



by courtesy of British Airways Photographic Services

A NEW RADAR-VISUAL UFO SIGHTING

British Airways "Trident" jet involved
see page 2

Editor CHARLES BOWEN

Consultants

GORDON CREIGHTON, MA, FRAI, FRGS, FRAS
C. MAXWELL CADE, AInstP, FRAS, AFRAeS, CEng, FIEE, FIERE
BERNARD E. FINCH, MRCS, LRCP, DCh, FBIS
CHARLES H. GIBBS-SMITH, MA, FMA, Hon Companion RAeS, FRSA
R. H. B. WINDER, BSc, CEng, FIMech E PERCY HENNEL, FIBP
I. GRATTAN-GUINNESS, MA, MSc, PhD

Overseas J. ALLEN HYNEK, PhD

AIME MICHEL

BERTHOLD E. SCHWARZ, MD

Assistant Editor EILEEN BUCKLE

An international journal devoted to the study of Unidentified Flying Objects

Vol. 22, No. 4
(published November 1976)

CONTENTS

UFO seen from "Trident" near Lisbon: Omar Fowler	2
The "Stonehenge" incidents of Jan. 1975 — Pt. 2: Ted Bloecher	5
Advice for Ufology: I. Grattan-Guinness	12
UFO-Helicopter Close Encounter over Ohio: Jennie Zeidman	15
Another Teleportation in Brazil:	20
Soaking Wet "Space Flight": Gordon Creighton	23
Astronomer's Surprise in Perseus: Robert A. Schmidt	24
Spies for the "Spacemen": Gordon Creighton	28
British Reports, old and new: Jenny Randles	30
Mail Bag	32
World Round-up	iii

© FSR Publications Ltd.

*Contributions appearing in this
magazine do not necessarily
reflect its policy and are
published without prejudice*

For subscription details and
address please see foot of
page ii of cover

IMPROVED REPORTING

OUR JOURNAL has always been fortunate in its contributors; people with something to say on the subject regularly jostle to have work accepted and published in our pages. These people know that if accepted, their reports, views or discoveries will be presented with care in a responsible journal, and that not only will they reach a small but select audience which specialises in the subject, but also will gain an entry into many prominent institutional libraries around the world. Possibly they also feel it is better that way than to have their work kicking around the news-stands as bait for a less critical audience.

Particularly noticeable during the last year or two has been the improving quality and variety of the investigations, and the relevant reports which have been sent to us. This has applied especially to reports from France, Belgium and Spain, to some from South America and, more recently, to a growing stream from the United States of America.

It has been a source of dismay, therefore, that with an occasional notable exception, there has been little of comparable quality from investigators in Britain. We have been subjected to "scientific" hoaxing (which, as far as we were concerned, served to underline our inability, as a purely spare-time publishing organisation, to find time both to edit this magazine and indulge in our own investigations), and to witness frantic publicity-seeking drives which invariably misfired. But while we have been grateful for the sterling efforts of friends like Peter Johnson, Jenny Randles and a handful of other conscientious investigators — who can in no way be blamed for the paucity of material, the shyness of ridicule-fearing witnesses or the squirrel-like activities of some other investigators — we have yearned for more of the detailed reports of in-depth investigations which we feel may be there for the asking.

Fortunately there is a chance that the tide may be on the turn. Omar Fowler and his colleagues of SIGAP have had a truly remarkable case drop into their laps, and they have treated it straight and with no nonsense, recording separate statements from each of the three main and highly-qualified witnesses. And what a case it turns out to be! Radar alert of UFOs from ground control at a major airport, with three air liners involved — two of them British Airways planes — followed by radar-visual observations by the crew on the flight deck of at least one of the aircraft, and visual observations by the passengers. All this, and a repeat mystery a couple of hours later when the same crew were making their return flight.

How did Messrs. Omar Fowler, Richard Beet and their colleagues come to know of this?

For the simple, but effective, reason that they had set up a system of communication with the public, particularly that elusive and hidden public which undergoes a UFO experience, and is then unable to find anyone who will listen sympathetically and responsibly to their story. That system consists of two essentials: first, a telephone directory entry under "Unidentified Flying Objects": secondly, an entry in the telephone directory's "Yellow Pages" of small advertisements. One of

the pilots of the British Airways *Trident* airliner involved in the incident over Portugal saw the Yellow Pages entry. Knowing that passengers in his jet liner who had seen the phenomenon might conceivably "leak" a garbled story to the press, and wishing to get the record straight, he called Mr. Fowler on the

telephone. The rest followed.

At the time of writing this Editorial (late October 1976) the incident has not been publicised by the mass media, so the report is something of a major success for Mr. Fowler and his team.

UFO SEEN FROM "TRIDENT" NEAR LISBON

British Airways Jetliners involved with ground control in a remarkable radar-visual case

Omar Fowler

WE have interviewed the Captain, and the first and second officers of a *Trident 2* (G-AVFG) following their reported UFO sighting off the coast of Portugal on the evening of Friday July 30, 1976. The officers have asked for their full names to be withheld.

The Skipper, Captain D.W., who has been flying for British Airways for 20 years and has more than 10,000 hours of flying to his credit, describes the incident:—

"We were about 40 miles south of Lisbon when Lisbon Control (Air Traffic) called up a *TriStar* that was above us and said: 'We have reports of a UFO. Could you confirm the sighting?' We looked up and there, sure enough at 90°, was this very bright light; I drew a sketch as we flew along. The time at night was 2000 GMT, nine o'clock local time. It was still light, the sun had just set, there was no cloud, and we could still see the ground. The crescent moon could be seen, but it was daylight to all intents and purposes at 29,000 feet.

"(As) we looked up, there was this brilliantly white, incredibly bright object. Relative to us, it was at 90° and looked about 30° in elevation. It was an incredible thing to see just sitting there, so I said (to his crew), I think we will just tell the passengers, so I made a cabin address and said: 'If you look on the starboard side, you will see what we believe to be a UFO.'

"Then as we were looking, a long cigar-shaped, or sausage-shaped brown affair appeared below it and to the starboard side of it. It just materialised, just appeared there, and then another one appeared next to it. Certainly, I saw this very bright light which Lisbon had asked me to confirm and the *TriStar* had already said: 'Yes, we have this UFO in sight.' I confirmed that (to Control) and I said: 'There is no way that this is a star or planet.' This is all on tape.

"We saw the bright one for eight minutes, but (as for) the other two, I think the first one appeared two minutes later and the third one at the same time. It was then that I thought I was looking at something very unreal. I think the bright light was fascinating, but the other things were also extraordinary, and something that I cannot possibly explain. It certainly was not natural. If natural is what I have been

Mr. Fowler is Chairman of the Surrey Investigation Group on Aerial Phenomena (SIGAP), and he and members of his team, being alerted to the remarkable events described herein, were fortunate in being able to tape interviews with the Skipper and co-pilots of one of the three airliners involved. This report, transcribed from the tapes, has been sent to FSR, and to BUFORA with which SIGAP is affiliated, for publication.

EDITOR

accustomed to for the past twenty years, then this was not natural and the other members of the crew agreed with me.


"Apart from ourselves and the *TriStar*, there was also a T.A.P. (Portuguese State Airline) 727. I had been speaking to the *TriStar* Captain, and then the T.A.P. pilot started speaking to Lisbon and it was then that they said they were going to "scramble" some fighters. Whether they did so or not I don't know, but they were getting excited about it and completely blocked the "air" (radio band). This was difficult as we wanted descent clearance. Finally we were able to clear with Faro (airport).

The first officer, C.T., who has been flying for 20 years, including 12 years as a Royal Air Force fighter pilot, recorded his version of the events, and his impressions:—

"The *Trident 2* aircraft (C-AVFG) flying from London to Faro on Friday July 30, 1976, was in a position 08° 30' W., 38° S., just South East of Lisbon at 29,000 ft., heading 195°. The speed was 500 knots, the time 2000 GMT.

"It was a beautifully clear sky, a newish moon had appeared and the sun was setting. A very bright light appeared, well above the horizon, bearing 30° from our position. The light was really incredibly bright; dazzling and very large indeed. Its shape was very difficult to discern. Rather like an enormous headlamp in the sky. It was not a star, planet or satellite.

"Whilst watching this light an incredible occurrence was witnessed. At a much lower level, a large rectangular object suddenly materialised. It



The sketch made by the Captain of the *Trident* during the course of his sighting

had the appearance of a thick, foreshortened condensation trail. The periphery was of a vapourish appearance and coloured, probably by the setting sun. The centre was very dark, solid looking, somewhat cigar-like and appeared stationary.

"Approximately 30 seconds later another of these objects suddenly appeared just behind the first. I watched the objects continuously for some five minutes: they appeared to be stationary although the shape did alter slightly, probably due to our own Southward progress. They were not aircraft condensation trails: vapour was present, but it was all embracing the dark centres. I was under the impression that a third one appeared underneath the second but couldn't swear to it.

"Another light then appeared at 'seven o'clock' (relative position) to the headlamp, but was lower on the horizon, not so intense, and maybe unrelated to this situation.

"The sighting was also observed by a British Airways *TriStar* en-route to Faro, and by Portuguese Airlines. The Portuguese controller became very

excited and talked about sending up fighters to have a look. Whether they did or not I don't know.

"I have been flying at high altitude now for 20 years, 12 of them in the RAF, and have never witnessed the like of this before."

The second officer, S.S., has been flying for five years. Confirming that the *Trident* G-AVFG was flying from London to Faro, Portugal, on the evening of July 30, 1976, he went on:—

"The first we saw of the object was when 'Air Traffic' called up to the *TriStar* that was right above us and said that they had a 'contact' at about 3 o'clock (area of the sky) and was there anything there? So we turned around (in our seats) and had a look. There, at 3 o'clock or slightly higher, was this bright light. It was daylight and the sun was setting, and it certainly appeared to have form rather than being a point source. It was far too bright to be a star, or anything explainable, no matter what effects the atmosphere may have had.

"We watched this thing for a while and then, below it to the right, a fat sausage shape appeared,

then behind that another one appeared. I am not sure about those; the thing that was totally unexplained was the light. The sausage shape could at a stretch of the imagination have been contrails caused by an aircraft, but they were too short and besides that they could only have been made by a very large aircraft, or whatever, and in any case the atmosphere was very dry and there were no contrails being produced by any aircraft, so it is very unlikely that it was a contrail.

"Really that is all there was. This thing, the light, was stationary but I wouldn't like to say what happened to the brown things as they were getting further away all the time behind us.

"We carried on down over the coast, turned in to descend and could still see the light in the distance.

"The thing that interested me was the light, for it was totally inexplicable. I have a Physics degree, so I am not completely 'lay' about it.

"Anyway we came back to London Airport and reported it to 'Air Traffic' and filled out a report on the UFO forms.

"The light was of several orders of magnitude brighter than any star. As far as I am concerned it wasn't any star; it was a very bright white light.

* * * * *

The crew questioned the passengers at Faro Airport after the landing. Nobody had had a camera available, but one witness had binoculars, and had viewed the bright light. He described seeing an object like "crinkled silver paper" in the middle of the light.

Return flight radar surprise


After the initial contact made on the flight from London to Faro (Portugal) at 2000 GMT on July 30, 1976, the aircraft landed, refuelled and took off for the return flight to London the crew decided to switch on the radar and scan the area where the initial contact had been made...

Here is Captain D.W.'s report:—

"We took off an hour and a quarter later. We came up to this area (of the sighting) again — we had a note of the Latitude and Longitude on a card — and I decided I would turn on the Radar. I tilted the Radar. It is in the nose of the aircraft and can be tilted up and down.

"To see aeroplanes on the Radar, you really have to know where they are. For instance, we saw the *TriStar* going down, because we knew exactly where it was. We knew it was two minutes ahead, so we were able to look about eighteen miles ahead on the Radar scanner; you could see a tiny speck, and that was the *TriStar*.

"I turned on the Radar and in the same position where we had seen these objects. I got a return with the Radar at 5° tilt up. I was climbing through 28,000 ft., going for 31,000 ft. With the Radar 5° tilt up, it scans then from about the lateral attitude of the aeroplane upwards. First I got this big 'Blip' and then a couple of others close to it. The big 'Blip' was much bigger than any ship I have ever



seen..." (Question...by ship, you mean an aircraft?)

"No, I mean a ship, because you can pick up the ships as you come over the Channel. They produce much bigger 'Blips' than aeroplanes do. I know how big these things are and a ship, say a big tanker, a 200,000 ton tanker, would produce a 'Blip' an eighth of an inch long. This thing (the Radar Blip) was three times...at least three times as big as that, and then there were others that were not as clear. You had this sort of elliptical image on the Radar screen which was just solid, and there was no way that this could have been an aeroplane, there was no question of that. The lights in the cockpit were dimmed and there was just a backdrop of stars; the moon did not seem to be around anymore, there were just stars and nothing to see at all.

"We had the Radar return at 20 miles, and stationary, and we passed climbing. Gradually they disappeared on the starboard side, which is what one would have expected, as that is where they were and the closest that we reckon we got was seven miles. As the image gets close to the bottom of the Radar screen, it gets rather diffused and you can't really read it, but that was the last straw as far as I was concerned. It was a good Radar — they vary a bit — but this was a good one. At night of course you can see the Radar screen very much better than you can during the day. Because the lighting in the cockpit is very dim, you can read the details much more clearly and that's about it..."

First officer C.T. stated:—

"On the way back, it was dark, very dark, (although) quite clear with a completely cloudless sky. We thought we would have a look on the Radar when in the same position (as the earlier sighting) so when we got within about 50 miles, we turned the Radar on and pitched it up. Of course we were still climbing and blow me if we didn't get some enormous returns on the 20 miles scale. There were

(Continued on page 19)

THE "STONEHENGE" INCIDENTS OF JANUARY 1975

PART 2: THE EVENTS

Ted Bloecher

Based on investigations by Budd Hopkins, Jerry Stoehrer and the author, this is the complete account of a paper presented at the CUFOS Conference at Lincolnwood, Illinois on April 30, 1976

THE FIRST PART of this report was a general account of events in the early part of 1975, their later "unveiling" and investigation, and subsequent UFO reports in the area of the "Stonehenge" Apartments, a prominent tower block in North Bergen, way across the Hudson River from Manhattan, New York City. I will now relate the original events in detail.

II: Events in January 1975

The following four reports of UFO experiences all occurred in the same locality and within one week of each other. Two of these reports are most certainly independent corroborations of the same event. The chronological order in which they occurred presents an excellent example of the escalation of strangeness: the first example, of the observation of a structured object several hundred feet over the site, does not qualify as a close encounter by the strictest definition; the second experience by multiple witnesses, on the other hand, is a classic example of a Close Encounter, Type I; the third example, in which a near-landed object was seen at the same time that striking physical effects took place, qualifies as a Close Encounter, Type II; the final example, which appears to be the same object seen at even closer range, involved a group of small, sample-gathering occupants and is an example of the Close Encounter, Type III. These four reports, of course, did not come to our attention in the order in which they actually occurred, as they are presented here.

The following narrative accounts by the witnesses are excerpts from taped interviews conducted by the investigators. These statements have been edited and re-arranged to present an orderly sequential of each incident, as it occurred at the time. Complete transcriptions of all tape-recorded interviews are on file with the Center for UFO Studies and the Mutual UFO Network. In addition, a complete set of all transcripts are in the personal files of the investigators.

