

# THE U.F.O. Investigator

FACTS ABOUT UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena

Vol. IV, No. 6

May-June, 1968

## NICAP BREAKS WITH COLORADO PROJECT New Evaluation-System, Expanded Network, To Offset Project Failure

After a long struggle to insure a full, objective investigation, NICAP has severed all relations with the University of Colorado UFO Project, which was financed by the Air Force. This followed a warning to project heads after a partial break in September, 1967, when NICAP ceased transmitting UFO reports.

To aid project scientists still trying for a fully impartial approach, this semi-break was not made public. As a further aid, NICAP subcommittees were instructed to continue helping project field teams in the hope that some new, indisputable evidence might cause a change in general policies.

In the contract signed in 1966, the AF and the University of Colorado promised an objective, scientific investigation. NICAP was listed as a source of information—the only private UFO organization named in the contract—and our full cooperation was requested by Dr. E. U. Condon, project head, and Coordinator Robert J. Low.

To have refused, because of our doubts of an AF-financed study, would have put NICAP in a bad light. We would have been sharply criticized, first by skeptics claiming we had no real evidence to submit, and second by many citizens (including NICAP members) who believed the Colorado project would reveal all known facts and reach important conclusions.

Despite our misgivings, we pledged our assistance. After working with most of the project staff, we began to hope for a majority-controlled impartial study—a hope shared by many of the Congress, the press and the public. Unfortunately, this hope steadily dwindled. Its final deathblow was the firing of two top scientists, and the resultant resignation of the administrative secretary.

To offset the project's failure, NICAP is greatly expanding its investigation-evaluation system. New subcommittees and special investigators will be added. Steps have been taken to speed transmission of UFO reports to headquarters. We are starting an entirely new and greatly enlarged evaluations plan to make full use of the knowledge and experience of our numerous scientific and technical advisers. We intend to do all that the Colorado Project was supposed to do. This will be a big job—the biggest we have ever had. We ask the help of all NICAP members in carrying out this vitally important new program.

The inside story of the Colorado UFO Project broke on April 30, 1968, when NICAP and LOOK Magazine joined in disclosing the developments behind Dr. Condon's firing of two project scientists.

At a Washington press conference, NICAP revealed additional facts it had known for months but had not made public in the hope that project difficulties could be straightened out. The following points were given the press by NICAP's director:

1. In the AF-Colorado contract Dr. Condon was named as a principal investigator. According to a statement to NICAP by Coordinator Low, in October, 1967, Dr. Condon had not made a single field investigation since the project began in November, 1966, nor did he plan any field investigations. At the same time Coordinator Low stated that Dr. Condon had never interviewed any of the known, responsible witnesses listed by NICAP at the project's request, including many military and airline pilots, scientists, tower-operators, radar experts and other highly qualified observers.

2. In 1966, Mr. Low proposed, in written suggestions to high Colorado University officials, that the project be made to appear—to the public—as totally objective, whereas it would actually be "conducted almost exclusively by nonbelievers, who, although they couldn't possibly prove a negative result, could and probably would add an impressive body of evidence that there is no reality to the observations."

**Bulletin:** Mr. Robert Low has been taken off the Colorado Project. Full details, learned just before press time, on page 4.

3. NICAP made a partial, unpublicized break with the project in September, 1967, after frequent press interviews and a lecture to scientists indicated Dr. Condon was strongly biased, scoffing at UFO believers. In addition, NICAP was told by project members that Condon and Low appeared headed for a negative conclusion, ignoring most of the powerful, documented evidence.

At this time NICAP ceased transmitting UFO reports but permitted NICAP "Early Warning Net" members to keep on phoning local sighting reports to the project. Subcommittees also were allowed to aid scientist field teams in checking certain cases.

4. Both Dr. Condon and Low urged NICAP to resume transmitting reports. The director sent them a list of questions, with a promise to resume if answers were satisfactory.

Among the questions were queries about the reported lack of Condon investigations, the evidence of negative bias and the apparent disregard of most NICAP-submitted cases. Another vital query was whether Dr. Condon and Low would agree to detailed examinations of the verified evidence.

5. Both Dr. Condon and Low refused to answer the questions. The signed refusals are in NICAP records.

6. Drs. David Saunders and Norman Levine were fired by Condon on February 9, 1968, "for incompetence," he said in a press release. According to the two scientists, they were discharged for revealing Low's 1966 proposals.

Dr. Condon has stated he never knew of the Low proposals until early February, 1968. When he did learn of them he did not fire Low but the two scientists who, with others, had opposed Low's suggestions.

One quick result of the NICAP-LOOK disclosures was a blast from Congressman J. Edward Roush. Congressman Roush, already concerned about the UFO problem after examining NICAP evidence, asked for a Congressional investigation. (See page 4 for detailed Colorado Project story.)



## Membership Drive Prize

NICAP is launching an all-out membership drive, with a grand prize for the largest number of new memberships secured, and other important prizes. Details on another page.

If your membership card bears the symbol IV-6 your membership expires with this issue. We shall appreciate it if you will renew early, without waiting for a renewal notice. This will insure your receiving the July-August issue without a possible delay from a last-minute renewal.

Please notify us promptly of any change of address.

## THE **UFO INVESTIGATOR**

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

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

### New Moon Findings

Scientists are no longer sure the moon is dead. Some are now even prepared to say that it is an active body with a hot, volcanic interior. Data from Surveyor VII, the last of America's soft-landing lunar probes, indicates that at least some of the moon's mountains are made of the kind of granite rock that is common on Earth, rock that is known to result from violent, high-temperature processes within our planet. If the lunar highlands were formed by such processes, the probability arises that the origins of the Earth and moon may be more closely linked than has been believed.

Surveyor VII landed in an area unlike that where previous Surveyors touched down. The site was mountainous, whereas the earlier locations were plainlands (maria). Scientists assigned to the Surveyor program did not expect to find anything in the mountains that was substantially different from what had been found on the maria, but Surveyor VII's camera disclosed an inordinate amount of rocks. According to Dr. Eugene Shoemaker, the geologist who interprets Surveyor's photographs, "There were many small pebbles and a greater variety of rocks, some of which appeared coarse-grained and banded." One of the pebbles was scooped up by the surface-sampling device on the spacecraft, and was subjected to chemical analysis by the on-board system designed for that purpose. The analysis led to the discovery of the granite.

