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UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Enclosed herewith is a copy of a lecture given by Professor James E. McDonald in Washington regarding the UFO problem.

2. Professor McDonald has recently been in Melbourne for discussions with the CSIRO on meteorological problems, and at the same time, took the opportunity to present an address to members of associations interested in UFO activity.

3. The lecture papers enclosed were brought to this Headquarters by Mr Frances Williams who professes an avid interest in UFO's, for the information of the authorities handling UFO reports.

(L.B. Brown)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
SUMMARY - An intensive analysis of hundreds of outstanding UFO reports, and personal interviews with dozens of key witnesses in important cases, have led me to the conclusion that the UFO problem is one of astonishingly great scientific importance. Instead of deserving the description of "hoax phenomenon", which it has had during twenty years of official mishandling, it warrants the attention of science, press, and public, not just within the United States but throughout the world, as a serious problem of first-order significance.

The curious manner in which this problem has been kept out of sight and maintained in disregard is examined here. Basic responsibility for its systematic misrepresentation lies with Air Force Project Blue Book which, on the basis of first-hand knowledge, I can only describe as having been carried out in the past dozen years in a quite superficial and incompetent manner.

Years of Air Force assurances have kept the public, the press, Congress, and the scientific community in general under the misapprehension that the UFO problem was being studied with thoroughness and scientific expertise. Tho I have found to be completely false. Illustrative examples, drawn from a very large sample, will be described to demonstrate this.

It is urged that the time is long overdue for a fresh start in the official handling of the UFO problem, an investigation in which persons outside of official Air Force channels can participate. The history of the way in which a problem of potentially enormous scientific importance has been swept under a rug of ridicule and misrepresentation for two decades.

The hypothesis that the UFOs might be extraterrestrial probes, despite its seemingly low probability, should be considered as at least unsatisfactory hypothesis for explaining the new-available UFO evidence.

INTRODUCTION

June 24, 1967, will mark the twentieth anniversary of what we might whimsically call the "birth of June 24, 1947," Kenneth Arnold, a Boise businessman flying in his private aircraft, reported seeing a formation of nine disc-like objects skimming along at high speed between him and distant Mt. Rainier. He said that they moved in an unconventional manner "like a saucer would if you skipped it across the water." A reporter who interviewed Arnold after he landed that evening in Pendleton, Oregon, coined the phrase "flying saucers" to add a feature-story twist to an observation that this experienced pilot had told in conversation - and a journalistic era was thereby opened.

As one digs back through the subsequent history of the UFO problem, it becomes evident that a wave of UFO sightings actually began several days prior to Arnold's observation, but it was not until about July 4 that press interest rose exponentially and "flying saucers" were headline news throughout the country. I have recently had the opportunity of reviewing a compilation of UFO sightings for those first few weeks of what is usually regarded as the beginning of UFO observations, a compilation being prepared by T. R. Bloecher for publication later this year, probably by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP). Although I was already familiar with much UFO history when I began to examine Bloecher's material, I was startled to see the large number of reports of high-speed unconventional objects that flooded into press offices throughout the country in that early period, far more than I had ever guessed.

Only a small fraction of the reports were carried by national wire services, so it has been necessary for Bloecher to dig into old newspaper files in many major U. S. cities to unearth the dimensions of that wave of sightings.

I cite this early period as exemplifying much that has happened subsequently, although most of the reports of that period have never been checked as were later cases, so one cannot yet regard the evidence for all the 1947 sightings as conclusive. A mixture of denials led to a rather quick fall-off in news value of the "flying saucers" in late 1947. Hoaxes were headlined with about as much emphasis as were reports from experienced observers. The published reports fell off, and for awhile it appeared that one had witnessed just another "silly summer phenomenon," as some newspapermen described it.

But, surprisingly, the UFO reports began cropping up again. Here and there they received press coverage, mostly non-wire coverage in local papers. By 1948, considerably more reports were coming in, and military concern (which had probably never died out) was responsible for establishing an official investigatory project, Project Sign (often loosely called "Project Saucer"). Sign was set up January 22, 1948, with headquarters at Wright-Patterson AFB, within the then newly-created United States Air Force. That date marks the beginning of Air Force responsibility for investigating UFO phenomena, a responsibility it carries to this date. I think it is rather striking that UAP was exactly seven days old when it was handed the UFO problem in 1948.