1: The Gonzalez Sighting, January 6, 1975

The earliest appearance in North Hudson Park of a UFO in 1975, so far as we can determine, occurred on the morning of January 6. The observer was 39-year-old Francisco Gonzalez, a Cuban emigre living with his family in West New York. At that time, Gonzalez was employed by Stonehenge as a

part-time doorman. His schedule for duty was on Monday mornings, from midnight until 8.00 a.m. On January 6 at approximately 2.30 a.m., the doorman was on duty in the lobby:

"I was standing at my desk, right? Looking out, almost beside the door, in front of me, when I saw that thing."

The large 8 x 9 plate glass window is to the left of the front door. The doorman was amazed to see a sizeable object hovering motionless several hundred feet above the playing field some 200 yards west of the building.

"I saw something round," he told me in our telephone conversation on January 29, 1976. "It was very bright, with square windows. I was really shocked!" Not believing his eyes, the doorman stepped over to the lobby entrance to examine the object more closely. "I was standing in the door without opening it and I saw this thing very clear — the bottom of the object." He said it was at an elevation of approximately 45 degrees, was circular in plan-form with the windows around the perimeter, and had a flat bottom that was brightly illuminated. Observing from below, Gonzalez was unable to describe the top of the object. He compared its angular size to that of the full moon.

After a minute or so, Gonzalez went outside to the driveway for a better look. "When I opened the door, I heard that sound," he told Hopkins and Stoehrer in their February 1 interview. "Then I was *really* shocked!" He said the sound was unlike any conventional aircraft, and compared it to the "buzzing or humming" of a bee, going "straight into your ear" and creating a vibrating sensation in the inner ear. It was such a "heavy sound," he said, that he thought "it was going to wake up everybody" in the building.

After several minutes, the object began to ascend slowly, going straight up. "Not like a helicopter," he said, "and *not* like a plane, no-no. *Straight* up! And I said to myself, 'My God!'" Disturbed by what he saw and heard, he went back into the lobby and tried to call the Stonehenge security guard, "but he wasn't there. He was down in the garage looking at the boiler." In the meantime, the object gradually rose out of the doorman's line of vision in the lobby. When he reached the security guard, Alberto Perez, the latter did not take him seriously: by the time he was finally persuaded to go out into the street, the object was gone. Gonzalez estimated he had seen it from four to five minutes. In a telephone


interview with Perez in February, the security guard affirmed the doorman's report but admitted that by the time he got to the street the object had disappeared.

Gonzalez had been impressed by three things: the bright light on the bottom of the object, the lighted windows and the penetrating sound. He told the investigators that he had been able to see short sections that separated the windows, "like a frame." He said six to eight windows were visible from his angle, each of which emitted a yellowish light. The bottom was a bright white light without any apparent source.

Apart from the security guard, the only person he mentioned the sighting to at the time was his wife. "You know, I got home at eight o'clock next morning, and I explained to her what I saw. But I never talked to nobody else." Gonzalez *did*, in fact, tell one other person about one week later: after the accident with the lobby window, he mentioned his sighting to the building superintendent, Bernard Mydland. Mydland, in turn, told his assistant, Amaury Perez, who took over as superintendent some time later, recalled the incident during our January 25 interview with doorman Bill Daliz, and he referred us to the observer at that time.

The doorman's description of the object is similar to the object seen by others less than a week later. The odd noise, the object's flat bottom, and its "windows" around the perimeter were features of other sightings that Gonzalez knew nothing about. There is no reasonable possibility of collusion amongst the various witnesses. Gonzalez did not even know of George O'Barski until more than a year later, nor had he ever heard of the Wamsley family. He was, of course, acquainted with Bill Pawlowski, but they were not close friends and neither mentioned his UFO experience to the other. While Gonzalez knew of the accident to the window, he did not associate it with a UFO, and understood that it was believed to have been broken by vandals. It is this element of silence and containment that argues persuasively against the possibility of a hoax, or of a fabricated report.

The date of the sighting was based on the witness's recollection of the fact that it occurred in early January. He was certain that it had been before the lobby window was broken; since his schedule was for Monday morning duty, the only possible date is January 6. Independent corroboration came from



Sighting of January 6, 1975: Francisco Gonzalez's drawing

Amaury Perez, who recalled being told about the sighting about the time the window was broken, and Gonzalez himself told us that he had spoken to Bernard Mydland about a week after it happened.

2. Close Encounter in West New York, January 11


The second incident of the January 1975 series was a low-level Close Encounter, Type I, by a family of five at a location 12 blocks south of North Hudson Park. Following Jerry Stoehrer's talk for the Robert Fulton School PTA in North Bergen, on March 25, on the subject of the Stonehenge incidents, he was approached by 12-year-old Robert Wamsley, who told of a UFO sighting by his whole family. Stoehrer also spoke to his mother, Mrs. Alice Wamsley, the only other family member present at the meeting. Preliminary information was obtained at the time and Stoehrer interviewed all who were involved on March 27 and April 1, 1976. The sighting had taken place at the family's former residence at 67th Street and Boulevard East, in West New York. Robert Wamsley saw the object first:

"It was about 9.30 [p.m.], and I usually look out the window and look at the stars; and I saw something that was about 30 yards off the ground, above a three-storey building — just almost looked like it was going to land on the building. It stopped above the building and it hovered for about two minutes, and I told my brother, my mother and my father. They saw it, really got a good look at it; and then it moved — coasted along so — and then it went past the building and you couldn't see it any more, so we ran outside. And then we saw it moving down this way (toward North Hudson Park—TB). It had like a dome on the top of it, lit up, like a fading white and green light; and then there was the round shape. On the bottom it had like four-by-eight lights, a rectangle shape. We saw there were windows, and the lights were in them, going around. They looked like colours, like blue, red, green, all mixed together, and they went around the ship. It hovered for awhile, and then it moved, coasted; and then it went toward the Boulevard, and then it went out of sight, so we ran downstairs. There was like a humming sound, and when it went away, we couldn't hear it any more. It was warm out, and we saw it going down toward the 'round house' (Stonehenge), and then we lost sight of it."


Robert's mother, Alice Wamsley, was the next person to see the object: "My son was looking out of the window with his binoculars at the stars... I thought he was all excited about a star. I go to the window and I couldn't believe what I saw myself. I said, 'Robert,' and he said, 'Mommy, that's a flying saucer,' and I said 'I know, I know!' We saw the shape of a saucer and could see the windows, and you could see this thing that's going around. You know what it is right away because the way the lights are revolving... It's not flying straight, like a plane; that is going — like, *up*. (It's) doing a funny thing, like a 'hmmm,' and it looked like it was right on top of the three storey building. I couldn't believe what I was seeing! And the lights




1.



2.




3.



4.

Sighting by Joseph Wamsley's family on Saturday January 11, 1975, at West New York, New Jersey. Drawings as indicated:

1. by Robert Wamsley;
2. by Mrs. Alice Wamsley;
3. by Joseph Wamsley, Sr;
4. by Debbie Wamsley;
5. by Joseph Wamsley, Jr.



5.

were gorgeous, and I think there's a dome... it was not a very bright light, the lights came from the ship itself, but the dome was a reflection. It could have been a reflection from the lights going around. There was a lot of windows, and they were not big — they were like square, oblong. They go right around the whole ship — that was where all the action was, on the top. It kept rotating around, a whole row of lights all different colours, and that's beautiful. I wanted to get a better look... because it was going above the building, and I had no shoes on, I'd just a bathrobe. It was not that cold, thank God, as it usually is in January. My husband and my children, we ran down, across Boulevard East, by the river, and it was all windy from the river. It was headed for the park. The building blocked it and you couldn't see it any more."

Mr. Wamsley got to the window too late to see it from inside. "Bob saw it and called me, and then we went across the street and I caught the end of it (It was) like a flying saucer. It was round — say, from a distance, three foot high, maybe five foot high. It had a dome, a round dome, and was all lit up... Then it went over by this 'round house,' and that was the end." He had seen it only for a minute, he said, and described its movement as "very slow, coasting nice and easy." The object had windows, Mr. Wamsley told Stoeher. "They were small and they were long — they were like longer than they were wide. They went around the whole ship." He added that the rotating lights were of all colours, and they revolved around the base of the object.

Joseph, Jr., 16, had seen it only from the window and did not go outside with the others. "My brother said he seen something; we looked out the window

and I seen a — you know, it looked like a flying saucer. It had some lights, red and white, and it was spinning. I seen some windows in front. (They were) square.” He said that the spinning lights were “underneath the windows,” and described the top of the object as “roundish.”

13-year-old Debbie Wamsley said, “My brother called me, ‘cause he was looking out the window, and he says, ‘Ma, there’s a UFO.’ My mother didn’t believe him. And then... we all ran downstairs to look at it. It was roundish, and had lights revolving at the bottom.” Debbie also described the windows as “not square, but rectangular,” taller than they were wide. “It was going straight and was heading for the park. It went behind something and then I couldn’t see it.”

These five accounts contain minor discrepancies and some ambiguity. It is not certain, for example, that the “windows” and the revolving lights are separate features. Even so, there is sufficient consistency to conclude that an object with a domed top, rectangular “windows”, and emitting a humming sound, was seen at close quarters by a family of five; moreover, that an object of very similar description would again be seen in the same area only a few hours later lends even greater weight to the Wamsleys’ report.

All of the witnesses recalled that the sighting occurred just as the “Bob Newhart Show” was about to begin on television, confirming the night as Saturday, and the time as 9.30 p.m. The family recalled it as the middle of January, a month before Mr. Wamsley’s birthday (on February 12). As mentioned by several family members, the night was mild. Their choice of dates was January 11. A check of the *New York Times* weather data tells us that the temperature on January 11, 1975, hit an all-time high of 63 degrees. At 9.30 p.m., on January 4, it was 39 degrees; on Saturday, January 18, at the same hour, it was 42 degrees.

3. The Saucer and the Broken Window, January 12

Early on Sunday morning, January 12, William Pawlowski was on duty as doorman at the Stonehenge Apartments. “I was working like from 4 o’clock in the afternoon to the following morning till 8 o’clock, almost 16 hours. On Saturday, a lot of people go shopping, that’s how I remember; and

I was working for Eddy (Obertubessing, head doorman) at the time, because that was his day off.


“Now, around that time — say about 2.30, maybe 3.00 — I’m standing at the desk... The window’s here and the door’s over there. I’m looking up at the hill and I see all these lights up there, and they were so bright that you couldn’t look. It was like looking into the sun, you know? It’s always dark up there — *always* dark, and they were so bright that I was wondering, at that time of morning, what the hell’s coming off here?

“Then I ignored them because I figured perhaps (it was) a bunch of cars up there. I had to make a call so I turned around; I was looking up one of the tenants’ telephone numbers at the time. My back was to the window. Then I got the number, closed the book and put it down, and picked up the phone. The phone is not behind the desk, but on the wall, over here.

“I’m standing there, on the phone, looking up at the hill at all these lights up there and I thought it was a string of cars, you know? But apparently it wasn’t, because the lights were too high. I’d say about ten feet off the ground. I was on the phone and I’m thinking to myself, How the devil can that be, so high up in the air? That is impossible — either that or my eyes are tired, or something, you know? I mean, it was ten feet up in the air! This is what I couldn’t figure out, you know? Now this is just a guess, but there were eight to ten (lights), and it looked like they were spaced apart about two, maybe three feet, in a round circle. I’ll tell you the truth: this thing gave me the idea that it was a flying saucer.”

Pawlowski said the lights appeared to be fixed around the edge of a dark object not clearly seen behind the glare, but definitely round and wider than it was high — perhaps 20 feet wide. Asked about the shape of the individual lights, Pawlowski replied, “The way I pegged them was round, that’s why they gave me the idea they looked like. Maybe it was a different shape, because, you know, when you’ve got a light, it could be an angled-job (square—TB) and still give off a circular glare. I mean to the human eye, it’s like an optical illusion.

“I’m talking to the tenant and I’m looking up there, thinking to myself, That looks like a flying saucer! Now, all of a sudden, bingo! I hear a noise — it sounded like a ‘boom!’ I said: ‘What the hell was



Sighting of January 12,
1975: William
Pawlowski's sketch

that?' Then I looked down and saw the glass, you know? Shattered. I says to the party; 'I'll call you back.' I put the phone down right away and checked the window. The lower corner of the window by the door, right in the corner, was shattered. I'd say the cracks were a foot, maybe a foot and a half long. I bent down, like this, and I looked at it. Then I looked up and the lights were gone.

"I went outside, and it's got a little nick out of it (the window—TB). It looked like the size of a marble, like a piece was nicked right out, out of the outside. It didn't go all the way through. This is what puzzled me, see? I thought maybe it might be kids outside throwing rocks, or something like that, you know? Then I stopped to figure, how in the heck are they gonna throw it over the wall that high from the street, down below? So I threw that one out, and then I remembered this thing on the top of the hill, so I figured either somebody was up there with a rifle, you know, taking pot-shots... But then when I figured the angle — the wall, and the corner of the window — it'd be impossible. Now, you figure for it to be down here, it's utterly impossible with a rifle, because I got down and looked. (You can't see the top of the hill because of the wall—TB.) Now, when I stand by the wall, the wall is that high; it'd be utterly impossible to turn around and put a bullet in the corner of the window, so it had to be something higher up in the air. It had to be something higher than the top of that hill! I searched the area, the whole street there (the drive-way—TB); I had a flashlight, and I didn't find anything. So I called the cops.


"Matter of fact, when the cops came down, I said; 'Hey, why don't you go up on the top of the hill and check?' I says: 'Maybe there's somebody up there with a rifle, or something like that. I says: 'I seen a flash of lights up there, maybe there's a bunch of kids up there with a — you know, with cars, or what-not. But I don't want to tell them, you know, the damn thing was ten feet off the ground, because, they'd say, this guy's either cracking up, or he's drinking the wrong kind of booze. So the cop says: 'Well, maybe they're gone by now, you know?' Just like that! He let it slide and just wrote up the broken glass, cause unknown, and that was that.

"I told (Police Lieutenant Al) del Gaudio that I had seen lights. He works at the police station but he lives in the Stonehenge with his wife and son. So he told me, if anything ever happens down there, just call him, you know? So, when I seen him in the morning, I talked to him about it."

Then there was the damaged elm tree, across the street from the apartment building. Pawlowski told us about it: "They got a big tree over here, and that tree is maybe a hundred, or a hundred and a half (years—TB). That thing was split right down the middle. I don't know if that happened at the same time, but it was around the same time. Because Sunday morning, at 8 o'clock when I got off work, I went across the street to the bus stop, waiting for the bus, and I noticed this tree was split, split right down the middle, and I was thinking to myself, it would take a lot of lightning to do that, you know? This is the same morning, and I'll never forget that because it was such a nice tree, you know?"

Two significant points stand out in Pawlowski's account. The first has to do with the trajectory of a rifle bullet: from the top of the hill it is not possible to see the lower half of the lobby window because of the driveway wall; any bullet fired from that spot would have to be fired from a height of well over six feet to miss the top of the wall and hit the glass near the floor. The second significant point is the fact that the chip at the impact point on the glass was missing from the outside of the window. Any normal physical impact from the outside world would drive the fragment in the direction of the impact in this case, nicking out a chip from the inside.