Despite the clues afforded by the presence of granite, the origin of the moon remains uncertain. However, in light of the data from Surveyor, three theories appear most reasonable. As Dr. Shoemaker explains, "Earth and moon formed within 200 million years after the sun. The moon may have condensed from the same patch of dust and gas as Earth, in which case they are sister planets. The moon may have condensed separately and been captured by Earth early in its history. Or the moon once may have been part of Earth and separated from it while the latter was still fluid. We are not going to find out which is correct until we can get some men up there. We should get all the information needed on the maria in two flights. By the third trip, I hope we can land in the highlands."

Another Surveyor scientist has also made a discovery that supports the revised context in which the moon is presently being considered. Dr. Jack Green, aerospace specialist at McDonnell Douglas Corp., and consultant to the Surveyor program, has detected areas on the lunar surface that may contain life-bearing moisture. Using a special telescope to study the crater Aristarchus, Green has found dark sections that suggest the presence of sulphur, an element that on Earth is associated with water-containing minerals. If the relationship between sulphur and hydrous rocks holds true on the moon, reports Green, there may be relatively warm, moist places near craters, where small organisms might live. Terrestrial bacteria, for example, are known to survive in such environments as hot springs.

Green agrees with the new findings from Surveyor regarding the possible volcanic activity beneath the moon's exterior. He is persuaded that protrusions such as craters were probably formed by subsurface processes rather than by the impact of meteors or

## FORMERLY SECRET AF REPORTS SECURED

Twelve formerly secret AF project reports, including over 80 documented sightings, have been obtained by NICAP after weeks of work with the "Freedom of Information" (Moss) Committee of Congress. All the reports are stamped "SECRET" or "CONFIDENTIAL," with warnings against divulging the contents, under provisions of the Espionage Laws. Although the cases occurred in the early 50's, they form an important, little-known part of the UFO official records.

These AF-UFO official Project Reports include verified jet chases and other encounters with unknown flying objects. Witnesses include AF and Navy pilots, radar and air-base tower operators, CAA (now FAA) personnel. Atomic Energy Base observers, etc. In many cases, the AF admitted the objects were unexplained—though public statements indicated they were conventional objects.

<del>SECRET</del> UNCLASSIFIED	SECURITY INFORMATION
<b>STATUS REPORT</b>	
<b>PROJECT BLUE BOOK - REPORT NO. 7</b>	
FORMERLY PROJECT GRUDGE	
PROJECT NO. 13073 31 MAY 1952	
AIR TECHNICAL INTELLIGENCE CENTER WRIGHT-PATTERSON AIR FORCE BASE DAYTON, OHIO	
UNCLASSIFIED	COPY NO. 33 752-11949
UNCLASSIFIED	

One of AF reports now available.

The existence of these hidden early reports has been known to NICAP for years, but efforts to get them were fruitless. We knew there was a Blue Book Special Report 14, published in 1955. It seemed obvious there must be previous project reports, but AF Headquarters and project spokesmen denied this repeatedly.

After passage of the "Freedom of Information" Act, new efforts were made, and finally the Moss Committee succeeded in forcing the AF to cease withholding the reports. It developed that Project Blue Book had stamped the reports "Unclassified" in 1960, which permitted them to state UFO sightings were not classified. Actually these official records were made available for nearly eight years, and only after Moss Committee pressure.

The 12 AF Project reports have been combined for printing by NICAP. The publication will contain approximately 200 pages and will be 8-1/2 by 11 inches in size, the same as Vol. 1 of "The UFO Evidence."

Though it was merely proposed in the preceding issue, the publication has been ordered by about 175 members, and we are now accepting definite orders, at \$5.00, mailed at book-rate. For quicker delivery, you may add \$1.00 for first-class mailing.

similar nonvolcanic events. He foresees craters as useful sites for manned bases, because if there are hydrous minerals nearby, as his observations indicate, the rocks could be processed to yield their water for use by the astronauts.

# French General, Scientists, Report UFOs

In recent months, close approaches have dominated reports of UFOs, but several other cases by specially qualified observers also have added important evidence.

On the night of April 12, two UFOs were observed in the Washington, D.C., area by two men, one a zoologist, the other an astronomer. In a signed report to NICAP, the first witness described the objects as dull orange globes. They appeared at 11:40 p.m., he said, and moved swiftly across the sky, SSE to NNW, disappearing in about five seconds.

An earlier report, recently received, confirmed an encounter by General Paul Stehlin, a top-level pilot in the French Air Force. On an afternoon in September, 1967, General Stehlin was piloting a plane over Villacoublay, a military airfield near Paris, when he saw a silvery cigar-shaped object flying parallel to his aircraft. The UFO paced the general's plane for several minutes, then accelerated and rapidly went out of sight.

Several 1968 reports describe EM (electromagnetic) interference effects from nearby UFOs. One case occurred on Jan. 2, in Whitehorse, Yukon, Canada. About 4 p.m. Tom Banks and Errol Smyth were cruising in their snowmobiles when they spotted a pulsating orange-yellow UFO just over the treetops. Its radiance, they said, was brighter than the sun. Banks reported that his snowmobile stopped and he felt an unusual heat—both effects supposedly from the UFO. The strange object quickly disappeared, after which the snowmobile functioned normally.

## TV INTERFERENCE

Shortly before midnight on Jan. 8, according to the Trenton Times, an orange-red, bowl-shaped object was sighted at Jackson, N. J. The witnesses were Mr. and Mrs. Robert LeChance and a neighbor, Mrs. Gertrude Gifford.

Just prior to spotting the object, LeChance said, the colors in his TV picture faded out. Mrs. Gifford reported that her TV set "went out completely, and my lights dimmed. . . . It (the UFO) went down behind the tree line, then came up and went down again. . . until it finally disappeared." She told police she was badly scared by the incident.

An unusual wind effect was reported on Jan. 30 by a number of Venezuelans. The sighting was described by witnesses on the Punto Solo ranch in the Palo Seco area. A spokesman for the group, ranch-owner Prudencio Salzar, said a silvery object emitting red lights landed near a corral. As it took off, he said, it made a sound "and the trees around the site were shaken violently by blasts of wind."

## CLOSE APPROACH IN CANADA

A disturbing UFO sound was also linked with a sighting on Feb. 19, near Bengough, Saskatchewan, Canada. The witness, Mrs. Martha Heggs, said the sound was a high-pitched whining noise which caused "a tingling sensation throughout her body," according to a report submitted by NICAP member D. F. Clausen.