Project Sign gave way to "Project Grudge" in February, 1949; and, with ups and downs, Grudge continued until about March, 1952, when it was superseded by "Project Bluebook," in organizational entity that survives today, still headquartered at Wright-Patterson AFB. The summer of 1952 brought back the greatest waves of UFO reports on record, and the first Bluebook officer, Capt. E. J. Ruppelt, has related (Ref. 1) the hectic efforts of his staff
of about ten Air Force personnel to keep pace with the reports that poured into WPABs that summer. The famous Washington National Airport sightings of July 19 and 26, 1952, which included CAA radar observations, commercial airline pilot observations, and ground observations, created the neariest thing to a panic-situation that has ever evolved from UFO reports. After a White House query and numerous Congressional and press demands for an accounting, a press conference was called and the entire series of observations was "explained" as due to anomalous radar propagation and mirage-type refraction events. I have carefully examined those official explanations and find them entirely inadequate, incidentally. Although press attention subsided in the face of these assurances, Air Force concern behind-the-scenes continued, and early in the following year a panel of scientists was assembled to review the situation.

THE ROBERTSON REPORT AND THE CIA

The Robertson Panel (chaired by Caltech theoretical physicist H. P. Robertson) met in January, 1953, and reviewed selected UFO reports - apparently about eight in detail and about fifteen others on a briefing-basis. Two working days of case-reviews followed by two days of summarizing and report-drafting constituted the entire activity of this Panel during the period January 14-17, 1953. I describe that Panel's work in more than passing manner because I believe that the Robertson Panel marked a turning point in the history of UFO investigations.

On the first of three visits to Project Bluebook at WPAB last summer, I asked to see the full report of the Robertson Panel and was given that report by the present Bluebook officer, Maj. Hector Quintanilla. He informed me that he had "ruled out" on the basis of the "12-year rule" covering UFO documents. I made extensive notes from it and discussions with Quintanilla. On my next trip to Bluebook, on June 19, I requested a Xerox copy of the report. The copy was prepared for me, but not given to me because a superior officer suggested that since "another agency" was involved, they'd have to check before releasing it to me. I reminded him that I already had extensive notes on it and that I had already discussed its contents with many scientific colleagues around the country. I was assured that their check was perfunctory and that I would be sent the copy in a week or two.

In fact, I never received it. The "other agency," the Central Intelligence Agency, ruled that this document did not come under the "12-year rule" and reclassified it. Although a so-called "sanitized version" was later released, the full document remains undisclosed. A number of sections of the "sanitized version" have been published by John Lear, who asked for full release but got only the partial version (Ref. 2).

I studied the full version in unclassified status. Military and scientific staff at WPAB have been aware of my possession of this information for months. I have discussed it with many scientists. I regard it as open information in no way bearing on the security of the United States, and I shall now describe its contents here. I urge that press and Congress demand full and immediate release of the entire text of the Robertson Report, including the CIA recommendations which have had such strong bearing on the way in which the Air Force has subsequently treated the UFO problem, so that other scientists can make their own evaluations of the matters in which scientific pursuit of the UFO problem was derailed in 1953.

The scientists comprising the Robertson Panel (Robertson, Luis N. Alvarez, Lloyd V. Berkner, Samuel A. Coudemir, Thornton Page) on the basis of what I must regard as a far too brief examination of the evidence already in Air Force files as of January, 1953, ruled (first) that there was no evidence of any hostile action in the UFO phenomena. In particular they ruled (secondly) that there was no evidence for existence of any "artifacts of a hostile foreign power" in any of the records which were submitted to them. And (thirdly) they recommended an educational program to acquaint the general public with the nature of various natural phenomena seen in the skies (meteors, vapor trails, haloes, balloons, etc.), the objective being to "remove the aura of mystery" that the unidentified objects had "unfortunately" acquired.

In view of the rather limited sample of UFO evidence which was laid before this Panel, such conclusions were perhaps well warranted. The crucial shortcoming was this: There is no evidence that any of these five men had previous extensive contact with the UFO problem. The principal cases they examined excluded some of the most interesting and significant cases already on record (e.g., United Airlines, 1947; Chiles-Whitted, 1948; C. B. Moore, 1949; Tombaugh, 1949; Farmington, 1956; Chicago & Southern Airlines, 1959; TWA Airlines, 1959; Seymon Hesse, 1950; Mid-Continent Airlines, 1951; Nash-Porterfield 1951; and many other very significant 1952 sightings). And a mere two days of review of the UFO data (prior to going into report drafting session) would not be enough for all the hundreds of science to sort out the baffling nature of this problem. The only scientist present at these sessions who had already examined a substantial number of reports was an associate member of the Panel, Dr. J. Allen Hynek. When I asked him last June why he did not speak out on the basis of his then five years experience as chief scientific consultant to the Air Force on UFO matters, he told me that he was "only small potatoes then" and that it would have been impossible for him to do so at that time.