The date of the Pawlowski sighting was based upon the observer's own recollection; he was certain that it could not have been later in the month, as he was ill with pneumonia at that time. It could not have been earlier, as it would conflict with Gonzalez's testimony regarding his earlier sighting. But most important, Pawlowski's testimony coincides so agreeably with details provided by George O'Barski regarding his own sighting at the same spot, that the likelihood of two separate events is far less compelling than that of a single occurrence seen by two independent observers.



George O'Barski's drawing, done with the assistance of Budd Hopkins

4. A Classic Sample-Gathering Operation

George O'Barski works the graveyard shift at his liquor store in New York City — that is, he comes in at 6.00 p.m., closes the store around midnight, spends an hour or more checking stock and taking inventory, then locks up and drives back to North Bergen around 2.00 a.m. His movements are almost carbon copies from day to day and so far as he can remember, there was nothing different about the night of his close encounter in North Hudson Park with a UFO and its occupants.


It was George's custom to drive to a nearby all-night diner for a late snack before returning home. To get there, he'd drive through North Hudson Park to avoid traffic lights. On this night in January 1975, he had barely turned into the park when his radio began to emit heavy static. He slowed down to fiddle with it, grumbling to himself about the anticipated high cost of repair. His left-hand window was half-open, as it was a mild night. The radio then cut out altogether, just as other things began to happen:

"I heard this damn noise. I thought: 'What the hell was that? No trucks (are) allowed in here...' and I saw over my (left) shoulder this — thing coming.

It looked like a great big pancake that had puffed up, you know? It was flat, I would say, maybe six feet high, and the thing landed, right in front of me, in the park!

"There's some trees there (along the sidewalk on the left—TB)... It landed just the other side of the trees. Then when I came ahead, there's an opening there, and Jeez! I seen 'em there, you know? I seem 'em, people come right down!... It came in about ten feet off the ground, and that's when they came out, and then it settled to the ground... but the little guys came out before the rest came down.

"It was off the ground, and I seen this thing come down like a stairway, or ladders — I don't know what the hell it was — and I seen all these guys come down... like kids coming down a fire escape. I'd guess, in round figures, ten — might have been eight, nine, eleven. They were short! Maybe three and a half feet tall... and they had helmets on, or something. I couldn't see their faces... But you could see their arms — they had gloves on, I could see that. The whole thing was a uniform, or something... It was dark (in colour). And they had feet, legs same as any other person — only they were short!



Sketch showing the sequence of events on the night of George O'Barski's close encounter at North Hudson Park

"They had these little shovels... like a handle on, like little bags, and they had these little shovels... might have been large spoons, or something — and they were working like little beavers, you know? All over the ground... Well, they filled these little bags up... There was light all through there because there were a lot of windows all the way around, like slits... maybe a foot wide, six to eight inches, and spaced apart about a foot, a foot and a half.

"It was three minutes and they must've scooted up. As I say, they got out before it landed, got filled up, and by the time it landed they were able to get back in, right? and they took off. It was that quick. I hear this droning, you know? And I notice this thing — it just took off... and there was no propellers on it, or nothing! It just seemed to float, but boy! it went just like that!... It wasn't a big, loud noise, it was a drone... that quiet hum... it was just like part of the air. Just like something blowing on the wind!

"All I know is to get the hell out of that park. I was goddam scared. I was scared to death! I figured the goddam world had come to an end, or something. I didn't know what to think. I thought, Man, either I'm going crazy, or something's awful wrong going on there, you know?... You know, even after I got through the part, (if) I seen a cop I wouldn't've said a thing!"

George forgot the late snack and headed straight for home. "I was sweating and I immediately made some tea. I thought, Jeez, I don't even wanna stay up — I'm scared! I went to bed — I was *that* scared. I pulled the covers over my head! I got up and took two aspirins... And I went back the next day. I thought I was dreaming. I went back there and there were all these little holes in the ground. They were about four inches, five inches wide, and six inches deep. I'll tell you something: I even felt the holes, you know? Because I didn't believe it looking at them... When I saw the holes, I was even more scared! I came home and drank some more tea. Then my son was asking me, several times during the day, 'You look awful upset.' So I told him what happened. He says to me, 'Well, I'll tell you: if anyone else had told me that, I'd figure they were drunk or something. But you don't drink.' He says, 'man, you must've seen something!' I says, 'I sure did!... I went over there and I seen them holes!'"

Intrigued by his father's story, Frank O'Barski went to the park to see the holes for himself. Ten months later, at the site with the witness, we were

able to find 12 to 15 small triangular spots in thick, untrampled earth where the sod-roots and all was missing. Each spot was slightly depressed, and the effect was exactly what one would expect after ten months: while rain had gradually refilled the holes, the roots still had not grown back into the spots.

In that first visit to the site with George O'Barski, we were able to get additional details on many points of his encounter not covered in his first taped interview with Budd Hopkins. He drove through incident step by step, providing a reliable timetable, and he clarified a number of details regarding the description of the UFO. For example, O'Barski said he saw several antenna-like projections standing straight up above the dome. The sides of the object, he explained, were approximately six feet high, with another two or three feet at the highest point of the dome. He said the colour of the object was dark, or black, and he described another "window," or foot-wide band of light, that encircled the object where the sides and the dome met; this emitted the same incandescent-coloured light as the vertical panels around the sides. The doorway from which the occupants emerged was on the side of the object facing George's closest position; it opened inward and was in complete darkness, about as wide as two of the vertical "windows." The object did not descend all the way to the ground, but came down to about four feet, at which time the figures quickly re-entered in pairs. They looked like "little kids in snowsuits," according to O'Barski, complete with shoes or boots that did not appear to be separate from the rest of the uniform. The covering over their heads was more like a ski-hood than an actual helmet. O'Barski said that the humming noise was more pronounced during the arrival and departure of the object, and he compared it to "a refrigerator that's starting up."

George O'Barski was unable to provide a specific date in January for his encounter. The similar details described independently by Bill Pawlowski, such as the time of night, the precise locale, height from the ground, number and position of windows, its general shape and size, and the duration, all argue persuasively for a single occurrence involving two separate witnesses. In addition, the description of the weather conditions by O'Barski is consistent with the weather data for January 11/12, 1975, as obtained from the *New York Times* (see table).

(continued on page 31)

Weather data for January 11/12, 1975

Time	Temp.	Hum.	Winds	Barom.	Data for Jan. 11	Jan. 12
9 p.m.	63	93	SW 10	29.89	Sunrise: 7.19 a.m.	7.18 a.m.
10 p.m.	62	93	SW 12	29.92	Sunset: 4.47 p.m.	4.48 p.m.
11 p.m.	61	87	SW 9	29.94		
Midnight	58	64	NW 9	29.96	Moonrise: 6.33 a.m.	7.11 a.m.
1 a.m.	59	46	NW 10	29.99	Moonset: 4.24 p.m.	5.23 p.m.
2 a.m.	56	38	NW 8	30.04		
3 a.m.	55	35	NW 10	30.06	The moon was new on January 12, 1975.	
4 a.m.	52	38	NW 7	30.07		

ADVICE FOR UFOLOGY

I. Grattan-Guinness

Dr. Grattan-Guinness, Departmental Head of Mathematics at a Technological Institute, and Editor of the journal *Annals of Science*, is also an Editorial Consultant and Director of FSR.

THE value of aphorisms. (1) Ufology is still an immature field, despite all the effort devoted to it. Thus it is not yet in the condition to be cast into the form of universal or statistical laws. Instead we have to resort to aphorisms,¹ disconnected clues and hints from which more systematic ideas may one day emerge. The notes below take the form of extended aphorisms on a range of questions to which ufology in some respect seems to relate. Probably none of the comments is original, but as a collection they may make a contribution.

2. The logic of explanation; knowns and unknowns. It is commonly held among scientists and philosophers that scientific theories explain the unknown in terms of the known. Probably this view relates to the chronological fact that theories are created in a 'known' problem-context and later may be applied to new, 'unknown' contexts. But it is not a correct description of scientific knowledge itself, for there the opposite applies: a scientific theory *per se* explains knowns in terms of unknowns, undefined concepts and relationships between them.² Criticisms of ufology are often based on the belief in the passage from unknowns to knowns, and they can be rebuffed from this point of view.

Unknowns tend to be more abstract than the knowns they explain, and as new theories convert old unknowns into new knowns, the new unknowns may well be more abstract still. Thus, in particular, an explanation of (some aspects of) ufology may rely on ideas which are even more abstract, and *not* less so, than the UFO phenomena themselves. Thus the hopes for clarity to which ufologists look forward in an explanation could be unfounded.

3. The philosophical complexity of science. There are at least three factors involved in the interpretation of a scientific theory.³ There are the sense-data, which we can call 'the appearances.' Then there are the laws which the appearances are said to obey; they are the stuff of theories, and are often referred to as 'laws of nature.' Finally, there is the way things are, whatever that is; for this we assign the word 'ontology.'

A wide repertoire of interpretations of a scientific theory may be asserted in terms of these factors. For example, we may say that the purpose of a scientific theory is: to discover ontology, and show that it is of such-and-such a form; or to aim for ontology and perhaps even discover it by accident, but never be able to prove that such success has been achieved; or to aim only for laws of nature, and abandon ontology as God's business; or to organise appearances in the most simple or efficient manner

possible, where talk even of laws of nature, never mind ontology, is only a way of speaking; and so on.

Even these few examples show that a complex philosophical situation is at hand. What can it tell us about ufology? Firstly, theories about UFOs are subject to this range of interpretations, so that ufologists should ponder the issues involved in deciding between them. Secondly, scientists rarely think deeply about these interpretations, although they are inevitably involved with them; thus they often plump for a crude appearances-orientated interpretation of science, with an acceptance of only 'respectable' data and repeatable experiments, a worship of exactitude, a belief in invariant concepts with universal reference, and the assertion of the primacy of 'facts' and 'observations.' Yet some branches of science seem intrinsically statistical, exactitude involves theories of measurement, and 'facts' are actually heavily laden with theoretical considerations and even abstract concepts.

On this narrow philosophical base do scientists often dismiss ufology; the data is not reliable, the phenomena are hardly ever repeatable, and so on. Much of this type of criticism can be despatched by pointing out the same features manifesting in science itself. However, ufologists should also make more allowance for the *absorbing fascination* of scientific problems, and for the fact that scientists quite reasonably are often too preoccupied with their own interests to be bothered with ufology.

4. The training of scientists. The failure of scientists to think about the philosophy of their work is largely due to the fact that they are not encouraged to do so during their under- and post-graduate training. Instead they receive rote learning of 'perfect' theories which fall from the sky into printed books, and then proceed to equally rote research along lines laid down in great detail by their superiors.⁴ When the research strays towards real originality, then they are often unable to handle the inevitable uncertainties that arise.

One case of this unfortunate situation is the extremely ahistorical character of scientific education. Students do not get the chance to realise that scientific theories are creative work (and often very disordered and unrigorous work too), that the historical background is essentially built in to current work (to disadvantage, sometimes), and that today's research is part of a continual historical process.

The narrow conception of scientific theories discussed in no. 3 arises largely from these defects in training, from *omissions* in science education as much as from any articulated creed. Ufologists

often see scientists' criticisms as part of a conscious programme, but I doubt it very much.⁵ The difficulties are graver still, in a way; they concern a cultural-mental block which cannot fully accommodate the tentative and imaginative character of science and simply *does not know* that the subject has always been like that.

5. The rise and decline of physics. Some potted history here; much too potted to escape criticism from specialists, I fear, but hopefully adequate for the current purpose. Newton stated his inverse square law of universal gravitation in the late 17th century and inaugurated the era of Newtonian mechanics, with its power to explain both planetary and terrestrial motion. In many respects his detailed exegesis was confused or unworkable, but his results laid the foundations of 18th century rational and celestial mechanics, which became the 'pace-setter' for other sciences to imitate. However, the efforts around the turn of the 18th and 19th centuries to absorb heat and optics, and then electricity and magnetism, into its realm were largely unsuccessful. Instead, physics was widened to accommodate these new areas and took over the mantle of pace-setter: some scientists tried to use energy as the unifying idea which Newton's law could no longer provide. Relativity and quantum mechanics required major revisions of conception in the early years of this century, but the status of physics was undiminished and indeed became further enhanced by the close association of physics with technology and engineering.

But in the last twenty years or so a significant change in status has occurred. Though still a vast enterprise and exciting in very many spheres, physics has lost much of its primacy to the biological and medical sciences (for which physicalistic explanations had been considered in the past).⁶ There the laws of nature are much less clear, and unifying concepts are not prominent. Even mathematics, which developed in intimate relation with the rise of physics, is now finding many of its most exciting applications in these newly prominent fields.⁷

6. Ufology as fringe science. The historical sketch in no. 5 relates to ufology in various ways. Firstly, when the subject became popular in 1947 the advocates asserted some kind of 'extra-terrestrial hypothesis'; that UFOs are machines, and that they visit us from afar. (It is sometimes overlooked that these two assertions are *independent* of each other, though both are usually asserted.) To this hypothesis the critics produced powerful arguments, showing how difficult it would be to reconcile the alleged evidence (type of motion, and size of object) with technological practicalities. The hypothesis seems reasonable — after all, what else non-natural but a machine can fly? — but I see its advocacy also as part of the dominance of physics in science. Similarly, the current move towards psychic interpretations (which I shall discuss in no. 7) may be seen as part of the swing away from physics. In other words, both kinds of explanation may have an element of fashionability embodied in them.

Another aspect of the decline of physics is that science may now be in an exciting if dangerous

state of development, in which some of even the most orthodox theories and reliable concepts are under severe attack, and previously 'fringe' areas come into prominence. The excitement lies in the novel prospects ahead; the danger is caused by the drift towards intellectual anarchy, in which the tried skills become redundant, the tasks are unclear, and the problems are too difficult.⁸

In my view ufology is one of these many fringe sciences. Thus it might well receive a more sympathetic reception from scientists, especially the younger ones. However, ufologists should realise that their subject is *only one* of these fringe areas, and abandon the extravagant claims that they sometimes make for it and the unjustified criticisms that they make of scientists' honest uninterest in it. Further, they must realise that if ufology progresses at all, then probably *the scientists will effect the progress concerned*.

This is a good time for ufologists and scientists to get together, but ufologists should make their approaches in a cautious manner. If some individual contacts are successfully established, then rather more formalised relationships might be attempted. Professor Hynek has led the way with his Center for UFO Studies, which has already held joint meetings with scientific organisations.

7. The psychic realm. For good or ill, the psychic aspects of ufology have lately come into great prominence. As a positive hypothesis psychism seems to be almost valueless, for despite much research we still know so little about it: its unknowns (in the sense of my no. 2 above) are more unknown than most, so that explanations of UFOs in its terms are particularly hazardous. Nevertheless, prominent witnesses such as Geller and Stella Lansing force the possible connections to be explored. Therefore ufologists might follow the progress made in the most thrusting areas of psychic research, even though no direct relationship with UFOs has yet been established. A pace-setter seems to be out-of-the-body experiences, and Eisenbud has made the appealing characterisation of UFOs as a sort of converse phenomenon, namely into-the-experience-bodies.⁹

Some of the important traditional work in ufology, such as statistical evaluations of UFO data, should also be borne in mind in this context. If any kind of repeatability of UFO phenomena is attained, then shielding experiments of the type well-known in psychic research might be attempted. Precognition could also be explored; at least, the examination of a case ought to include the recent past history of the eyewitness, and not just the duration of the alleged experience.