Looking out her window, Mrs. Heggs saw a clearly outlined UFO. Its lower portion, she said, was like "two shallow plates placed lip to lip." It also had an "inverted bowl" superstructure and a smaller, dome-like structure on top of this. An aerial-like section supporting a small sphere could be seen at the extreme top. Around the superstructure, Mrs. Heggs reported, were six or seven arch-shaped ports, and she could see what looked like riveted seams around the lower part.

The UFO was first seen circling "about one foot" above a 35-foot power pole mounting a transformer. It circled the pole to the left four times, then moved out over the witness' farmyard, descending to "three feet off the ground" and hovering for about five minutes, "directly in front of three wrecked cars." It ascended to about 20 feet and circled four storage bins. The object then moved northeast over three more bins and circled two nearby tractors and continued onward seemingly to survey two parked trucks, two elevated fuel storage tanks and an electric water pump. It then headed toward some trees, leaving the farmyard.

Mrs. Heggs reported that, during the sighting, her "dog was cowering, lying on the snow and trying to cover its ears with its front feet." Her cattle also reportedly "took flight when she first saw the object. . . . running into their sheds. They did not emerge until after the UFO had left the area."

Five nights later, another UFO encounter took place near Westhill, Pa. The details were given to NICAP in a signed report by Mr. Karl E. Will, a chemical engineer.

Mr. and Mrs. Will had just left Westhill for their home in Carlisle, Pa., when they spotted a brilliant object approaching from the west.

"It was somewhat oval in shape, with a foreshortened tail end," Mr. Will reported. "The rear of the object had a fin or antenna tipped with a red light. The underside. . . sported two red lights, one on either side and somewhat forward of the center."

As a jet aircraft flew in the vicinity of the UFO, he added, the object's red lights "seemed to dim near to extinction" but brightened after the plane left the area.

"In the meantime," Will continued, "I had removed the spotlight from the trunk of my auto and tried to signal the object by blinking the light. As soon as I did, the lights went out. I sighted the object no more."

## PHYSICAL-EFFECT REPORT

Possible physiological effects from UFOs have been reported in increasing numbers. One example is described in a signed NICAP report by Nicholas Sgouris of Syracuse, N. Y.

At 6:15 p.m. on March 4, Sgouris was driving outside of Syracuse when he saw a solid object "with flashing multicolored lights" which were steadily blinking. Its altitude was about 200 feet.

"My car started running funny," the witness reported. "I looked out the left window and saw an object approaching from the left. It passed over (the) highway in front of me. . . ."

Sgouris said his car slowed almost to a stop after he had sighted the object and that he experienced a "funny feeling" and couldn't move until the UFO headed away.

Another Syracuse sighting was reported on March 8 by three citizens. The UFO at first appeared to be ball-shaped, but as it changed position it was seen to be a large disc with a domed top.

Other logged reports, with few details: March 27, 77 miles east of Anchorage, Alaska, a large, silvery, rectangular object seen by 11 witnesses; April 8, Toronto, Canada, a hovering object with a ring of orange-red lights and three white beams which lit up the area; April 12, Cape Neddick, Maine, an oval domed object with a cluster of red blinking lights and a pulsating white light in front.

## SUBMERGING UFO CASE

Since publishing "The Question of Submerging UFOs," (Vol. IV, No. 5) we have received other reports of objects on or near bodies of water. One case is described by Barry A. Nason, New Brunswick, Canada. Nason was fishing in Trout Brook Lake when a small UFO, estimated three feet in diameter, hit the water about 15 yards away.

"It was traveling in a spinning fashion," Nason said. "It sprayed water seven or eight feet high. . . and made a terrible, loud sound." Nason crouched, fearing the UFO might come his way. The object then left the water and went into a clump of bushes, making "an awful commotion." It then flew back over the lake and submerged at one edge. Nason said he saw a big cloud of steam and heard a gurgling sound. For some time afterward, he stated, the water was covered with small waves.

A second 1967 Canadian case, investigated by NICAP member D. F. Clausen, involved a close approach to a school bus. The report was made by Mrs. Evelyn Brown, the driver. On June 1, 1967, Mrs. Brown was headed toward Shaubavon, Saskatchewan, when she glimpsed a strange object over her left shoulder. She stopped the bus and the UFO also stopped, hovering for several seconds. It was a round device, with a "dull aluminum" appearance. Above the main body she said, was a superstructure with portholes and atop this was a "glass-like" dome.

After about 15 seconds, the UFO lifted, passed over the bus, then hovered again, to the right of the vehicle, finally moving to a position "dead ahead."

"At this moment Mrs. Brown turned on the headlights," Mr. Clausen reports. "The object stopped immediately. She then switched the headlights off and on three or four times. The 'object' rocked three or four times. . . stopped rocking, hovered for about two seconds, then rose very fast, straight up out of sight."

# THE INSIDE STORY OF THE COLORADO PROJECT

When plans for the Colorado Project first became known to NICAP, before the 1966 contract signing, several Board Members, advisers and also the director were extremely skeptical. It appeared this might be mainly an attempt to take the heat off the AF after the backfire of their incredible "marsh gas" story—a hasty UFO sighting explanation which brought nationwide ridicule and rejection.

After discussions with Dr. Condon, Mr. Low and project scientists, we promised to cooperate—with a frank warning that this would depend entirely on the project's impartiality. Dr. Condon and Mr. Low fully agreed.

For weeks before the official start on November 1, we briefed project members and helped plan the investigation. Most of the group—men like Dr. David Saunders, an experienced psychologist, later head of the computer section—seemed to take the problem seriously.

On October 4, 1966, the University of Colorado gave the AF a detailed proposal, No. 66.1.253, which was incorporated into the contract as the basic policy. The main points, confirmed by a photo-copy of the contract, included these provisions:

"The work will be conducted under conditions of the strictest objectivity by investigators who, as carefully as can be determined, have no predilections or preconceived positions on the UFO question. This is essential if the public, the Congress, the Executive and the scientific community are to have confidence in the study."

## "I GUESS I'M AN AGNOSTIC"

The first jolt came on October 8, after the contract was signed. The New York Times, the Denver Post and other papers ran stories quoting Condon:

"I guess I'm an agnostic . . . it is highly improbable they (UFOs) exist . . . the view that many UFO sightings are hallucinatory . . . will be a subject of our investigation, to discover what it is that makes people think they see things." On October 9, in the Denver Post, Condon was quoted as hoping "to learn why astronomers, satellite trackers, FAA radar operators, etc., don't report UFOs . . ." (NICAP: Many such reports are official records.) . . . "early reports are so old and vague they are no good."