In reflecting on all that I have learned in my past year's work on this problem, I regard this four-day session of the Robertson Panel as a pivotal point in UFO history. For instead of a recommendation that the problem be taken out of Air Force hands (on grounds of non-importance of the UFOS) and turned over to some scientific agency for adequate study, there was a most regrettable fourth recommendation made at the specific request of CIA representatives present at the final sessions of this
panel. (CIA representatives listed in the report given to me on June 6, 1966, included Dr. H. Marshall Chadwell, Mr. Ralph L. Clark, and Mr. Phillip G. Strong. Top-ranking USAF representatives present were Brig. General Garland, chief of the Air Technical Intelligence Command, P. C. Durant and J. A. Hynek were "associate members" of the Panel.)

Whereas three of the five recommendations were later rescinded (true for about six years), the fourth recommendation was never fully reported in a manner that press, public, Congress, and science can evaluate. However, enough of that fourth recommendation is described in Lear's summary of the "sanitized version" that even persons who have not seen the entire document, as I have, can sense that a minor tragedy of science may have been in effect in January, 1953.

The fourth recommendation, made by the CIA, asked for a systematic "debunking of the flying saucers," to use the actual language of the document. And the stated objective of the "debunking" was to "reduce public interest in flying saucers." Now I wish to make very clear that, on the basis of my examination of the full context of this fourth recommendation, I do not regard this as a dark and sinister action of a covert body trying to deceive the citizenry of the nation. Rather, the reason behind this regrettable decision (that appears to have been acted upon so very faithfully by Project Bluebook ever since) was entirely understandable when seen from a solely national-security viewpoint. The unprecedented wave of UFO reports of 1952, some just in official Bluebook files alone, tied up Air Force reconnaissance personnel and intelligence machinery to an alarming degree. Given scientists' opinion that there was no evidence that the UFOs came from any terrestrial power hostile to the U.S., it seemed to some people to be urgently important to reduce this "noise" that might cover up real "signals" coming into intelligence channels. Hence, viewed narrowly from security viewpoints, it made good sense to get this noise suppressed. It has indeed been effectively suppressed in the ensuing fifteen years.

AIR FORCE REGULATION 200-2
Within a few months after the CIA recommendation was incorporated as the fourth item in the Panel summary, a very important Air Force regulation, AF 200-2, was promulgated (August, 1953). This regulation contains the actual wording that "the percentage of unidentified must be reduced to a minimum," a goal that has been well achieved. AF 200-2 was tied in with another regulation, JAMAP-146, that effectively made it a crime punishable with up to ten years imprisonment and $10,000 fine, if anyone disclosed, at air-base level, any information on any "unidentified." Auxiliary regulations made the four armed services subsidiary to the Air Force in U.P.O. matters, so that all reports from any military channels were supposed to go to Project Bluebook at WPASB. Local commands could release to the press or to interested citizens information on reports for which known explanations are available; but all unknowns were to go to Blue-book.

This had an effect that is well known to all who have studied this problem closely. At Bluebook the most outrageously unscientific "explanations" were assigned to important sightings. Cases bearing the slightest resemblance to feathered creatures were called "birds," and some of the most improbable "balloon" phenomena in all the history of ballooning can be found in Bluebook files. "Astronomical" was tagged onto cases that are no more astronomical than ornithological and so it went. The "percentage of unidentified" was, by the fiat of scientifically untrained Bluebook officers, steadily reduced to a minimum. And science was damned.

I could discuss, for hours, specific details of cases reported since 1953 for which Bluebook has given utterly unreasonable "explanations." cases I have gone over in detail and many of whose key witnesses I have personally interviewed. The only non-military person who has had continuing opportunity to examine these cases was the Bluebook consultant, Dr. J. A. Hynek, who has held that role continuously for eighteen long years. I have discussed some of the famous howlers with him and with Air Force personnel, I can only say here that I am quite dissatisfied with such answers as I have been able to secure.