8. Miscellaneous matters.

8.1. The necessarily residual character of the UFO category — objects identified as unidentified — cause special problems. Without doubt it will not itself turn out to be a well-defined category, but need decomposition into sub-classes. At least four of these seem applicable: 'natural' phenomena (including camera faults), hoaxes, psychic projections, and machinery (of human and other origin).

8.2. Ethical aspects of the problem need attention,

especially when the witnesses are young persons or incomplete adult personalities (as they often are: why?) Even the category of fraud is not necessarily easy to establish, since the hoaxers may be attempting to imitate previous apparently genuine experiences. Their motives in perpetrating a hoax are worth considering, too; for they are *asking* for derision even if it is not justified! This is partly a psychological point and I now turn to some others.

8.3. The *degree* of hostility shown by critics is often surprisingly strong, especially when accompanied by a disinclination to consider the data being rejected. Ufology seems to unlock a deep-seated fear in some people. It might be worth considering other topics which similarly disclose phobias. One of these is the fear among many UFO witnesses of recalling their experience; maybe the experience resolves some tension. Perhaps even the ability to have such an experience is itself some kind of psychological defect.

8.4. Undoubtedly there is and always has been a great deal of suppression and mis-transmission of information in this field by public bodies,¹⁰ but I suspect that the conspiracy factor has been over-rated. Personally I doubt if the public bodies have much more in the way of explanation (in the sense of my no.2: data is another matter) than the civilians have. More attention should be given to the other kind of manipulation of the public: the unending effluent of trashy UFO books in sub-English with sensationalist claims amidst the inaccurate reportage. If ever a subject needed rescuing from its advocates, then ufology is the one.

Notes

1. In retreating to aphorisms for an immature field I follow the recommendation of J.R. Ravetz, *Scientific knowledge and its social problems* (1971, Oxford), 376.
2. I have discussed this matter in more detail in my 'Rationality and its limitations,' *FSR*, 19 (1973), no.5, 22-23.
3. I regard a theory here as already formed; many more factors are involved in its creation, but they are not under discussion here.
4. The degree of such rote training must be experienced to be believed. Repulsed by the rote character of my undergraduate mathematics degree course, I used to try to discover the interest of mathematics by questioning mathematics Ph.D. students about the details of their research. But my hopes were dashed, for I found it impossible to extract descriptions in other than the particular terms that these students used. Thus I could not construct a perspective within which their research could be sited, even though on several occasions it was clear that I had taken course, at a simpler level, in the same areas of mathematics.
5. However, a scientist might well hold specific views about his own subject and the manner of its future development. While this state of affairs will probably not directly affect his assessment of ufology, it can only tend further to constrain his conception of legitimate science.
6. This loss of status can actually be quantified in various ways. For example, the editor of a prestigious physics journal told me recently that its circulation had dropped by 60% in a decade. A particularly interesting point of contact between physics and life sciences was the apparent contradiction between the second law of thermodynamics and progressive evolution; see, for

example, J. Needham, *Time: the refreshing river* (1943, London), 207-232.

7. A particularly exciting example is catastrophe theory, the study of discontinuities in continuous regions. The very general foundations (in algebraic topology) allow for a wide range of applications, including to physics (I believe that the term 'catastrophe' in this context comes from metallurgy); but the major thrusts are in, for example, cell embryology, molecular biology and neurophysiology. Thom, *Structural stability and morphogenesis* (1975, New York) is the Bible, though it is very difficult to follow.
8. In a mature science problems appear to be manageable, and tasks are fairly clearly specified. However, the *means and techniques* that may be brought forward to fulfil these tasks can be controversial and even lead to new and unexpected fringe studies.
9. J. Eisenbud, 'The mind-matter interface', *J. Amer. Soc. Psych. Res.*, 69 (1975), 115-126 (p.121). The role of psychic phenomena in human affairs hinges on the view held on their subsumption under or exclusion from the range of biological activity; see, for example, ch. 9 ('Biology and telepathy') of Sir A. Hardy, *The living stream* (1965, London).
10. For an excellent account of such developments in the USA see D.M. Jacobs, *The UFO controversy in America* (1975, Bloomington, Indiana).

October, 1975

CENTER FOR UFO STUDIES

The Proceedings of the 1976 CUFOS Conference will be available in mid-December 1976.

334 single-spaced pages, 13 pages of black and white photographs. 35 pages as presented or distributed.

This is a limited edition, and as orders are required quickly, please send your remittance, \$15.00, as soon as possible.

924 Chicago Avenue, Evanston, Illinois 60202

New subscriptions are our life-blood, so . . .

PLEASE TELL YOUR FRIENDS ABOUT

FLYING SAUCER REVIEW

And if the name worries them, well everyone knows us as . . . FSR!

UFO – HELICOPTER CLOSE ENCOUNTER OVER OHIO

The Coyne Event of October 18, 1973: meteor or UFO?

Jennie Zeidman

THE "great autumn wave" of 1973 over the eastern United States produced several reports which have already become classics in the UFO literature. One of particular interest took place near Mansfield, Ohio, and involved an apparent "close encounter of the second kind"¹ between an Army Reserve helicopter and an unknown object. The very high Strangeness-Reliability rating² of this case and some controversy over its interpretation have prompted the Center for UFO Studies to investigate it in depth. A complete technical report will be published by the Center; meanwhile, I should like to review the facts of the case and comment specifically upon the hypothesis that the object was a meteor.

At 11.05 p.m. on October 18, 1973, a Bell Huey UH-1H helicopter of the U.S. Army Reserve, with a crew of four, was en route from Columbus to Cleveland, Ohio, a distance of 96 nautical miles (110.47 statute miles). The aircraft was on a heading of 030° at a barometric altitude of 2500 feet – approximately 1200 feet above the high rolling hills, woods and farmland of northeast Ohio. The night was totally clear and starry with unlimited visibility. The last quarter moon was just rising.

Sgt. John Healey, seated in the left-rear position of the helicopter, noticed a red light off to the west, moving south, which seemed brighter than an aircraft navigation light, but as it was not relevant traffic he did not mention it, and it is unknown whether this light had any relationship to the subsequent events.

Perhaps three or four minutes later, Sgt. Robert Janacek, the crew chief, sitting in the right-rear position, reported a red light on the south-eastern horizon, ninety degrees to their flight path. It resembled the obstruction light of a radio tower and appeared to be stationary. The light was kept under surveillance, and approximately 30 to 40 seconds later it appeared to start to converge on the helicopter at an airspeed estimated in excess of 600 knots. Captain (now Major) Lawrence Coyne, the aircraft commander (in the right-front seat) thought the light might be an F-100 fighter of the Ohio National Guard, based at nearby Mansfield airport. He abruptly took the controls from Lt. Arrigo Jezzi, who had been acting as co-pilot, and put the helicopter into a powered descent of 500 feet per minute. Radio contact was established with the Mansfield tower, with the following conversation taking place:

"Mansfield tower, this is Army helicopter 15444..."

"Go ahead, one-five-triple-four..." the tower acknowledged.

"Mansfield tower, do you have any high-performance aircraft in this area at 2500 feet?"


There was no response from the tower. The transmission was attempted several times, but to no avail. Then other nearby stations were tried, on both VHF and UHF channels, also without response. The radio equipment seemed to be functioning normally; the "channel tone" and "keying sound" were both heard, yet Coyne contends that no recording of these transmissions can be found on the control tower tapes. (It is standard procedure to record all tower/aircraft communications.)

The red light increased in intensity, assuming a brilliance described as that comparable to the landing light of a Boeing 727 aircraft at a distance of 500 feet. Coyne put the collective pitch in the full-down position and threw the cyclic forward, thereby increasing his rate of descent to 2000 f.p.m. The light maintained its radial bearing and a collision seemed imminent.

Suddenly the unknown object *halted* in its westward course and assumed a hovering relationship, about ten degrees above, and slightly to the right of the diving helicopter. A cigar-shaped, slightly domed, sharply delineated, grey-coloured structure was observed by three of the crew. (Jezzi reported from his oblique angle he saw only a red light.) The object, from Coyne's perspective, filled the entire right-front windshield panel. The brilliant red light was clearly defined on the bow, and for the first time a white light at the stern and a green light aft and below were revealed. The reflection of the lights clearly illuminated the grey structure of the craft, which appeared smooth and featureless.

The green light swung around in the manner of a directional spotlight and *beamed* into the helicopter cockpit with seeming deliberation, casting a "pyramid-shaped" green beam upon the crew and their instruments. An undetermined time later (a few seconds?) the object moved off to the west, accelerating rapidly, the white light *increasing* in intensity as it receded. Lastly it made a decisive course change of 45° to the right, and disappeared over the north-west horizon.

In the moment before the object had "hovered," Coyne had been in a powered autorotation, descending at 2000 f.p.m. The last altitude he noted 1700 m.s.l. (measured from sea level – approximately 500 feet above the ground ± 100 feet).



Coyne's eyes were adjusted to the dark, he could see the ground clearly, he was experienced in night low-level helicopter operations, and had emphasized during our several hours of taped discussions that he was not concerned at that moment with his precarious proximity to the ground.³

In the moment *after* the object moved off to the left, Coyne glanced at his instruments and read 3500 feet altitude (2300 feet above the ground) with a rate of climb of 1000 f.p.m. His left arm was outstretched with the collective still in the full-down position; the cyclic was still forward. In other words, the helicopter controls were in the position for a dive, yet the aircraft was in a 1000 f.p.m. climb! Coyne gingerly manipulated the "reversed" controls until he was able after a few seconds (during which the helicopter climbed yet another 300 feet) to bring the ship back under positive control. Cruising altitude of 2500 feet m.s.l. was re-established. Radio contact was easily achieved with the Canton-Akron tower, a few miles to the east, and the flight continued uneventfully to Cleveland. The crew had been totally unaware of the helicopter's climb or of any G-forces acting upon their bodies during the climb (but they had been acutely aware of the dive as the object approached). They had also been unaware of any noise or turbulence from the object, except for one "bump" after the unknown had already departed towards the west.

Independent reconstructions of the event (by Dr. Hynek and myself) from Janacek's first sighting of the red light until the object disappeared on

the north-west horizon, gives a most logical estimate of elapsed time of 5.5 minutes.


* * * * *

Philip Klass⁴ dismisses the object as a fireball of the Orionid meteor shower, and I should like to respond in detail to that hypothesis.


Most obviously against the meteor theory is, of course, the duration of the event. From any astronomy textbook one easily verifies what one has realized from childhood: once a meteor has "tasted" the earth's atmosphere, its fiery flight can endure for only a few seconds. Average shower meteors are visible for less than two seconds; fireballs and bolides rarely last more than ten seconds.⁵ The Orionids (known to be debris from Halley's comet) are a relatively minor meteor shower which does not produce fireballs at all.

Every visible meteor produces a train of excited and ionized atoms⁶ (indeed, it is the train one sees, not the meteor itself) and there is ample photographic evidence⁷ of trains which have persisted, twisting and undulating for half-an-hour or more, before dispersing into the upper atmosphere. However, meteor trains are diffuse and luminescent, and bear no resemblance to opaque objects which blot out the background stars and have a precisely delineated structure.

Meteors "ignite" and become visible at altitudes from 100 to 80 km. For an observer essentially at sea level, an object at 80 km. could theoretically



The object as it appeared in the front front windshield panel





Hovering relationship at closest approach to the helicopter

be visible over a path 720 km. in radius. The Orionids are characterized by swift streaks, persistent trains, and velocities of 66 km/sec, and *theoretically* could travel from horizon to horizon, passing through the zenith, in 22 seconds. A sporadic meteor traveling at the average meteor velocity of 40 km/sec could traverse the entire sky in about 36 seconds, and an extremely slow fireball with a velocity of 12 km/sec (characteristic of pre-midnight meteors, when they are "catching up" to the earth and their velocity must be subtracted from the earth's orbital velocity of 30 km/sec) could *theoretically* have an upper limit of 110 seconds.⁸

But these figures could rarely, if ever, obtain. They are all based on the extreme assumptions that a meteor (not the train) could maintain a horizontal path (relative to the observer) or alternately, could maintain its altitude of entry, continuously skimming the top of the atmosphere for upwards of 2000 km. Empirical evidence indicates that these phenomena do not occur. Meteors are not observed to travel 180° from horizon to horizon. Faint (shower) meteors have a usual path length of about 60 km; bright meteors may have a path length of 300 km,⁹ but in fact, to be visible, they must be within 150 to 200 km of the observer.¹⁰ Angular velocities average about 20° per second;¹¹ thus a meteor, if it could keep itself "alive," on the average could traverse the entire sky in a mere nine seconds.

If an object moves at a generally constant rate from one extreme side of an observer to the other extreme side, its apparent motion will be most rapid when it passes directly in front of (and is closest to) the observer. The Mansfield UFO, after approaching the helicopter with the apparent speed of a jet interceptor, suddenly *decelerated* and assumed a

hovering relationship at its closest point in front of the helicopter — the position where, had it been a meteor moving across the line of sight, it would have appeared to be moving fastest.

Meteors do not make decisive course changes. The course change of the object was not a misinterpretation of the helicopter crew of a change in their own machine — the aircraft maintained a bearing of 030° throughout the event.

It has been suggested¹² that the UFO would have passed *over* the diving helicopter, had the two been in close proximity, whereas a meteor would have presented the reported relationship of always being essentially ahead of the helicopter. Granted that an object at great distance would appear to cross in front of the helicopter, and granted that an object on a "frozen" heading and altitude would have passed over, and perhaps even behind the aircraft. If the UFO were intelligently controlled, however (a speculation only), it presumably might also have the capability of continuously adjusting its flight path so as to maintain any desired relationship with the helicopter.

Klass is encouraged by the facts that the Orionids have a characteristically green colour,¹³ that Coyne's crew reported that a green light flooded the cockpit, and that the upper sections of the helicopter's windshields have an anti-glare green tint. In fact, the UFO had three distinct and separate areas of colour: red, green and white. All three colours were seen through the clear portions of the windshield. (Sitting in the helicopter, I noted that the green plexiglass is so lightly tinted it is, in any event, inconsequential.) The red light was by far the predominant one reported by the crew, both in intensity and in the percentage of the total event-time it was observed.¹⁴

If the object were indeed a bright fireball of such extra-ordinary properties, one wonders why it was not reported by other observers, on the ground or in the air. Surely it would have been a spectacular sight, leisurely crossing the highly populated areas

of Pennsylvania, Ohio, the Great Lakes shores, and Michigan. No fireballs were reported at the time of the Coyne incident; however several other UFO events were reported near Mansfield that evening, and most significantly, there is now known to be a family of four, and another lone person who, apparently, actually witnessed the Coyne event. A small group of very able technical people, the Civil Commission on Aerial Phenomena, based in Columbus, Ohio and directed by Mr. Warren Nicholson, must be commended for their diligence in pursuing this aspect of the investigation.