On October 9, the Post also quoted Low as saying the UFO project came close to being unacceptable, but "when you're asked to do something, you don't say no—not to the Air Force." Next day, after defending Low, Dr. Condon said, again in the Post: "... 95% of the UFO reports are relatively easily identified as . . . well-known natural phenomena . . . (which) indicates an appalling lack of public understanding . . ."

During a phone call from NICAP's director, Mr. Low said he and Condon were incorrectly quoted, that Condon was an honest agnostic, willing to be convinced by true evidence—such as NICAP had already outlined. NICAP delayed its intended break pending word from Condon. In a November 8 letter, Dr. Condon again pledged an objective study, listing these ground rules:

The main guide would be "whatever appears to us . . . most clearly to serve the national interest." Existing facts, sighting reports would be as fully tested as possible . . . "These guidelines are required by the very process of research. No proper investigator would approach his work otherwise."

## THE DECISION

After a long conference at the University of Colorado, NICAP decided the number of unbiased scientists, evaluating the massive factual evidence and making field checks, might reverse any negative approach—or at least offset any biased conclusions with a strong majority dissent.

On this basis, NICAP told its subcommittees to aid project field teams; we submitted several hundred representative reports, including many—but by no means all—of our strong, hard-core cases.

Early in '67, we learned from some project members that they were thoroughly testing the extraterrestrial hypothesis, using the strongest evidence. But our cautious optimism was soon jolted again.

On January 25, Dr. Condon made a speech at Corning, N.Y. Press reports indicated he had already decided on a negative report.

When we saw the press story we phoned Dr. Saunders and announced we were breaking off. He asked us to wait, then went to Condon and told him the project could not go on without NICAP's help. After a discussion with Saunders and other scientists, Dr. Condon apologized to NICAP by phone, said he was badly misquoted, and urged us to continue our "valuable cooperation."

The director told him we were taking a serious risk, that NICAP could be called blind or stupid to help a biased project. Condon denied any bias. After 30 minutes of blunt discussion, Dr. Condon said he would not make any more speeches or public statements on UFOs. He agreed to put this in writing.

For a man as determined as Condon, this was a major concession. It seemed that, temporarily at least, there might still be hope for full-scale evaluations.

For several months, this uneasy truce continued. Then early in September it ended.

In a speech before scientists at an Atomic Spectroscopy Symposium, Dr. Condon concentrated on humorous contactee stories. According to one of the audience, Dr. William S. Bickel, a University of Arizona scientist, the talk was funny—but devoid of any hint of a serious problem, or a serious investigation. To Dr. Bickel and others present, it seemed likely the Project report would be in the same vein.

## THE FIRST BREAK

A quick NICAP call to a project member brought more bad news. Against protests by most of the scientists, a search for negative evidence was now being emphasized.

Within ten minutes we gave the project official notice: Transmission of NICAP's UFO reports was ended.

This action, we learned later, had a stronger impact than we expected—almost a shock effect. One suggested possible reason concerned the university's request for more AF funds—over \$200,000 to extend the investigation. Examination of important UFO information from NICAP was cited in this request.

Whatever the reason, Dr. Condon sent Low to Washington to urge that we reconsider. During a somewhat tense session with the director and Assistant Director Gordon Lore, Low admitted the split in the project and Condon's "present" disbelief in UFOs, which he said might still be changed by good evidence. He was reminded they already had many strong NICAP cases. Low explained they needed the rest of our reports so they could not be accused of reaching a verdict without all of NICAP's evidence.

Before we could resume, Low was told, he and Condon would have to give satisfactory written answers to some important questions. Low said he would try to persuade Condon to reply.

Most of the questions sent to Condon and Low concerned guarantees that all NICAP-submitted cases would be fully investigated, that Dr. Condon would personally examine these cases, would make field investigations and interview witnesses in major cases. Condon also was asked if he considered all the reporting pilots, scientists, tower operators, radar experts, etc., to be deluded, incompetent or hoaxers.

## QUESTIONS REJECTED

In replying, Condon and Low refused to answer these key questions, but both praised NICAP highly. Condon: "We deeply appreciate the (NICAP) cooperation . . . the help you have given us so far has been of great importance . . ." Low: "NICAP's assistance has been invaluable . . . Your files, because of the high caliber of the field investigations NICAP has conducted, are of very good quality . . . Our working relationships . . . have been excellent . . . It would be a great pity if they were terminated . . . Dr. Condon has said to you that our study is being done objectively. It is."

Because of the evaded questions, NICAP's ban remained in effect.

About one month later, a far different Low statement was given to the director by a project member. Dated August 9, 1966, addressed to University officials E. James Arthur and Thurston E. Manning (U. of C. vice president), it summed up some officials' views:

"In order to undertake such a project, one has to approach it objectively. That is, one has to admit the possibility that such things (UFOs) exist. It is not respectable to give serious consideration to such a possibility. Believers, in other words, remain

outcasts . . . admitting such possibilities . . . puts us beyond the pale, and we would lose more in prestige in the scientific community than we could possibly gain by undertaking the investigation . . ."

Under the heading "Comments," Low made his personal proposal:

"Our study would be conducted almost exclusively by non-believers, who, although they couldn't possibly prove a negative result, could and probably would add an impressive body of evidence that there is no reality to the observations. The trick would be, I think, to describe the project so that, to the public, it would appear a totally objective study, but, to the scientific community, would present the image of a group of nonbelievers trying their best to be objective but having an almost zero expectation of finding a saucer. One way to do this would be to stress investigation, not of the physical phenomena, but rather the people who do the observing—the psychology and sociology of persons and groups who report seeing UFOs . . ."

Even though we were partly prepared, this was a shock. Our first impulse was to show Low's proposals to the press and announce a complete break with the project. But the memo, though not marked restricted by Low, had been shown to us confidentially and we were asked to wait for a final showdown between Condon and project scientists.

On Dec. 12, 1967, a copy of the memo was given to Dr. James E. McDonald, senior atmospheric physicist at the University of Arizona, who for some 18 months had been intensively investigating UFOs, under a university grant. McDonald, shocked as we had been, urged Saunders and Levine to let him tell Low he had the memo. It was his belief that Low and Condon would be badly upset and would quickly change the project policies. To insure this, McDonald also asked permission to inform the National Academy of Sciences—which was to review the project's report.

