesses won't report openly, tell them we will agree to keep their names confidential until they consent to join others in a release. We shall be glad to send you NICAP sighting forms, or to mail them directly to witnesses you name.

Don't wait for the "break" — for the flood to start. We won't need the drive then. We want the holdouts now, all the good cases we can get — from World War II, the 1950's and on up to date.

One BIG case could wreck the debunking operation — a completely confirmed case with specially qualified, unimpeachable witnesses of such standing that official denials would be futile.

The chances of obtaining such a momentous report will rapidly increase if we start a wave of hidden sightings rolling into NICAP.

Please help us. Go after the holdouts!

UFO EVIDENCE SUPPLEMENT

A complete set of previously classified Air Force Project Bluebook Reports 1 through 12 is being considered as a Supplement to Vol. I of The UFO Evidence, if sufficient interest is shown.

The release of this material was the result of combined work by NICAP and Cong. John Moss' Freedom of Information Subcommittee of the House of Representatives. In the past, the USAF denied that these reports had ever been written, despite the well publicized Special Report No. 14.

The full set of reports — running about 200 pages — includes scores of unexplained and poorly-explained cases from the early 1950's when the late Maj. Edward Ruppelt established his reputation as the most conscientious person ever to head Project Bluebook. Most of the cases are from military sources, including pilots, control tower operators, etc. Many are radar and radar/visual sightings.

In addition to case studies, the reports include considerable background information on the workings of the USAF investigation, reports of briefings of military and private groups, investigation techniques (successful and otherwise).

Ninety cases are described in great detail with the USAF explanations, and many more cases are included in chart forms, not unlike the charts in Vol. I of The UFO Evidence.

In the previous issue, we announced a response by D. J. Allen Hynek, AF UFO Consultant, to a question by a Richmond News-Leader reporter, during Dr. Hynek's recent visit for a high school lecture.

If the Colorado Project report was completely negative, the reporter asked, what did Dr. Hynek think the results would be.

Here is the answer as we printed it: If the Colorado Project conclusion is completely negative — denying UFO reality — he (Dr. Hynek) will "take the wraps off" his personal files of good unexplained cases and make them public.

This information was phoned to us by another member of the News-Leader staff, who has never been in error during several years of relaying factual information. After the issue was out, he told us that, unknown to him at the time, the question had followed an "open" taping interview and that Dr. Hynek's reply was not intended for publication.

According to the newsman who interviewed Dr. Hynek, his actual answer was:

"Some very interesting things would happen. I would make use of my personal file of good sightings."

In reporting this to us, the other newsman used the paraphrased expression "take the wraps off" — which we understood to be verbatim.

Regardless, the meaning and the intent are essentially the same. We did not misrepresent Dr. Hynek's answer as stated to us.

A careful study of Dr. Hynek's public views in the last two years shows that this answer is in full accordance with his stated views. He has repeatedly urged a complete, impartial scientific investigation. He has publicly revealed possession of a thousand unexplained sighting reports, many from specially qualified and responsible sources. Certainly, he could not in good conscience keep silent and withhold all this massive evidence if Dr. Condon's final report should label all witnesses as incompetent, deluded or frauds.

In spite of all this, Dr. Hynek has now denied making any such statement. In his letter — and an identical statement to the Denver Post — he stressed that it would be improper for him to try to influence the Project.

We clearly stated that this did not appear an attempt to influence Dr. Condon or others on the Project, since it was a spontaneous answer to the newsman's query.

We believe that this is Dr. Hynek's chief concern that Dr. Condon and others may construe his words as deliberate pressure. We have expressed our regrets to Dr. Hynek for causing him any embarrassment by unintentionally printing a private statement, and a copy of the letter will be sent to Dr. Condon.

We should like to point out that we have been very careful in quoting Dr. Hynek's statements in this two-year transition period. During this time, he has admitted changing from absolute rejection of UFO reports to seeing that a serious situation exists, requiring an impartial scientific investigation — which he freely admits the AF has not conducted.

Even earlier, when Dr. Hynek had a large part in the official debunking, we refrained from any sharp attacks, hoping that he would make a new, impartial and scientific investigation of the unexplained cases, and that this would win him over.

We repeat our regrets to Dr. Hynek that we unintentionally published a private statement. We hope this will not cause any shift in his often-repeated desire to have all the facts out in the open and to end evasive so-called "explanations" completely contrary to the truth.

If you have a membership card with the expiration symbol "IV-5" then you are due to renew before the next issue.

It is NICAP's plan to publish this complete set of Project Bluebook reports at \$5.00 per copy, if enough interest is shown by members. If you are interested, please let NICAP know as soon as possible.