We have established that the reported events represent an uninterrupted observational time of approximately 5.5 minutes. Even if we totally distrust this figure, and arbitrarily condemn it as being overestimated by a factor of two, we still obtain a time of 165 seconds — still much too long for a fireball, even under the most favourable assumptions used to estimate meteor flight durations.

It is noteworthy that the crew estimated the object's speed at "in excess of 600 kts," as it approached the helicopter, and that when seen, they estimated it to be "on the horizon," a distance they equated with 15 miles. An object travelling at a speed of 600 kts would cover a distance of 15 miles in 78 seconds — a time which corresponds very nicely with the elapsed-time reconstruction done by the crew. The point is, of course, that they are all quite experienced observers (Coyne had had, at the time, 19 years in military aircraft) and their estimates of time deserve high credibility.

May I suggest that the reader now takes his outstretched arm and slowly describes an arc of nearly 180° across the sky, from horizon to horizon, passing at an elevation of about ten degrees in front of him, and making sure that this exercise takes five-and-one-half minutes to accomplish. Upon completion, and possessed with an abundance of well-established textbook data on the behaviour of meteors (and a rather tired arm) the utter folly of the meteor hypothesis should immediately become evident.

Finally, I should add that Coyne and Klass have never met. Coyne informed me that Klass's contact with the crew consisted of three long-distance calls to him (Coyne) and a TV "talk-show" conversation with Healey. No mention is made by Klass in Chapter

29 of *UFOs Explained* of the total duration of the UFO observation — a most crucial part, but one which seems to have eluded Klass and his co-workers completely.

Let me close now with a quote from Mr. Klass himself:¹⁵

"Those of us who investigate famous UFO cases that Hynek finds 'unexplainable' invariably find prosaic, terrestrial explanations after *rigorous* (sic) investigation."

Res ipsa loquitur.

References

1. Where the UFO appears to be within 500 feet of the observer and there appears to be physical interaction or physical traces associated with the event. See Hynek, J.A., *The UFO Experience*, 1972, Chicago, H. Regnery & Co. [Also Abelard Schuman Ltd., London.]
2. Strangeness of the reported event and reliability/credibility of the witness. *Op. cit.*
3. All very well; but had his present rate of descent been maintained, he would have (as pointed out by P. Klass) abruptly encountered the ground in only 12 seconds more.
4. Klass, P.J., *UFOs Explained*, 1974, N.Y., Random House, Chapter 29.
5. Krinov, E.L., *Principles of Meteoritics* (translation from the Russian), Pergamon Press, N.Y., 1960, p.64.
6. McKinley, D.W.R., *Meteor Science and Engineering*, 1961, N.Y., McGraw Hill Co., p. 137.
7. *The Flammarion Book of Astronomy*, 1964, N.Y., Simon & Schuster, p. 382-383.
8. I am indebted to Dr. Wm. M. Protheroe, Professor of Astronomy, the Ohio State University, for supplying the formulae and checking my work on the flight times of meteors.
9. *The Flammarion Book of Astronomy*, p. 381.
10. Abell, Geo. O., *Exploration of the Universe*, 3rd Ed., 1975, New York, Holt, Rinehart & Winston, p. 363.
11. Olivier, Charles P., *Meteors*, 1925, Baltimore, Williams & Co.
12. Klass, P.J., in correspondence with Stanton Friedman, February 4, 1976.
13. I was unable to find any source for the colour of Orionids; Klass cites Dr. David Meisel, director of the American Meteor Society, as his source.
14. Klass attributes the red colour to the ionized gases flowing from the meteor head.
15. In a letter to the Editor of *People*, magazine, Vol. 6, No. 10, September 6, 1976.

UFO seen from Trident (continued from p. 4)

no clouds in the sky, and these were ten times the size of any aircraft returns that you ever get on any aircraft Radar. Very large, and there appeared to be a cluster of them. We turned the lights down and started to look for them, but we couldn't see anything, and yet we had this completely positive 'ident.' It was about 10° off to the left and it went down the left hand side as we passed. We went within seven miles of it and never saw a thing. Any doubts that we had about these things having solid middles well...that confirmed it, that sold us at that stage."

Second pilot S.S. added:—

"We took off again and about two hours later we

passed the same spot, we returned on the same track, the skipper had turned the Radar on just to see if anything was there and we got these very strong returns (Blips) at about twenty miles away, about 5° up from our position. You can get this information ref. distance and inclination from the airborne Radar.

"The returns appeared stationary and we closed with them as we flew along. We came down their Port side and passed about six or seven miles away from them. They were very strong returns, and if they had been aircraft we probably would have seen 'nav' lights as it was a very clear night. They could have been military for they don't always carry 'nav' lights, but they were very strong returns and it is surprising that we didn't see anything."

ANOTHER TELEPORTATION IN BRAZIL

ACCORDING to *O Dia* of July 22, 1976, a 33-year-old man named Sidney Walker, married and father of a family, residing at rua Azevedo Sodré 97, Bairro Gradim, São Gonçalo, near Rio de Janeiro, stepped out of the house at 7.00 p.m. on June 14 to go to buy a packet of cigarettes at the nearby café-bar Itaúna, on the Praça (Square) Evaristo Ricamar in the suburb of Bairro Gradim. He came up to the counter and asked his friend the manager, Vasco de Freitas, for the cigarettes, and was duly served. Then he set out for his home again along the rua Washington Luís. He had left home wearing just the clothes on his back and, in his pockets, barely more than enough loose change to pay for the cigarettes.

It seems however that the café-owner noted that he had made a mistake over the change, for he hastened out after Sidney Walker and, arriving at the entrance to the café, he stood there watching the retreating form of his friend. And to his amazement he saw a UFO, and from it a beam of light directed down upon Sidney.

The café-owner was terrified by the sight, for he had already read about cases in which people had disappeared under precisely similar circumstances. So he rushed after Sidney calling to him to turn back, but almost immediately found himself "nailed to the spot" by a strange force, so that he was totally unable to move. All he could do was to stand there and watch as Sidney Walker turned out of sight into the Avenida Dr. Gradim. And it was evidently on that street that he vanished from the realm of men, though how this happened was only to be explained much later.

Sidney's family sat up until far into the night, waiting for him, and at last set out to look for him. The first place they visited was the Café-Bar Itaúna, where they found the proprietor, Vasco de Freitas, in a nervous, edgy state, and tight-lipped. For he was afraid to reveal what he had seen, and so confined himself simply to saying that Sidney Walker had indeed been there and bought a packet of cigarettes. "I haven't seen him since then. But why, what's the matter, has something happened?" he asked.

When they told him that Sidney had not returned home, the café proprietor was more worried than ever: he was terrified, still keeping to himself the awful secret that he dared not divulge. So, he simply continued to maintain that the missing man had been in his café, had bought a packet of cigarettes, and that was that.

The local police station was informed of Sidney's disappearance but all their efforts to locate him were unsuccessful. On learning this, his mother, Dona Lidia da Cunha Walker, had a stroke and was rushed to hospital. Sidney's brother, Edson, who is in the Brazilian Army, next tried to see

I am much indebted to Dr. Walter Buhler of the Brazilian Society for the Investigation of UFOs (SBEDV), Rio de Janeiro, for sending a collection of news reports covering a fresh case of teleportation in that country. These I have translated and two are summarized here to give as up-to-date a picture of the case as possible.

GORDON CREIGHTON

whether the Army could do anything about finding Sidney.

The days passed, and all attempts had proved fruitless. So Edson put an advert in the missing persons column in the newspaper *O Dia*, and it duly appeared on June 27. It read as follows:

SIDNEY WALKER, aged 33, married, of rua Azevedo Sodré 97, Bairro Gradim, São Gonçalo, has been missing since June 14 when he left his home saying he was going to buy cigarettes. He was wearing "Lee" denims, a long-sleeved striped pullover with polo collar, and black shoes.

Meanwhile other investigatory bodies, as well as the Police and Army, were also engaged in the search, but all in vain. Sidney's father, Ildefonso Walker, was plunged into despair, and the mother was still in hospital. Sidney's wife, Lidia, their son Adriano and the rest of the family were all distraught and anxious.

Finally . . . A letter

Written on July 8 and posted on the 12th, the letter reached them on the 14th. It was addressed to Sidney's mother, Dona Lidia da Cunha Walker. Brother Edson opened it and it read as follows:

Natal. Rio Grande do Norte,
July 8, 1976.

Dear Mother:

As I write these lines I am longing to see all the family again. Mum, I am up here in the North. Don't be worried about me, because I am O.K., thanks to God. How is dear little Adriano, and how is Lidia, how are they all? And is Dad well? And how is Grandma? I think a lot about her. And about Lidia, and Adriano, and brother Edson. Is Adriano still going to kindergarten? God bless you, Adriano, and make you happy. My son, one day you will understand all this and you will forgive your Dad. Lidia, keep up the payments to the Union, because it's very important for Adriano. I've got my union card with me, but you can do the necessary. Dad, look after all my tools carefully, won't you, because perhaps I'll

be wanting them one of these days. Give my best wishes to Fabio [brother-in-law] and his family, and all the others. Dad and Mum, I am passing over to you the job of brining up and educating Adriano. Please send me a photo of him. Love and kisses and I ask you for your blessing. And give my best to Dona Otavia and her family.

Sidney Walker, Natal, July 8, 1976.

P.S. Please everybody write to me as soon as possible. Love to you all, Mum, Adriano, Dad, Grandma, Lidia, and everybody. Sidney.

Enclosed in the same envelope was a second letter, addressed to his brother Edson. It ran as follows:

Dear Brother Edson,

Please, I beg you, for the love of God, mail me 700 Cruzeiros at once, so that I can buy my ticket back home. Edson, it takes three days, and I am really going through hell. It is driving me crazy and I can't stand much more of this suffering. I'm all alone, and all I've got are the clothes on my back... Speak to Dad and Grandma and Lidia, and get them to rustle up the money I need. I'll pay it back later. I beg you please, for the sake of Adriano, do this for me, as soon as you possibly can! God reward you for it and help you and all yours.

Natal, July 8, 1976.
Sidney Walker.

P.S. Tell Lidia I love her very much.

Though all still totally in the dark as to what had happened to Sidney, the family were at least relieved to hear from him. For he was alive and well, it seemed, in Natal, though nobody knew precisely how or why. On the back of the envelope there was his address in Natal:

Rua Araguari 375
Bairro do Dix-Sept Rosado
Rio Grande do Norte

Edson gave careful thought to the matter, and came to the conclusion that it would take quite a time for the money to reach Sidney and for the latter to get home, so, making use of his connections, he had a word with one of the Federal Deputies. The latter then got in touch with the Deputy for the State of Rio Grande do Norte, who advised a federal agency, the DOPS*, whose representative in Rio Grande do Norte then found Sidney, tracing him to Alecrim, Bairro do Rosado. The DOPS thereupon advised his family.

Sidney was found living in a thatched hut with an elderly married couple. Dazed and confused, he was quite unable to explain to the men from the federal agency precisely what had happened to him. He was next taken to the INPS† medical centre in Natal, where, after examining him, the doctors advised that he be immediately placed in a hospital in Rio de Janeiro when he arrived there. They had found in him, they said, symptoms of partial amnesia, which alternated with moments of rather more



The Coast of Brazil showing the distance between São Gonçalo (near Rio) and Natal

frequent lucidity, during which periods he was capable of making statements.

Sucked up by the light

As soon as he had received this report from the DOPS agents in Natal, his brother Edson Walker set out for the North to see Sidney, and their reunion took place at the INPS medical centre. The reunion was a moving one, and Sidney was weeping. "Why did you do it?" asked Edson.

Sidney, still confused and dazed, said he hadn't done anything wrong. And then he went on to relate a fantastic story — a story subsequently to be confirmed by Vasco de Freitas, the proprietor of the Café-Bar Itaúna.

Sidney explained how he had gone into the café to buy the cigarettes, and how he had then started out for home again along the Rua Washington Luís.

"There, I felt that something was pulling me upwards. I fought desperately against it, but 'it,' whatever it was, was immensely powerful, and I began to feel my eyesight fading, and I lost consciousness. All I do remember is that I was abandoned among some coconut trees up there at Rosada in the North, and that I was found and helped by an old couple, who took me into their thatched hut. All we lived on up there was coconut, mandioc flour ('farinha') and olive oil. I don't remember the date when I came to my senses and found myself lying in the copse of coconut trees, nor do I remember anything of what happened after I felt myself being sucked upwards and lost consciousness."

Edson took Sidney back with him to the South, where they arrived home at 2.30 on Tuesday, July 20, to find all awaiting them in festive spirit (apart

from Sidney's mother, still in hospital, and still unaware of these later developments).

Sidney is going into the ASPEG+ hospital today for medical treatment. He has round red marks, some 2 cm. or so in diameter, on various parts of his body. It is understood that these marks appear to have been caused by suction, in the way that cupping-glasses cause marks when these are used in medical treatment. However, these marks on Sidney's body are far smaller than cupping-marks, and there are a lot of them.

This concludes the main details of the report in *O Dia* of July 22 1976 from their representative at Niterói. The same paper continued, however, on the next day (July 23), with a follow-up report on the case from the same source, which ran as follows:

At least two more people living in Bairro do Gradim, São Gonçalo, say that they too saw three flying saucers moving around in the sky over that district on the evening when Sidney Walker, aged 33, of Rua Azevedo Sodré 97, was allegedly sucked up by one of these craft, being subsequently abandoned by them in the town of Alecrim, near the Space-Tracking Station and Air Base at Barreira do Inferno do Norte. As we have already reported, Sidney Walker vanished on June 14 and was only found again recently.

Meanwhile, scores of people living on the Rua Rio de Janeiro in Quitadinha, Petropolis, say that they saw three unidentified flying objects, emitting beams of yellow, red and green light, and watched them for half an hour. The radio station at Petropolis (*Radio Imperial*) were informed, and they sent reporters to the area and these reporters confirmed for themselves that the phenomenon was a fact. The three saucers were moving upwards and downwards in the sky at high speed. They have been making their appearances for the past three days. And there were three saucers seen at the time when Sidney Walker was carried off.

Fresh revelations

Two witnesses, Martinaldo de Castro, and a 64-year-old fisherman named Joao Cavalcanti de Albuquerque (residing at Travessa Antonio Goncalves 83, Bairro do Gradim, São Gonçalo) also have declared that they saw three flying saucers passing right over the district just a few moments before the time when Sidney Walker was taken up by one of them.

These two witnesses said: "We were terrified, and we decided to make for home at once, out of fear something might happen to us. Later on, we did hear about the disappearance of the young chap, but we did not associate the two things at the time. Now, however, we feel absolutely certain that he genuinely was sucked up by one of the saucers and taken off to that place there up in the North."

Since Sidney Walker's return home, his family and friends have all been trying to see him and hear his fantastic story, but however much he tries he cannot remember anything of it. All he can recall is that he had bought a pack of cigarettes at the Café-Bar Itaúna and that when he stepped out on to

the street he felt himself being drawn upwards and everything when black and he lost consciousness, finally coming to his senses again in a grove of coconut trees in the town of Alecrim, where he was found by an elderly couple who took him in and gave him shelter in their hut. While he was there with them the only food he got was mandioc-root flour, olive oil and coconuts. Then he decided he would write to his family, telling them where he was and asking for money for the journey back. In the meantime however he was found by agents of the DOPS office in Natal and taken into a local clinic of the INPS. He is now to go into hospital here for treatment.