#### FURY OF THE SCIENTISTS

The scientists' group finally agreed, but the results were disastrous. Condon and Low were furious. It was reported later that Condon fiercely denounced Saunders and said he should be professionally destroyed. Dr. Levine received similar harsh treatment. Both were fired the next day charged with "incompetence."

The administrative secretary, Mrs. Mary Lou Armstrong, courageously defended the scientists and told Condon the project had been "gravely misdirected." Condon told her to put her complaints in writing. When she did, he demanded she keep the letter confidential. In a stormy session she refused, then resigned.

Following this, Condon wrote Dr. McDonald and demanded he return the copy of Low's proposals, calling the memo "stolen papers." McDonald refused, on the basis of an earlier Low statement that project records should be in open files, none of them classified.

About this time, author John Fuller approached Levine and Saunders in regard to an article for LOOK to give the matter nationwide publicity. NICAP agreed to delay its UFO Investigator story, provided our part in the struggle was fully covered and a NICAP box statement was included.

#### CONGRESSIONAL CONCERN

At our Washington press conference, the day LOOK came out, we stated we did not accuse Condon or Low of dishonesty. Strange as it might seem, both appeared to believe their approach was correct and fully justified since they were convinced (from lack of examining the massive evidence) that UFO reports were nonsense. NICAP strongly rejected such an approach as improper for the heads of an announced "objective" study.

General public reactions to the disclosures ranged from shock and indignation to an increased disgust by those who have never believed in the project. Some broadcasts quoted NICAP and LOOK without comment. Some stations, like KLAC, Los Angeles, blasted the project. In Congress, Reps. J. Edward Roush (D. Ind.), Jack Brotzman, (R. Colo.) and others demanded a Congressional investigation. Roush, a member of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, asked the AF Secretary to look into the published charges. Also, as a member of the Government Operations Committee, which delves into claims of misuse of Federal funds, Roush asked the Comptroller General to investigate.

According to the Denver Post, May 2, 1968, Roush told its Washington Bureau that the Colorado probe was an AF "trick" rigged from the start with the conclusion reached before the investigation had even begun.

Weeks before this, NICAP had realized the project's failure could be misconstrued, causing many people to think all UFO investigations had ended. Even the AF, awaiting the Condon report, had made little pretense of checking UFO reports.

To fill the void, and quickly, two alternate NICAP plans were worked out.

On April 30, NICAP wrote President Johnson, enclosing the Low proposals and other evidence and urging that he create a new, absolutely unbiased UFO Commission to replace the wrecked project—a commission completely independent of any military or civilian Government agency. As one safeguard for a truly impartial evaluation we suggested that all important decisions be by majority vote. We also suggested that the Commission members, selected by the President, be recognized authorities on astronomy, aerospace operations, electronics and other fields related to UFO investigations—scientists of high stature, convinced that the UFO situation is serious enough to require total evaluation of all reports by responsible observers.

#### ANSWER FROM THE AIR FORCE

Whether the President was shown the evidence, or his AF aide took over, is not known. Regardless, the answer came from the Office of the Secretary of the AF, signed by Col. B. M. Ettenson. Without the slightest mention of the bias evidence, Ettenson wrote:

"Dear Major Keyhoe:

"President Johnson has asked that I reply to your recent letter regarding allegations pertaining to the Air Force contract with the University of Colorado for the investigation of unidentified flying objects.

"The Air Force awarded the unidentified flying object contract to the University of Colorado in October, 1966, convinced that an impartial, open-minded, independent and objective scientific report would be forthcoming and we expect that Dr. Condon will fulfill the terms of the agreement. . ."

Since the report was not completed, Ettenson said the AF would not comment further.

About this time, Coordinator Low was taken off the project. Low had been assigned to write the final report, a job that would take all summer according to official statements. But he was suddenly transferred to other duties, with a claim that his project work was done.

To some, it appeared the university was "running scared" and might even try to revamp the project to avoid further criticism. But this faint hope ended when a Low replacement named Gilmore was named. It was announced he would live with the Condons while doing "editorial work" on the report. His UFO knowledge, if any, was not mentioned.

It is not impossible that Condon could be persuaded to change course, admit the existence of unexplained reports from highly-qualified observers, and recommend an enlarged investigation. But those of us who worked with the project expect a completely negative report, rejecting all verified evidence, ridiculing veteran pilots, scientists, and other responsible witnesses—and changing from high praise of NICAP to a bitter attack.

However, several explosive developments are due to become known, and a negative Condon report is certain to ignite the worst UFO controversy ever. Instead of being a disaster, the Colorado fiasco will turn out to be a badly-needed jolt, setting off powerful actions which cannot be stopped.

#### NEW OPPORTUNITY

But NICAP does not intend to wait for the Condon report—or the backfire.

THIS IS OUR BIG CHANCE.

To offset the Colorado Project's failure, we have already started a new nationwide operations plan. The key points:

1. A greatly enlarged reporting network, with a speed-up of factual information to NICAP headquarters.
2. An expanded evaluation system involving more than 20 times as many scientists and engineers as the Colorado Project had at its peak. (Full details on next page.)



## NICAP EXPANDS INVESTIGATIONS-EVALUATION SYSTEM

The expansion of NICAP operations, now underway, has two major goals:

1. The largest UFO reporting and investigating network in the world. (We already have the largest unofficial network.)
2. A redesigned evaluations system with more than 20 times the number of scientists and engineers in the Colorado Project at its peak. (The ratio is already eleven to one.)

New aid in evaluating and investigating UFO reports has been offered NICAP by scientists, engineers, and various technical specialists seriously disturbed by the Colorado Project failure.

The NICAP reporting-investigating network will be enlarged to include at least one Subcommittee in each of the 50 states, with several such units in the more densely populated areas. (Present U.S. Subcommittees number 35.)

To improve the evaluations system, scientists and engineers on the Panel of Advisers and Subcommittees are being grouped according to their specialties, to insure maximum evaluation of any aspect of UFO evidence.

New offers for the use of laboratories have been received, making possible added photo analyses, evaluation of soil samples reportedly linked with UFO landings, etc.

Typical of the comments triggered by the LOOK disclosures was this statement by a university atmospheric physicist:

"I was shocked and dismayed at the attitudes displayed..." This scientist, who is also a pilot, offered full assistance to NICAP, along with two other scientists at the university.