NOTE by Gordon Creighton

*†+ Whereas the Russians and other Communists are afflicted with the urge to telescope words, at the drop of a hat, into linguistic monstrosities, the Brazilians and Portuguese share with the United States the *mania for initials*.

Although I lived in Brazil for some years, I do not know what "DOPS" stands for, but presumably it is the Brazilian Social Security system.

"INPS" evidently denotes the Brazilian State Medical Services, but as to what on earth an "ASPEG" hospital is I just don't possess a clue.

STOP PRESS: CE'S IN UK

Close Encounter reports have been rare in Britain; suddenly we have three in one week!

Taunton, Somerset: A young lady schoolteacher driving on the Bath Road, overtook a lolloping, coveralled being. The BBC news desk, Bristol, has since said that this was part of a student rag, so that's back to square one.

Winchester By-pass, Hampshire: Occurred Sunday evening, November 14, 1976. BBC-TV coverage: Southampton area, November 15; *Nationwide* November 17 (including the Taunton teacher and her car). A Mrs. Bowles, and her passenger, a Mr. Pratt, saw an orange-coloured 'cigar-shaped' UFO. They turned off on to a side road. The UFO came lower and closer, and the car was said to have been moved bodily to the side of the road where it stopped. Three occupants were seen in the 'cockpit' and one came out and approached the car. The car engine, which had been switched off, started up on its own and 'raced.' The entity had 'pink' eyes but otherwise seemed normal. Mrs. Bowles was in a panic, Mr. Pratt kept calm. This case is being investigated by BUFORA and a full report will appear in the next issue of FSR.

Rhayader, Wales: BBC-TV Wales covered this case on November 22: it seems an object came down and hovered over the cab of a truck, glowed orange and gave off flames. The truck driver jumped out and ran. More of this later, I hope.

EDITOR

SOAKING WET "SPACE FLIGHT"

Gordon Creighton

ACCORDING to a report in the Brazilian newspaper *O Dia* of Rio de Janeiro (April 22, 1976) a man named Mário Restier in that country has claimed that he was seized by a UFO and remained absent from his home for three months of our time, whereas to him it seemed to be only a matter of two or three days.

He said that he had been walking along a road (the press report does not quote the date or place of the occurrence) when he caught sight of a disc, some eight metres or so in diameter, flying along at a height of three metres from the ground. It stopped, a porthole opened, and he watched three very tall men descend nimbly from it. They invited him telepathically to go for a trip with them. He refused, but resistance was useless, for he felt himself so dominated by something that he lacked the strength even to formulate his negative reply. Then he felt himself hoisted up by a force, which he thought magnetic, and put through the opening into the craft, where there was a third man.

He was aware of a flash which lit up the cabin and received the telepathic impression that the beings were thanking him for having accepted their invitation, whereas he had done nothing of the sort but had simply been hoisted aboard the craft.

The beings ordered him to get into a "glass box" filled with a liquid, which, as he explained in his statement, is the only method by which the human organism can be protected against the problems of such travel. Once again he felt himself obliged to obey their orders. And he found himself suddenly inside the "glass box." There he fell asleep, and awakened to hear one of the men telling him that they were "about to arrive." He got up out of the "glass box," and instantly his clothing dried.

Through a porthole he glimpsed large numbers of discs standing upon the soil of some unknown place. The men handed him fresh clothing. The machine was now approaching the ground for a landing. *When it had landed, the strange beings lowered their heads and at once became motionless. He now perceived that they were in fact robots.*

Outside the machine, six men received him. They were all very tall. They took him into a building which seemed to be the organizational and functional centre of this strange place. He saw men standing in line there receiving food.

He was informed that these were young men undergoing training for Space-Travel. He was told that, in the view of these other beings, we Earthlings are extremely overweening and aggressive — unlike themselves, who are "simple and well organized."

In one of the rooms into which he was taken, Mario Restier claims to have seen a terrestrial globe similar to those used in schools, and many maps,

with places marked on them. He says they did not tell him why these places were so marked, but told him that they would return to Earth.

He was "brought back here," in a journey similar to the "outward trip," and was put down at a spot less than one kilometre from the point where they had seized him.

Finally, Mario Restier made the surprising statement that, should the beings return and want to take him away again, he is quite prepared to go with them, "...as there is so much to learn with them and about them."

This looks therefore like an interesting example of extended control of a human mind.

Dr. W. Buhler of Rio de Janeiro, to whom we are indebted for the press-clipping, informs me that this is an old case which has already been reported — no doubt in his usual very thorough and detailed fashion — in his *Bulletin*, organ of the SBEDV, the Brazilian Society for the Study of Flying Saucers.

Since however he has not mentioned to me the date of either the case or of his report on it in the *SBEDV Bulletin*, it might take some time for me to trace it, and time is a commodity of which I have all too little. I thought it best therefore to give this brief account now, because this is in fact not the first occasion on which "Space-Travel inside a liquid" has been claimed. The previous case which I call to mind (and which I have not yet had time to translate for FSR as it is a whole book) is that of another Brazilian, Arturo Berlet, a man of German origin from one of the southern states of Brazil, whose alleged experiences have been very well ventilated in the Brazilian press as well as in the form of a whole full-length book issued in Portuguese by Dr. W. Buhler a few years ago. There is also a German edition of the book, and Arturo Berlet has even been to Germany and lectured about his alleged experiences.

Berlet describes in extraordinary detail an alien planet — which he said he thought was Mars — and a species of extremely unprepossessing people inhabiting it, who, he said, were about to launch an invasion of the Earth.

While I do not believe for a moment that either Arturo Berlet or Mario Restier have been away from this planet, or have visited another planet, I do think that both of them have undergone a sinister and unpleasant experience which is seemingly real to them. I think that when time and space permit we shall have to print as much as we can about both these episodes in the hope that they may throw some light on the massive attack — or whatever it is — that is being staged against the human mind from one or more sources whose true nature is totally unknown to us.

ASTRONOMER'S SURPRISE IN PERSEUS

Robert A. Schmidt

HERE are some unusual photographs taken by an unsuspecting amateur astronomer, who states he did not see the object he photographed.

The witness, Charles Baker of Norman, Oklahoma (but not a witness, since he didn't perceive the bright light source — a paradox?) was taking a series of photographs of the constellation Perseus, which was in the NNW quadrant of the sky. All in all a most reliable type of person, with considerable observing experience, and I suspect there was no "fluke" here, but a 100% legitimate observation of an unknown object.

The date was February 18, 1975, and the time was 8.00 to 8.05 p.m. CST. The weather was clear. Other details:

Transparency: 4-5 (on a "0" worst to "6" perfect clarity scale);

Camera: Edixamat 35mm, 450 mm, F 2.8 + 1A Skylite filter;

Film: High Speed Ektachrome (Kodak) ASA 160 pushed to ASA 400.

Exposure time: 18-22 seconds, tripod mounted, undriven.

Bright objects in the sky at the time of exposure were i) the Moon — 6 days — SSW, and ii) Venus — SSW (R.A. 23^h30^m , Dec. — $4^{\circ}42'$, magnitude -3.4).

1: Positional Analysis (observer)

Venus and the Moon were low in the SSW behind the observer. Observer was on a patio, behind the house which blocked out the light reflection from the Moon, while Venus was not visible to the observer from the position where the camera was mounted.

The observer did not see the object that appeared on the negative (transparency) while he was photographing Perseus. Such an apparently brilliant light source could hardly go un-noticed unless

During my recent visit to the United States I had the great pleasure of taking part in an excellent hour-long discussion on UFOs on Pittsburgh radio with Bob Schmidt, the author of this article. Bob is well-known for excellent studies which have appeared in FSR, notably two weird humanoid cases described in *Humanoids seen at Butler* (FSR Vol.14, No.5, September-October 1968) and *Callery UFO and Occupants* (FSR Vol.17, No.4 July-August 1971).

I apologise for the fact that publication of this contribution, like many another, has been held back by the pressure of scores of other contributions — a situation for which, nevertheless, we are extremely thankful!

CHARLES BOWEN




Figure 1: Schematic of observer's set-up




Figure 2: The film is sensitive to ultraviolet light where the human eye is not

it was of a nature beyond the visible spectrum available to the human eye.

2: Object Analysis

The object — that is, the image — is not the result of a rub or tear in the negative. Inspection of the emulsion shows continuity. It is highly improbable, too, that a rub or tear would produce such a high intensity burn-in of the emulsion. Again, the position of the image changed noticeably in the sequence of transparencies which would make it highly improbable that it was due to an emulsion defect. The chances seem to be of the order of a million-to-one against that defects would show up at nearly the same spot on four successive negatives. Foreign material in the film plane that could produce a defect would have caused a rub across the negative from one end to the other. Furthermore, as already stated, the emulsion of these transparencies shows continuity across the bright image, although sparse granulation is apparent at the very centre of the bright source.

The film emulsion is sensitive to 2000–3000 Angstroms Ultra Violet (UV) light, where the human eye is not: see figure 2.

3: Relative position of source

See figure 3. The photographs

display rays of light that crisscross the bright source. This anomaly is attributed to an internal lens reflection called a “caustic curve” and is not part of the object itself, but springs from within the elements of the camera lens — a sort of reflective spherical aberration. These rays have been eliminated in my figure 3 drawings as they are not associated with the object physically.

The object changed from position No. 1 to No. 2 and enlarged. This can be seen easily without the help of any measuring device, although the negatives were superimposed and studied under magnification with a light source underneath, so that the star images were brought coincident. The object showed a definite drift when this method was applied, and also a gain in overall area (size).

No.3 shows little or no positional change from No.2.

No.4 shows a complete break up and dispersal of light intensity. It would seem that the object now apparently displays a large emission of light energy. A considerable positional change has occurred here.

Although, due to reproduction, the object in No.4 does not show any resemblance to the object as in Nos. 1,2 and 3, the original negative (transparency) does show an intense light source located

in the “limb” of the expanded overall object.

4: Appearance of the source

The drawings of the object (placed horizontally) as seen in Figure 3, were sketched from the originals under magnification and backlighted to bring out detail from the intense images. Changes within the intensity are noted in the drawings.

5: Conclusions

In no way can this object be construed as a lens flare. The “burn-in” effect on the emulsion is not typical of lens flare behaviour, and there was no light source available to the eye of the camera which could create such a flare by internal reflection.

Since the observer did not see anything during each of the approximately 20 seconds exposures of film — and he did look skywards during the sequence of exposures, it would seem that the camera “saw” something unseen by his own eyes because, it is suggested, they could not see that far into the UV range.

A strong UV source would “burn-in” the film’s emulsion, and in this case apparently did do so.

Novae, quasars, meteors are out of the question. Positional




Photo 1




Photo 2




Photo 3





Photo 4

FIGURE 3
Relative position of light source



change of any astronomical body as shown by the photographs contradict every known celestial law.

The object bears comparison with that in the Lucci photo-

graph, taken in the late sixties at Beaver Falls, Pa., although in the latter case the object was visible to the observers when photographed.

It is my opinion that the

object, the image of which appears on these transparencies, is quite likely one of our friends (?) displaying yet another facet of their cloak and dagger activities.

R.A.S. June 3, 1975.

SPIES FOR THE "SPACEMEN"

Gordon Creighton

THE very cockles of the heart are warmed by a report in the London newspaper *Sunday Express* (August 22, 1976) concerning a legal wrangle which may well make history.

It concerns two German gentlemen, Herr Karl Veit and Herr August Woerner, ardent UFO buffs of long standing and close friends for years past. As the report puts it: "There had never been a word of disagreement between them. Both firmly believed in flying saucers. There had never been a doubt in the minds of Herr Veit and Herr Woerner that the strange vehicles carried 'Visitors from Outer Space' who had been sent on reconnaissance missions to Earth."

Herr Karl Veit, as many of our readers will know, heads the German Society for UFO Studies, Deutsche UFO/IFO-Studiengesellschaft, (DUIST), in Wiesbaden, and publishes a monthly paper called *UFO-Nachrichten*. Herr Woerner has his own separate UFO/study organization in Mayen, near Koblenz. Over the years they have collaborated, compared notes, and exchanged information about their researches and their findings. But now the long friendship has ended in a bitter quarrel, for Herr Woerner has taken out a summons accusing his old friend Karl Veit of "engaging in espionage activities in the service of Earth's extraterrestrial enemies."

The disagreement between the two old friends started in 1972, when they fell out over the knotty problem — indeed the key 64 billion dollar problem — of whether or not the 'Visitors' are friendly towards the Earthlings.

Herr Veit was adamant (as all readers of his *UFO-Nachrichten* will be fully aware). Beyond any per-adventure, in his view, the Cosmic Brethren, the Elders from Space "...are our friends. They have come to warn us against man's irresponsible probings into Space and interference with Nature. They are also trying to stop us from indulging in an atomic war which could not only destroy the Earth but also endanger other star systems."

This nice and beguiling theory was flatly rejected however by Herr Woerner as "dangerous poppycock." Said he: "The visitors, far from wanting to avert an atomic war on Earth, are simply waiting for one to start. Then, when most of the human population here has been wiped out, they will move in and take over the world."

Veit and Woerner naturally both claim to have

the fullest evidence in support of their theories.

And then suddenly the quarrel turned even fiercer. Because Herr Woerner had changed his mind as to where the flying saucers came from.

Said he: "They do not come from Outer Space. They have their bases deep in the Earth — their exits are in the inaccessible mountains of Tibet.*

When Herr Woerner's new theory had fully taken shape, he wrote to Herr Veit: "I presume that you will now put an end to your previous activities, and cease to act as a mouthpiece for these Satanic powers."

When Herr Veit ignored the challenge and showed that he still clung to his former views, Herr Woerner decided that the moment had come for him to take the question into the law courts. He got the State Court in Frankfurt to issue a summons charging Herr Karl Veit with "spying for extraterrestrial powers."

The lawyers for both sides are now considering this intriguing and unusual *mise en scène*. One court official was quoted as having made the following observation on the case:—

"There is no question of throwing the case out as frivolous. It is most unusual. But Herr Woerner and Herr Veit are both serious men. And Herr Woerner clearly believes that he has grounds for complaint. Our problem is that espionage cases are usually handled by the Federal Public Prosecutor. But he already has his hands full with cases concerning earthbound spies and terrorists. In any case, this is the first time that any court anywhere in the world will have to deal with alleged Space spying...

"I suppose that, in this day and age, it had to come sometime."

* * * * *

If I may be permitted to conclude on a more personal note, I will confess that (as I suspect many

NOTE

* Tibet (like the Bayan Kara Uula Mountains lying to the east of that country) is satisfyingly remote, and inaccessible, and mysterious, and we can easily see therefore what a boon it is to zealous Ufologists.

G.C.