Another offer came from a computer analyst and programmer, with detailed suggestions for computer analysis of UFO reports and promise of help in setting up such a program.

NICAP Subcommittees whenever possible have included at least one professional scientist, such as an astronomer or a physicist. Other existing subcommittee members include aerospace engineers, pilots, meteorologists, radar experts, photographers, former Intelligence officers and other trained analysts, and other persons whose background and experience are of value in UFO investigations and interviewing witnesses. The increase in Subcommittees will add even wider fields of experience.

The fields covered by the previous Scientific and Technical Panel members and the new advisers include space technology, astrophysics, communications, rocket and missile engineering and control systems, anthropology, psychology and numerous other subjects linked with UFO report evaluations.

With a UFO report involving reported EM (electromagnetic) interference with car ignition, a charred spot from a supposed touch-landing, and a photograph, the procedure would be as follows: Sample of the charred surface would be secured, also the original of the photograph; the car's electrical system would be examined; the witness or witnesses would be thoroughly questioned, and Subcommittee reports on background and reputation would be drawn up.

All this evidence and the investigator's opinions would be forwarded to NICAP headquarters, where copies would be sent to appropriate scientific-technical groups such as electrical engineers, photographic experts, and chemists (for evaluating the charred material.) Individual opinions and conclusions would be weighed at NICAP headquarters, with additional scientific discussions on unsolved points or differences of opinion.

In important cases involving detailed examinations a summary of experts' opinions, with dissents and the majority conclusion if any, would be made public.

Previously, the lack of a sufficient office staff kept us from making full use of all our advisers' talents. During our attempted cooperation with the Colorado Project, it was impossible to take on additional work.

But the failure of the Colorado Project to carry out a full-scale scientific evaluation has left us no choice.

### WE HAVE TO DO THIS JOB!

NICAP is the only full-time private organization large enough to do it. We have the foundation for rapid expansion. We can call upon authorities in any necessary field—experts whose reputations and experiences will command respect.

The results will be far-reaching. Many more significant reports will be submitted when observers can expect a serious and truly scientific evaluation. Members will receive not only more interesting information, on important cases, but also scientific discussions of various angles and theories.

All this is bound to have a powerful impact, when these evaluations reach Congress, the press and the public. They will greatly offset the fraudulent claims and hoaxes which have caused ridicule, hampered serious investigations, and aided the official and self-appointed debunkers.

To get this job started, we have temporarily reduced other work until we can get extra help. We will need real support to carry out this vitally important program.

But it will NOT take any half-million dollars, such as was given to the Colorado Project. (As an ironic sidelight, one former Project member was quoted as saying it became embarrassing sitting around and trying to think how to spend the money.)

There may be a better chance of securing a research grant from a foundation when our enlarged scientific operations are well underway. But before then we will need your help—and the help of non-members who see the need for this NICAP drive.

One way you can help speed this program is to secure new members for NICAP. For the first time in our history, we are launching a full-scale membership drive, with prizes which we hope you will find a worthwhile incentive. Details are given on the opposite page.

In previous years, unavoidable delays in publishing the UFO Investigator caused many members to hesitate in urging friends to join. Though some may not realize it, we have been on schedule since the end of 1967. The preceding number was accidentally called the March issue, instead of "March-April," but the present issue makes the third in 1968, and three more will be published in '68. The July-August number is scheduled for the first part of August—possibly sooner if important developments require it.

We expect the coming issues to contain increasingly interesting news. We are also making strong efforts to secure important sighting reports we know are being withheld by airline pilots and other responsible observers not under official orders.

We ask every member to make the utmost effort to build up NICAP membership—not only to finance our expanded operations but to increase our prestige and influence.

Another way in which you can help NICAP and at the same time learn about long hidden UFO information is to order the special NICAP publication of AF Project Reports, containing formerly "Secret" or "Confidential" sightings. Details on this \$5.00 publication are given on page 2. In the previous issue, we mentioned this proposed publication, intending to print it if there was enough interest. Some members sent in orders, but we have held their checks until we were sure of proceeding. We now have almost enough orders for a first run and we expect to mail copies about the last of June. (If you wish faster delivery than book-rate mail, you may add \$1.00 for first-class postage.)

If the response to our membership drive and the special AF Projects publication is large enough, it will not only expedite our expansion but speed up completion of Volume II, The UFO Evidence. This will probably be the most impressive material we have ever published, containing numerous important sightings and developments since January 1, 1964. Details will be given in an early issue, when we can announce the publication date and accept orders.

There are some official and self-appointed UFO debunkers who still hope the Condon report will be widely accepted in spite of the LOOK-NICAP revelations.

Dr. James E. McDonald recently summed up the debunker's expectations prior to the LOOK disclosures:

"... there was every reason to believe that Condon was about to quietly bury the UFO problem, his report providing a heavy tombstone to keep the corpse from rising to bother the United States Air Force."

Judging from the AF letter evading any mention of the evidence sent to the President, officials still plan on having a deep grave ready.

But after 11 years of such tactics, we have had enough. We will fight any such attempt to the last ditch.

If you resent the Colorado fiasco—if you are indignant, too, then help us as best you can.

With your backing, we can—and will—block any trick to bury the UFO problem.

## NICAP MEMBERSHIP CONTEST

As announced on the first page, NICAP is launching, with this issue of the UFO Investigator, a special membership contest to allow us to serve our members better and to obtain the financial backing to expand our scientific operations. NICAP members have long worked on an informal basis to help secure new members, but now, for the first time in our history, we are conducting an all-out organized effort to encourage fresh interest and support and to build our membership. We have selected a number of prizes we believe will have special appeal for members and supporters of NICAP. To aid you in entering the contest, a special form is enclosed with this issue.

**First Prize**—awarded to the person who submits the highest number of orders for new memberships and/or renewals—will include: 1) An original color painting approximately 18" x 24", by NICAP artist Ted Thoben, of a major UFO sighting, as selected by the winner; 2) A ten-year NICAP membership; and 3) Three autographed NICAP publications.

**Second Prize**—awarded to the person securing the second highest number of new memberships and/or renewals—will include: 1) An autographed copy of one of the UFO books by NICAP's Director, Major Donald Keyhoe; 2) A color photographic enlargement of one of the paintings specially prepared for NICAP by Ted Thoben; 3) A five-year NICAP membership; and 4) Two NICAP publications.

**Third Prize**—awarded to the person submitting the third largest number of memberships and/or renewals—will include: 1) A color-photograph enlargement of one of Ted Thoben's special UFO paintings; 2) A three-year NICAP membership; and 3) One NICAP publication.

As added incentive, NICAP offers special prizes to individuals making substantial contributions to the contest but failing to win any of the three main prizes. These special prizes are: Any contestant who submits five to nine orders for membership will receive a free one-year NICAP membership (or renewal, if the contestant is already a member). Any contestant who submits ten or more membership orders will receive a free one-year NICAP membership (or renewal) plus a color photograph of one of the Ted Thoben paintings.

The painting to be awarded as part of First Prize will depict any UFO sighting of the winner's choice, provided NICAP considers the sighting genuine and NICAP's file on the sighting is adequate.

The photographs to be awarded as part of Second and Third Prizes will be selected by the winners from a list of the Thoben paintings already in NICAP's possession. These will be extra large (the exact dimensions have not yet been determined) and will be made by a professional photo laboratory.

The color photographs to be awarded as special prizes will be selected by NICAP.

### CONTEST RULES

1. The purpose of the contest is to secure new NICAP memberships and renewals. Each order for one of these will count, with equal weight, toward a prize. A sample of the order form to be used by contestants is enclosed with this issue of the UFO Investigator. The sample may be copied by the contestant, or copies may be obtained from NICAP. Entries that do not supply the information on the sample order form may have to be disqualified. Only new renewals, submitted during the contest period, will count toward contest prizes.

2. The contest is open to all interested persons, regardless of whether they are NICAP members. If a contestant chooses to join NICAP during the contest period, his new membership may be used as a contest entry in addition to the other orders he submits. If a contestant is already a NICAP member and chooses to renew his membership during the contest period, his renewal can be used as a contest entry in addition to the other orders he submits.

3. The contest opens on June 15, 1968, and closes on August 31, 1968. All entries must be submitted during this period. Entries postmarked later than the closing date of the contest will be treated as normal, noncontest orders and will not count toward any contest prize. All entries become the property of NICAP, and none will be returned.

4. All entries must be accompanied by full payment for the orders being submitted.

5. All payments submitted with contest orders should be in U.S. funds. Currency, checks, and money orders are acceptable. Do

not submit stamps, coins, or foreign money.

6. Please make all checks and money orders payable to NICAP.

7. The judges of the contest will be the members of NICAP's Executive Staff, and their decisions will be final. Correspondence cannot be entered into with individual contestants about their entries, unless NICAP considers it necessary.

8. Winners will be notified individually by mail, and their names will be announced in the September/October, 1968, issue of the UFO Investigator. This will be the only official announcement, and no other lists will be offered or sent out.

## NETWORK TO REPORT SIGHTINGS

A nationwide UFO reporting network, composed of amateur radio operators, is being organized by Wayne Green, veteran "ham" operator and publisher of "73 Magazine." NICAP has offered full cooperation and is asking all its "ham" members to communicate with Mr. Green and help speed up the operation. Mr. Green has agreed to relay all network-reported sightings to NICAP, and to help in alerting our Subcommittees in the areas concerned, so that prompt investigations can be made.

If fully carried out, this UFO network system will fill a long-recognized need. In our earlier years, we tried to set up such a system, but there was not sufficient interest. With today's wide interest in UFOs, the plan should succeed.

There are some 265,000 licensed radio amateurs in the U.S., plus more than a million users of mobile radios in taxis, police cars, trucks, Civil Air Patrol and other vehicles. With all these available sources, a UFO reporting system could be set up to blanket the country.

Mr. Green has outlined his network plan.

"If we were to establish a net frequency on 80, 40 and 20 meters for UFO reporting we could arrange for a single tone to be transmitted, when an alert came along, which would turn on all of the loudspeakers of participating stations. Thus all of us could have a receiver set up on a net channel all the time, running silently. Amateurs in every community... could ask their local police, Civil Defense, etc., to call them immediately if any sightings are reported.

"When something is reported anywhere the local amateur station would call in on the net and net control would send the tone to alert the entire network. Once the area of contact was established amateurs in the area toward which the UFO was headed could alert their police and others... (This could include alerting the nearest NICAP Subcommittee or special investigator)."

Mr. Green suggests that interested "hams" start operations on 14250 kHz, and he offers his station — W2NSD, Peterborough, New Hampshire—as the control station. Alternate calls, if an operator cannot get on 14250, are 7250 or 3000 kHz.

## SOVIET SCIENTISTS SPLIT ON UFOs

A sharp attack on the USSR's recently announced UFO project has been launched by the Soviet Academy of Sciences, raising several questions about the official policy on UFOs.

The split between scientist groups was revealed in a late February edition of Pravda, Communist Party newspaper. The relatively new UFO Section of Moscow's All-Union Cosmonautics Committee was denounced by the Academy of Sciences as "sensational and unscientific." The Academy also rejected the reports of huge crescent-shaped objects, sighted by Soviet astronomers and publicized by Dr. Felix Zigel, an eminent scientist on the UFO Project's staff. (See UFO Investigator, Vol. IV, No. 4, p. 1.) According to the Academy, its physics division had studied the reports and found them to have a "well-known origin" with "no scientific base."

The possibility of such an attack was hinted by Dr. Zigel when he disclosed the remarkable sightings. "Unfortunately," he said, "certain scientists, both in the Soviet Union and in the United States, deny the very existence of the problem."

The Academy's published blast seems to indicate a shift in high Soviet policy since the UFO Project was announced. If this is so, then a cancellation of the project may be forthcoming. This still would not explain the abrupt turn-around, and it would leave another question unanswered: What will happen to the book on extraterrestrial life reportedly being prepared by the Academy of Sciences? According to Dr. Zigel, the book was to contain a sizable section on UFOs.

## Ludicrous Errors In Klass Book

To the would-be explainer of UFOs, nothing is so useful as a rare natural phenomenon, little studied or imperfectly understood, to which he can attribute an endless variety of normal or freakish behavior comparable (in his opinion) to that of UFOs.

In *UFOs-Identified*, Philip J. Klass, Aviation Week magazine editor, exploits such phenomena to argue for his "plasma-UFOs" theory, which he developed with injudicious speed soon after reading *Incident at Exeter*, by John Fuller. Fuller reported a number of UFOs were sighted near high-voltage lines. To Klass this was the clue and he was off like an alert bloodhound, via ball lightning and corona discharges, to claim that most UFOs can be explained as highly ionized gases, or as one of their "distant cousins."