FSR readers have by now spotted) my own position in these weighty problems tends to be a little nearer to that of Herr Woerner than the position of his opponent, though my view may be thought a trifle more simplistic, if one may employ such a term. For I like to visualize the KGB ensconced in their plush Headquarters, a truly posh *Lyublyanka*, at the Centre of the Earth, and there pulling levers and pressing buttons on all sides to produce earthquakes, wars, violence, blackmail, revolutions, drug-addiction, insanity, demonic possession, droughts, floods, murder and mayhem on both small and vast scales. And I have no doubt that, as an occasional relief from the boredom of a chairborne job, their top or favoured operatives are granted a spot of leave, to take a hand at the control of a UFO as these sleek shining *Vimanas*, the product of the technology of the Workers' Paradise, pop out from the Polar Entrances of the Hollow Earth, rather in the fashion that the huge fat white maggots of the bot-fly will pop out from the spines of cattle when you squeeze them at the right spots.

Some readers may of course write in to point out to me that the Control Point at the Centre of the Earth is already bespoken, according to long religious tradition, for certain other Gentry.

To which I will simply reply that I find it not at all without significance for you and for me that two distinguished organizations should be occupying what seems to be one and the same suite of offices. Might they in fact, on closer inspection, not perhaps turn out to be part and parcel of *one organization rather than two?*

Surely one must admit that it bears thinking about and makes an awful lot of sense.

PERSONAL COLUMN

£0.25 per line or part, i.e. £1.00 for 4 lines and so on.

PEN-FRIEND WANTED: Brazilian boy (28) wants pen-friend interested in UFOs and some of the following: pop and folk music; drawing; painting; poetry and astrology. Can write in English, Spanish or Portuguese. Luiz Reboucas Torres. Pca. Mal. Deodoro 397, Apto. 85, Ed. Daisy. Sta. Cecilian. 101150. Sao Paulo, Brazil.

UFO HOTLINE investigative network seeking new members, for complete information and application forms, write: International UFO Registry, P.O. Box 1004, Hammond, Indiana 46325, U.S.A.

CLYPEUS IS OUT AGAIN: only by exchange or free to correspondents. Write to: Clypeus, P.O. Box 604, 10100 Torino, Italy.

MEN IN BLACK: Articles, information, personal experiences, etc. concerning MIB required for research project. Write: FSR Publications Ltd., Box No. 10.

WANTED: 1955-1956 issues of FSR, paying up to £5.00 per issue for mint condition issues (1955-1956). Also Special Issue No. 1 (October-November, 1966) and Supplement No. 1 (October, 1970) of FSR (*FSR Case Histories*). State price and condition. Bradford Johnson, P.O. Box 83, Allston, Mass. 02134, U.S.A.

UFO AND SPACE AGE PUBLICATIONS

LIFE THE UNKNOWN, by Bernard J. Hurwood. The enigma of human survival. **96p**

FRATERNITY OF THE WEIRD, by Michael Harvey. A collection of documented reports on supernatural events, beyond human understanding **96p**

FLYING SAUCERS: The startling evidence of the invasion from outer space, by Coral Lorenzon **£1.00**

FLYING SAUCERS FROM THE 4TH DIMENSION, by Kurt Glemser **£1.00**

THEY WALK AMONG US, by Kurt Glemser & Alex Saunders **£1.00**

GHOSTS & HAUNTINGS, by Dennis Bardens **£1.20**

GODS, DEMONS & UFOs, by Eric Norman **£1.16**

UFO CONTACT MAGAZINE, by Major Hans Petersen Illust. 6 mixed back issues **70p each**

NEW HUMANITY Magazine, by Johan Quanjer. Illust. Includes UFO column. 6 different issues **40p each**

MY CONTACT WITH FLYING SAUCERS, by Dino Kraspedon **£2.90**

THE PRODIGAL GENIUS, by J.J. O'Neill. The life and work of Nikola Tesla **£2.90**

WORLD OF THE STRANGE, by Susy Smith **96p**

STRANGE WORLD OF UNUSUAL PEOPLE, by Brant House **96p**

PASSPORT TO MAGONIA, by Jacques Vallee **60p**

MYSTERIOUS DISAPPEARANCES, by Kurt Glemser **70p**

MIRACLES OF THE GODS, by Erich Von Daniken **£4.25**

AGES IN CHAOS, by Emmanuel Velikovsky **£1.10**

INVESTIGATING UFOS, by Larry Kettlekamp **£1.50**

THE MOTHMAN PROPHECIES, by John Keel **£6.00**

BLACK HOLES: end of the Universe? by Professor John Taylor **75p**

THE SHAPE OF MINDS TO COME, by Professor John Taylor **70p**

OUR HAUNTED PLANET, by John Keel **£2.40**

SECRET OF THE AGES, by Brinsley le Poer Trench **80p**

MINDS THROUGH TIME AND SPACE, by Brad Steiger **90p**

Prices include postage and packing and free lists. Lists ordered separately. 20p deposit or \$1.00 overseas. Prices and availability subject to change. Dollar checks acceptable — plus \$1.00 bank exchange. Write to:

Miss S. Stebbing, 87 Selsea Avenue
Herne Bay, Kent, CT6 8SD England.

BRITISH REPORTS, OLD AND NEW

Jenny Randles

ARE there "repeater" witnesses? Mrs. Fry is a middle-aged housewife who lives in Bexleyheath, Kent. According to her testimony, recorded by BUFORA Investigator Larry Dale, she appears to have been witness to possible UFO manifestations on several occasions. Two of these are worthy of note:

(a) On July 17, 1955, the country was in the middle of a heat wave. One of Mrs. Fry's children had come down with heat stroke, and at 11.30 a.m. the doctor arrived. Deciding that some specific tablets were required, he drove Mrs. Fry and her son to the surgery. On the way the car began to slow down, and then starting and stopping intermittently. A dark shadow appeared to be hanging over the road ahead, and the doctor, who was a young Indian on short term secondment to this country, kept trying to see out of the front windscreen to find the cause. Finally he stopped the car and they all got out.

About 100 to 150 feet directly above the road was an enormous mass of cloud-grey material, apparently oval in shape. There were three 'ball-bearing-like' mechanisms inside. The object was stationary, but now began to rotate faster and faster and make a very slight swishing or humming noise. It then flipped back upon its edge exposing a domed saucer shape and gradually rose upwards to fade from view into a cloudless sky. Duration of observation estimated at about 7/8 minutes.

(b) On May 31, 1975, Mrs. Fry and her husband were driving through London at about 9.00 p.m. The sky was cloudless. Mrs. Fry was the first to see two square silvery-coloured lights moving together in a parallel path with the car. She watched this for some time until her husband managed to stop the car just outside Woolwich. Getting out of the car they were both




Rising upwards



Left: July 17, 1955; Mrs. Fry's sighting.

Below: The "pylon" near Malden, Essex




now clearly able to see an octagonally-shaped craft with the two silver lights in the centre of a cross bar. At either end were two lights, a steady red one on the left side and a 'blipping' green one on the right. There was no sound as the object moved slowly along. Then, suddenly, it just went out and vanished completely. It was in view several minutes.

Object with a 'pylon' attached

Two young girls (aged nine) were witnesses to a sighting in Summer 1972, and despite their ages, investigator Andy Collins was satisfied with the story, which had not been mentioned to anyone previously. It was 9.00 p.m., and just dark. They were walking in a field near Malden, Essex, when they saw what they first took to be some new kind of electricity pylon. It soon became apparent that this was not the case. Atop what appeared to be a conventional girdered pylon structure (about one quarter the size of a normal pylon) was a dome-like object coloured silvery-orange. A row of 'portholes' visible along the edge, emitted clear light. The object seemed to be about half the size of a bus. The pylon structure was dark grey, the bottom portion covered by trees, and appeared to be transparent. Although it all seemed solid, there was a ghostly glow around the edges. After looking at this for several minutes they became frightened and walked away. They looked back once and it was still there. On looking back a second time it had vanished without trace.


Soldiers see UFOs

Two young soldiers were resting, having just returned from a map reading patrol, close to the Catterick camp in North Yorkshire. It was 1.30 a.m. on a cold, dark morning in December, 1972. Coming towards them from the north they saw an object shaped like an arrowhead and coloured red. It was the apparent size of a tennis ball held at arms length, and had a rectangular darkened section in the middle. As it moved slowly and com-



Catterick Camp "arrowhead" (1972)

pletely silently towards them it dulled to an orange colour, and finally turned brilliant white as it passed overhead. Altogether it was in view about one minute, when it suddenly went out, just like a lightbulb being switched off. The report was investigated by David Almond for the Yorkshire branch of BUFORA.



Left: Mrs. Fry's sighting, May 31, 1975

Separating objects over Barnsley

Mr. John Brook, a 24-year-old technical clerk, was walking close to his home in Barnsley, South Yorkshire. With him were his wife, their daughter, and a workmate, Mr. Ken Bagley. It was 5.10 p.m. on November 18, 1975. Mr. Brook glanced upwards on hearing a high-pitched humming or whistling noise. Strangely none of the other witnesses heard this sound. However, they all immediately saw a fluorescent ball of blue light apparently moving across the sky south-westwards in an erratic fashion, accelerating as it went, and becoming whiter in colour. The object zig-zagged about, then vanished suddenly for seconds at a time, only to reappear in an unexpected position and continue on its general course. This occurred several times.

The object now seemed to be elongated a little, and was rotating along this axis. Mr. Bagley thought he saw two pulsating white lights at either end of the now cylindrical object, but nobody else affirms this. Suddenly there was a silent flash of light, and the object separated into two balls of violet light which moved away from each other at 90° angles. These vanished almost instantly. After a few moments they reappeared and moved together, impinging with another silent explosion and flash of light.

The reformed object now continued its previous course, but began to drop steeply out of sight. The total duration was three minutes. Investigator David Strickland, for the Yorkshire branch of BUFORA, found no explanation and there were no un-

usual weather conditions at the time.

Matt black cylinders over the Potteries

The witness in this case, Mrs. Helen Pattison, is a well-educated young mother. She is a solicitor's secretary, and investigators Derek James and Chris Bourne of UFORA Staffordshire found her a most reliable witness.

At 8.15 a.m. on June 30, 1976, Mrs. Pattison was waiting for a bus at the village of Knutton in Staffordshire. Her five year old son drew her attention to a small executive jet aircraft. As she looked up to watch this cross the sky, glinting in the brilliant early morning sunshine, suddenly she observed a stationary cylindrical object. This was most unusual, not only because of its shape, but also because it was completely matt black. After this had been watched for a few minutes, a second similar object was seen emerged from behind it, and in two jerky motions moved to a distance of about two lengths behind the first object.

Both objects then dropped down about five degrees of elevation and began to move away at what the witness describes as "a snail's pace." The objects were in view about seven minutes before fading in the distance. There was no sound at all.

Daylight observation in Cumbria

The two witnesses to this sighting wish complete anonymity. They are a married couple who live in Central Lancashire.

On August 14, 1976, they were on the road between Cartmel and Kendal in Cumbria, close to the summit of Cartmel Fell. It was 6.30 p.m. on a brilliant, sunny day. They had been watching, through their binoculars, a

hot air balloon sailing across the valley below them. They also recall that at the time a high-flying jet aircraft was visible in the sky behind them leaving a clear vapour trail.

Suddenly they spotted a white star-like object, brighter in apparent magnitude than the planet Venus at its brightest. Viewed through the 12 x 50 binoculars it resolved into a flattened disc inclined at a 45° angle. The glow was coming from strong reflection of the top part. The object was six times as long as it was wide,



Cartmel Fell UFO

and they estimated that nine or ten of the discs would have fitted into the field of view of the binoculars.

The object remained stationary for about the first thirty seconds of observation; it then began to move. It grew smaller as if travelling directly away from the witnesses, and within ten minutes had faded from view. They later met two other people on the road who said that they had seen the same thing at about the same time, but it has not been possible to trace these people. They reported the sighting to Jodrell Bank radio telescope installation and they in turn passed the report to NUFON. It was investigated by Peter Warrington of MUFORA (Manchester).

Enquiries about BUFORA to 23 Sunningdale Drive, Irlam, Greater Manchester, M30 6NJ.

"Stonehenge" (continued from page 11)

Conclusions

When George O'Barski disclosed the details of his encounter with a UFO and its occupants in November, 1975, we had no idea what a Pandora's Box of surprises was being opened. Within a period of five months following that disclosure, our growing dossier of reported incidents now totals more than a dozen for the area in and around North Hudson Park. This clearly establishes the site as an apparent "repeater" locale for UFO manifestations. Even so, we have good reason to believe that we have seen only the tip of the iceberg: additional reports by local residents who refused to be identified continue to be received. The sheer number of unpublicized incidents from such a contained area affirms the problem of the "curtain of invisibility" that obscures the UFO phenomenon. How so many extraordinary events can occur, involving so many different people, and still go unnoticed by authorities and the public-at-large, begs an interesting question: What sort of outrageous situation must finally occur before alarm bells ring and someone pays attention?

NOTICE ON PHOTOCOPYING OF BACK ISSUES . . .

Assistant Editor Eileen Buckle thanks all those readers who have availed themselves of our offer. She regrets to announce that due to pressure of work the service now has to be discontinued.

In our next . . .

CEIII IN ITALY

Renzo Cabassi

UFO PHYSICS - I

Jan Heering

UFOs AND MYSTERIOUS

DEATHS OF ANIMALS - I

S. Robiou Lamarche

ROAD HAZARD DOWN UNDER

Bill Chalker

THE UFO INVESTIGATOR AS

COUNSELLOR AND HEALER

John B. Musgrave

Also many other items and details of the Winchester CEIII case.

MAIL BAG

Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.

A living creature in the Loch?

Dear Sir,—What is sauce for John Lade is sauce for Ted Holiday; he too should get his facts right.

While Mr. Holiday is right that a single monster cannot have existed on its own in Loch Ness, he is not correct in claiming that a dozen 'is genetically impossible'. Zoologists believe that 10 to 20 creatures would form a genetically stable breeding herd. The reindeer herd, which he refers to, collapsed not due to gene exhaustion, whatever that means, but due to exhaustion of the food supply. They suffered a classic population crash, a fate predicted for mankind in the not too distant future. Mr. Holiday does not say what happened to the eight reindeer which remained, but if they survived then his hypothesis that 12 monsters cannot survive is hardly tenable.

Contrary to his supposition that a Loch Ness monster weighs 35 tons, and I cannot see how he comes to this conclusion, other authorities give 1½ tonnes, e.g. Witchell. Seventy feet is excessive for the average reported length of the monsters; 8 m. is nearer the average. On his own assumptions, 20 1½ tonne monsters would only consume 16 tons of fish per year!

He claims that there is no evidence for heavy predation in Loch Ness. Since most of the fish live at depth in the Loch naturally there will be little evidence. Does he expect the monsters to be splashing about on the surface looking for fish? Predation could be going on unnoticed.

Whatever his views on the food supply in Loch Ness, the fact is that the loch contains salmon, brown trout and sea trout, arctic char and eels, all in abundance. There is adequate food for a colony of marine reptiles.

As far as I know the British Museum have not sent any experts to Loch Ness, nor do they intend to; they do not believe that any monsters exist! Nor have I heard that the Smithsonian are any more adventurous. But of course if this is all secret we would not know about it would we!?

Contrary to his implication that experts have concluded that the Loch Ness monster and Bigfoot are unreal, zoologists have in fact concluded that not only the monster and the sasquatch, but the abominable snowman and the great sea serpent are real unknown animals. The lack of organic remains and food supplies are not seen as obstacles to this belief; after all,

no-one had seen remains of the coelocanth before it was discovered alive. Remains of monsters in Loch Ness will, if they die at the bottom as seems probable, be retained there by the enormous pressure, and decomposition will be retarded by the low temperature.

Ted Holiday's arguments are plainly special pleading in favour of his pet theory that the monsters are not living creatures. By making exaggerated assumptions and ignoring awkward facts he attempts to justify his unbelievable ideas. The only connection between UFOs and the Loch Ness monster is that they are both anomalous phenomena, prone to similar ridicule and myth-creation.

Yours faithfully,
Stuart Campbell,
4 Dovecote Loan, Edinburgh
EH14 2LT Scotland.
March 27, 1976

[I apologise for the delay in publishing Mr. Campbell's letter — EDITOR.]

Who did that?

Dear FSR,—In Volume 21, number 6, someone wrote a letter titled 'effects on animals and birds' pretending to be me. (changing my name slightly with an 'M'.)

That person knew of my UFO adventures and my ideas about UFOs, but it seems peculiar that whoever wrote, wouldn't write under their own name. I have no idea who it could have been.

Now that UFOs have become the "IN" subject, a lot more magazines are cropping up. I do hope they're not stealing your staff and business away. Yours is such a good little magazine it would be a shame if it went under. Hope you have several big 'scoops', or maybe a winning lottery ticket.

Please note the change of address card enclosed.

Sincere best wishes,
B. Niblett,
Gen. Delivery, Sechelt,
British Columbia, Canada.
August 29, 1976.

Those Venusian Footprints

The letter by Colin Bord in FSR Vol.21, No.6, titled "On Dr. Jacob's view of Adamski's photography" jerked my memory to recall that I had seen one particular criticism of George Adamski somewhere else, namely that "...Adamski just happen-

ed to have some plaster of Paris with him."

And indeed I had.

On page 537 of the Condon Report, Dr. Condon quotes from Frank Edwards' second book*:

"...and, having a pocket full of wet plaster of Paris (which he seemingly always carried with him on desert trips), George quickly made a plaster cast of the footprint with the message, which he eventually reproduced..."

This is repeated by Dr. Christopher Evans in his book "Cults of Unreason" on page 148:

"...(Adamski just happened to be carrying plaster-of-Paris with him when he visited the desert that day)".

So it appears it was Frank Edwards who invented this particular myth about Adamski carrying wet plaster of Paris wherever he went (messy, if not jacket-destroying).

Is this a splendid example of scholars (Condon, Evans, Jacobs) sheepishly repeating a thoughtless distortion of facts without checkback — a crime usually attributed to uneducated or 'amateur' UFO enthusiasts?

Perhaps, when we have succeeded in deciphering these hieroglyphics we could well muse over why they were given in the form of footprints.

Ananda Sirisena
Wimbledon, London S.W.19.
October 7, 1976.

* "Flying Saucers — Here and Now!"
New York, Lyle Stuart, 1967.

Entity coincidences?

Dear Mr. Bowen,—I notice in FSR Vol.22, No.2 one of those coincidences which could easily be passed by, regarding witnesses' descriptions of entities, and which perhaps may be of some significance.

In this case it concerns a comparison of the eyes, head and communication of the occupants in the Maine encounter, October 27th, 1975, and Travis Walton's experience, November 5th, only nine days later, but on the opposite side of the country, in Arizona. They both tell of their captors' large eyes, large heads (dome-shaped heads without hair in the latter, mushroom-shaped and apparently, from the drawings, large and without hair in the former), and the lack of communication between the entities in both. A fuller description in Travis

Compendium Books

Books of interest to readers of FSR

VISITORS FROM SPACE (The Mothman Prophecies)
paperback J. A. Keel
75p

THE FIRE CAME BY Baxter & Atkins
£3.95

WHISPERS FROM SPACE J. W. MacVey
paperback £1.50

ANCIENT ASTRONAUTS; A TIME REVERSAL?
R. Collins
£4.25

THE INVISIBLE COLLEGE Jacques Vallée
£6.25

STRANGE ARTIFACTS W. R. Corliss
£6.25

OUR MYSTERIOUS SPACESHIP MOON D. Wilson
paperback 60p

SOCORRO SAUCER IN A PENTAGON PANTRY
R. Stanford
£5.85

Postage and packing 15% extra, minimum 20p.
Please let us know if you would like to be added to
our mailing list.

Many other titles in stock: UFOs, Fortean, etc.,
comparative religion, parapsychology, etc.

Compendium Books
281 Camden High Street
LONDON NW1, ENGLAND

Tel: 01-267 1525

HUYSER BOOKSHOP

Specialists in Science Fiction, UFOs, the occult and
gothics.

Australasian Agent for Flying Saucer Review. Back
numbers from Nov./Dec., 1969 right up to present
time (except for Jul./Aug., 1970 issue).

Write now for free catalogue. When you order you
will receive the next six months catalogues free.

HUYSER BOOKSHOP, 181 Cuba Street, Wellington,
N.Z., P.O. Box 299

Please state which is required. 1. Science Fiction
2. UFO, occult
3. Both (1 & 2)

CENTER FOR UFO STUDIES

Advance orders for copies of the Proceedings of the
first conference held at Chicago on April 30 - May 2,
1976, may now be placed, price \$15.00.

Three publications are also available ...
1973 - YEAR OF THE HUMANIDS by David
Webb (2nd Edition) 110 pages, price \$7.00.

A CATALOGUE OF 200 TYPE I UFO EVENTS
OVER SPAIN AND PORTUGAL by J-V. Ballester-
Olmos 77 pages, price \$4.50.

THE LUMBERTON REPORT: UFO activity in
Southern North Carolina by Jennie Zeidman 59 pages
price \$6.00

Please remit in US dollars, by International Money
Order if from overseas or Canada.
Center for UFO Studies, 924 Chicago Avenue,
Evanston, Illinois 60202 U.S.A.

FLYING SAUCER REVIEW

Annual subscription UK, Eire and Overseas £3.35, USA and Canada \$9.00 or foreign
currency equivalent (bank exchange commission on dollar cheques covered by this
amount). Additional postage is included in price which covers surface mail. Airmail
per annum extra for USA, Canada, S. Africa, Argentina, Brazil, etc. £2.40 (\$6.00);
Australia, New Zealand etc., £2.90 (\$7.00); Middle East £2.10. Single copies 50p
plus 7p additional postage = 57p. Overseas subscribers should remit by banker's
draft on a London bank, by personal dollar cheque (USA only), or by International
Money Order. Giro No. 356 3251.

NEW ADDRESS:

All mail, editorial and subscriptions can now be addressed to:
The Editor FSR PUBLICATIONS LTD., West Malling, Maidstone, Kent, England.
(Tel: 01-639 0784)

Remittances payable to "FSR Publications Ltd"

Artwork: Eileen Buckle

Walton's case could bring more similarities. If so, considering the mere few days apart, this may add more credibility to his experience.

It would, of course, be easy to create all sorts of coincidences in

compiling statistics from the UFO problem, but this type of 'contact' data is of interest and has appeared in past well-documented cases of course, where certain descriptions have coincided in the same period of time and

sometimes in very different locations.
Yours sincerely,
Raymond E. Cox,
59 Briery Road, Halesowen,
West Midlands B63 1AS
September 27, 1976.

World round-up

*of news and comment
about recent sightings*

England

Hertfordshire report UFO

According to a report in the *Hemel Hempstead Mail* (August 4, 1976) the crews of two police patrol cars spotted a UFO hovering over the Buncefield Oil Terminal at Hemel Hempstead in the early hours of Sunday, August 1, 1976, "just as the American spacecraft was scooping up samples of Martian soil."

The police cars were on the M1 motorway when the crew saw two lights hovering at some distance above the depot. The lights remained stationary for some considerable time, and the police radioed to headquarters to ask that a check be made by air-traffic control's radar scanner at nearby Luton airport.

A spokesman at police headquarters said: "I can confirm that our officers reported seeing these lights, and that we made a check with the airport. So far we have been unable to come up with any explanation for the lights."

Canary Islands (Spain)

Onion phobia?

According to a report in the Spanish newspaper *ABC* of June 27, 1976, from their correspondent at Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, a UFO was seen flying over a field planted with onions near Galda, a place to the northwest of the town of Gran Canaria, during the night of Tuesday, June 22, 1976. When inspected two days later, the crop of onions was found to have been annihilated, the few residual plants being burnt and showing signs of having undergone exposure to tremendous heat.

One eyewitness was a medical man named Dr. Francisco Julio Padron Leon, who has his practice in the north-eastern part of Gran Canaria Island. He reported seeing a strange clearly defined sphere, "looking like a compass," with a bluish-grey periphery, and of the approximate size of a three-storeyed house. On its lower part it had a silvery coloured platform with three panels inclined outwards. He also claimed to have observed two persons aboard the

craft. They were, he said, very tall beings dressed in vivid red clothing. They had no fingers, their arms terminating in a sort of pointed fin. On their heads they were wearing helmets resembling those of divers.

Credit: **Jean Bastide**, Translation by Gordon Creighton.

New Zealand

UFO and Occupants at Brookby

Here is the account of a strange encounter, retrieved from *N.Z. Space-View* No. 66, by way of the *Australian UFO Bulletin* of our old friends the Victorian UFO Research Society of PO Box 43, Moorabbin, Victoria.

It seems that at 11.30 p.m. on January 8, 1975... "Mr. Dale Norton and Miss Sheryl Ricard, returning from a flounder fishing trip, were about a mile from Brookby, Auckland, on the Alfriston Road, when Sheryl saw a round, brightly lit globe in the sky in front of them. It was lost from view behind trees at a bend in the road. As they passed the trees the object came closer, with all its lights blazing. Dale wasn't taking much notice of it, saying it was just a 'plane. The object then moved over the car and a paddock along the side of the road. By this time Dale had slowed the car to get a better view.

"Sheryl said that the object was circular, with a bright white dome in the middle and four lights about its rim, two red, two white. It also had four legs protruding from underneath it and a red light on the end of each leg. These lights were smaller than those around the rim. The dome appeared like clear plexi-glass. Inside the craft she said she could see three dark, shadowy figures moving around. The object by this time had moved in closer and was pacing the car. It was just above the power lines along the right hand side of the road. The object at this time was about 24 feet from the car.

"Sheryl panicked when Dale said he was going to stop the car for a better look, so he turned into the driveway of the first house they encountered. When he turned off the engine a faint hum could be heard. The object hovered nearby for a few

seconds, then shot off over the hills, before the householder...came out to see who it was. The object appeared to be the size of an average car."

The investigator, who interviewed the witnesses separately, points out how there were only minor differences in their accounts, and that these were to be expected as Dale was busy driving as well as observing, while Sheryl had virtually a ringside seat. The account concludes:

"Dale's mother, a registered nurse, states that Sheryl arrived home in a state of visible shock and had tranquillisers administered to calm her. The weather conditions were fine, a clear night with no wind."

The sighting area is in terrain consisting of a shallow valley with low hills around it. The area is one of large, mainly cleared, grazing paddocks.

Spain

Entity with a funny walk

The Madrid newspaper *ABC* for July 18, 1976, carries a report from its correspondent at Santander on the northern coast of Spain.

"At a small place called Escalante two people claimed to have seen 'a gigantic extraterrestrial, over three metres tall' a few days previously.

"The alleged occurrence was at 5.30 a.m. when the witnesses, a housewife and mother, Margarita Cagigas, aged 28, and a neighbour, Sr. Miguel Angel Ruiz Samperio, were on their way to work at a nearby place called Treto.

"They claimed to have seen the entity only from behind and consequently could give no description of features, hands, etc. They said however that the giant was wearing brightly shining dark brown clothing and was wearing on his head what looked like a silvery disc. Margarita Cagigas said he was a real monstrosity.

"The creature — if it had seen them — paid no attention to them, they said, but continued on its way. Margarita Cagigas added that she had the impression that its feet did not touch the ground as it moved along, but that 'it was flying, as a bird does.'

The newspaper reporter found Margarita Cagigas a timid and not particularly talkative person — not, in his opinion, a person “out for publicity.”

The same report also appeared in the newspaper *El Correo de Zamora* of the same date.

Credit: Jean Bastide of Aix-en-Provence, France. Translation by Gordon Creighton.

Venezuela

The price of an encounter with entities

According to a report from La Guaira carried in the Caracas newspaper *Ultimas Noticias* of September 18, 1976, a man has been placed in a Venezuelan psychiatric clinic after having had an encounter with UFO entities.

The man, unnamed, is reported to

be a resident at Los Teques, in the State of Miranda, to the east of Caracas. According to the reporter, he witnessed the landing of a flying saucer and had a confrontation with its occupants, who were “unquestionably extraterrestrials.”

It seems that, a few days previously to the appearance of this press report, the man had come running to the entrance of the textile plant where he works and collapsed on the ground a hundred metres or so from the gate. It was night time. The night guards who were on duty at the time picked him up and had him sent to the hospital at Coche. From there he was passed on from one hospital to another but nobody would take any notice of his story. Finally he ended up in a private mental clinic, where he was found to display “undoubted symptoms of mental hallucinations.”

The report goes on to say that evidently somebody is anxious to prevent the actual cause of the man's condition from becoming known to the public. Witnesses who were present when the night watchman ran out and picked him up say that his eyes were bulged and glazed with a fixed look indicating terror.

The La Guaira correspondent adds that over the past two months there have in fact been repeated reports of UFOs, emitting flashes of light of different colours, in the skies over and around Los Teques. These sightings have indeed been almost nightly. The news of the experience of the textile worker, coming as the culmination of these reports, has now set the local population agog with excitement.

Credit to FSR representative in Venezuela, Victor Gesua of Caracas. Translation by Gordon Creighton.

Still available . . .

FSR Special Issue No.4, **UFOs IN TWO WORLDS**

Includes a comprehensive account of the remarkable 1959 UFO & Humanoid Wave in Papua, New Guinea

70p (US\$2.00)

FSR Special Issue No.5, **UFO ENCOUNTERS**

Remarkable events in Brazil

42p (US\$1.40)

FSR Publications Ltd., (Back Issues), West Malling, Maidstone, Kent, England.

Available at last . . .

THE “COSMIC PULSE OF LIFE”

by

Trevor James Constable

This is the long-awaited sequel to the author's 1958 classic, “They Live in the Sky”

THE HIDDEN BIOLOGICAL POWER BEHIND UFOs UNMASKED!

Order direct from the publisher

MERLIN PRESS

P.O. Box 12159R

Santa Ana California 92712

400 pages plus 32 pages of photographs

\$5.95 U.S.A. Postpaid

Outside U.S. please add \$1.00

All copies personally autographed by author

FSR Back issues available ...

Vol. 22	1976	Nos. 1, 2 and 3
21	1975	Nos. 1, 3, 4, 5 and 6
20	1974	Nos. 1 and 5
19	1973	All numbers
18	1972	Nos. 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6
17	1971	Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5
16	1970	Nos. 5 and 6

57p (\$1.50)

CASE HISTORIES

Please note that Supplements 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 12 & 16 are now out-of-print.

STILL AVAILABLE ...

Supplements 4, 6, 7, 8, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17 & 18

27p (70 cents)