Numerous serious defects in this theory have been pointed out by Dr. James McDonald, senior atmospheric physicist at the University of Arizona; in a careful analysis before scientists at a Montreal meeting he demolished most of the Klass theories. Below are some of his major criticisms.

Klass says a plasmoid will trail an airplane if the latter has acquired, from snow, rain or dust particles, a charge opposite to that of the plasmoid. Analyzing this with applicable formulae, McDonald demonstrated that the Coulomb attraction cited by Klass would not draw the plasmoid behind the plane "even at the pace of a very slow walk." He also disproved the Klass explanation of why jets fail to overtake UFOs—that the plasmoid and the plane carried opposite charges and therefore repelled each other.

### Mirror-Image Error

As McDonald points out, Klass often shows an astonishing failure to understand scientific principles. To explain reports of UFOs causing failure of car ignition, he mistakenly uses the scientific term "mirror image" to create a mirror image of a plasma inside the hood of a car. In McDonald's words, this is a "a puzzling erroneous misconception to be held by an electrical engineer." As elsewhere in the book, the author obviously does not know what he is talking about.

Other errors cited by McDonald: Klass confuses "voltage" and "voltage gradient." His description of how a gyroscope reacts to external force is incorrect. His chapter on UFOs and radar does not show a clear understanding of radar principles.

In regard to the seemingly "inquisitive" UFOs attraction to moving or stationary objects on the ground, Klass stretches his 'theory' to the outer limits—creating the "charged pedestrian." According to Klass, a person may acquire a "very light charge" and if he encounters a low-altitude UFO he may find it drawn slowly toward him or that it backs off as he approaches, depending on whether the person and the plasmoid are carrying the same or opposite charges. One would like to ask whether the charge on the person can reverse itself twice during a sighting as Klass indicates in one case. (pages 46-47.)

### The Stretched Theory

Klass seems so little aware of the basic weaknesses of his theory that he insists on stretching it to cover a most astonishing range of UFO events, and on applying it to the strongest and most significant sightings. These, of course, are the daylight sightings of solid, structured objects with clearly defined edges, often with unmistakable structural details—domes, fins, apertures, appendages—seen by reliable observers, at close range, for prolonged periods. It is when he tackles cases in this category that Klass must go far afield for his hypotheses: to dust devils which might sometimes be able to detach themselves from the ground, to ice crystals forming "cold plasmas," to micro-tornadoes, to charged dust particles forming a silhouette, and the like.

Yet even granting, for the moment, that electrified dust particles could assume the shape of a structured object, where are we? What about those structural objects' details? Klass has an answer of sorts:

"The amorphous nature of the plasma-UFO encourages the observer's mind to supply spurious details that his eyes do not really see." Unfortunately for this glib dismissal of the problem, the details in question are not in the least "amorphous." Furthermore, these objects hover, rise, move about, emit sound, and dart into the sky after being observed for periods of half an hour or more. To maintain, as Klass does, that any cloud of

electrified dust particles, under no matter what freak conditions, could continue, despite wind or air currents, to give such an impression, with never the slightest change of configuration to indicate that it was really nothing but a dust cloud—is merely absurd.

Klass's interpretation of the Socorro, N.M. sighting (one of the three that he discusses in detail) is of considerable interest to illustrate his method. Here he concludes that the egg-shaped craft seen by Zamora was a "freak flying plasmas" that dropped from the scattered clouds that were over Socorro that day, or was triggered by corona discharge from the power line a mile away; that the two small figures seen beside the object were "moving wisps of whitish plasma"; and that the reported legs of the object were the dark branches of bushes in the gully. As for the landing-gear imprints, Klass speculates that the marks might have been caused if the plasma, with its stored electrical energy, had "shot out four miniature lightning bolts."

### Muddled Thinking

A particularly disturbing feature of this book consists of the author's use of what McDonald describes as "argumentation by concatenation." Noticing some vague relation between concept A and concept B, Klass next goes on to observe another remote relation between B and C. Then C may have something or other in common with D—and soon Klass is asserting that A and D are related. After tracing out several such tenuous chains of reasoning, McDonald comments, "If in approaching problems of meteorology and geophysics, scientists customarily employed that kind of concatenative logic, so casually ignored scale considerations, and rested everything on verbal arguments almost wholly devoid of quantitative considerations, they could easily show that volcanoes are related to hurricanes and earthquakes to blizzards." Argument by juxtaposition is another device—the specious assembly of what may appear to the reader a clever series of related deductions. Equally unpalatable is the use of argument by innuendo, as when failure of a correspondent to reply to the author's letters is mentioned as if it had something to do with the validity of the sighting itself.

Despite its sometimes uncritical reception in the press, this is a superficial book, and its pretensions to scientific authority dissolve upon inspection. Some very muddled thinking, and a great deal of speculation, has gone into the construction of the plasma-UFO theory. The theory lacks anything resembling rigorous scientific proof, and the author's arguments are riddled with scientific misconceptions. Mr. Klass's claims to have explained "most, if not all" of the strongest UFO reports are, as Dr. McDonald has demonstrated, simply absurd.

## Hynek Asks For Old Reports

The 19th-century period of "airship" sightings has caught the curiosity of Dr. J. Allen Hynek, long-time consultant to the Air Force on UFOs. Hynek has issued a public appeal for all people who witnessed the strange cigar-shaped objects of the 1890s to come forward and provide written reports in the interest of historical and scientific research. The appeal comes as something of a surprise, for these sightings have long been known to UFO researchers, and the Air Force has questioned their authenticity.

The sightings began in November, 1896, on the West Coast and developed into a wave that swept across the U.S. during the following five months. For want of a better term, the press referred to the UFOs as "airships," for they displayed characteristics that suggested an artificial device rather than a natural body and they moved through the air with apparent control and purpose. Lights were common on the objects, and they had a dirigible shape—but no dirigibles were then in operation.

Hynek asked that witnesses contact him at Northwestern University, Evanston, Illinois.

NICAP Assistant Director Gordon Lore has co-authored a book on the historical aspects of UFOs. Entitled *Mysteries of the Skies: UFOs in Perspective*, it's been published by Prentice-Hall, Inc., Englewood Cliffs, N.J., (see *UFO Investigator*, Vol. IV, No. 4, page 6). The price is \$5.95 and copies may be obtained directly from the publisher or from your local bookstore. The work treats some of the "airship" reports in detail.