In those Bluebook files have lain hundreds of cases that received no adequate scientific review, that have been explained away in such ridiculous manner that even amateur astronomers or untrained citizens have publicly complained about the absurdity of the official explanations. And much more distressing have been the many cases in which responsible citizens have, in good faith, reported significant encounters with unidentified objects at close range, objects defying explanation in conventional scientific and technological terms, only to have the Pentagon press desk release official explanations in terms of "twinkling star" and "inversion," "mirage," "balloon," "refueling tanker," and the like. Such explanations, put out as if they resulted from a careful Air Force check, made the citizens who reported seeing strange objects feel, as one victim put it to me, "like idiots." I truly doubt that Air Force personnel at WPASB and the Pentagon can have any notion of the bitterness they have created among persons who have been made the butt of ridicule by these "debunking" policies that race back so clearly to the 1953 decisions.

The net effect, over the years, of such policies and procedures has been entirely understandable. Newspaper editors, on having staff to send out to check even the sightings in their own vicinity in a manner that could be termed scientific, and having no reason to suspect that the Air Force would be superficially inventions explanations with essentially no scientific content, quickly grew convinced that there must not be anything to the UFO phenomena. Once this conviction was fairly well established, the natural proprieties of journalists to prefer writing feature stories
to factual accounts of inexplicable phenomena led to the "funny treatment," and that led to still more ridicule. That, in turn, led the discerning citizen to the realization that he had seen a large red, glowing object 100 feet long over a field, beside a lonely road at night, with no other witnesses to back him up, but he had better keep his mouth shut. And mouths shut up by the hundreds, as any serious student of the UFO phenomenon knows very well, through the recurrent phenomena of the disclosure of "hidden UFO reports."

The "hidden UFO report" is one that some person has never related to anyone except perhaps one or two friends or members of his immediate family, until, by chance, he encounters a serious investigator whose chief goal is not just ridicule UFO witnesses. Then he may disclose his previously hidden report. I have encountered many hidden UFO reports which the observer had not yet related to even to members of his own family, so strong has the "ridicule lid" become. NICAP is often the recipient of hidden UFO reports when persons happen to read of that organization's serious efforts to solve the UFO puzzle. It is not surprising that one does not find huge numbers of hidden reports that have been disclosed to Bluebook.

Thus the process grew cumulative in nature. Instead of a steady stream of disbelieving reports with multiple witnesses who saw a given event from various locations (obviously involving in scientific terms a high degree of probability), there was a near-stoppage of reports, or else the painfully recurrent situation where one found only a single witness. And this is a situation where the probability of additional observations seemed very high. The "percentage of unidentified" was "reduced to a minimum," and ridicule was one of the potent reductive factors.

Commercial pilots have had bitter experiences with Air Force discrediting of their reports, as for example in the famous Killian case (American Airlines pilot who, along with several other crewmen on Feb. 24, 1959, saw three UFOs over Pennsylvania). NICAP files and the important Air Force "UFO Evidence" (Ref. 3) have several good examples. The effect, by the late 1950's was clearly evident in the reluctance of airline pilots to report sightings, a reluctance strongly enhanced, in some instances, by management directives from airlines offices instructing their pilots that they were not under any circumstances to publicly report any unidentified aerial objects that they might see during flight operations. This further reduced the percentage of unidentified in an area of great potential importance.

Another exceedingly adverse effect of AP200-2 has been that radar sightings of unidentified objects cannot be disclosed to press or public by local air base personnel. Radar sightings do leak out in the midst of periods of active sightings, but then the next day official disclaimers usually appear, as in the case of the important Midwest wave of early August, 1965. Radars at Tinker AFB and Carroll AFB reportedly had unknowns at positions compatible with reports from many states highway police in Oklahoma and Texas, as was learned by direct phone calls from the Oklahoma Department of Public Safety in the wake of the excitement (Ref. 4). But the following day, the press was told these were due to "inversions" and "electronic malfunctions," as had happened before in such important cases as the Red Bluff, Calif., sightings of August 11, 1960, or the Redmond, Oregon, case of Sept. 24, 1959, or Skowhegan, Me., February 11, 1966, etc. In the August, 1965, Midwest episode, it was interesting that Wichita Weather Bureau radar, unaffected by AP200-2, also tracked many of the objects and, like the subsequently denied USAF radar observations, matched ground-visual observations closely. In some cases FAA radar observations have been available to confirm visual sightings: in others, one gets the impression that FAA releases are compromised in some manner not unlike those at Air Force bases.

No single effect of AP200-2 has been as scientifically dismaying as the compromising of the radar data. Here is an already available electromagnetic sensing device, deployed in large numbers throughout the country, which is known to be capable of detecting UFOs. This latter assertion is fully justified by the present disclosure of many Air Force radar observations of high-speed objects for which no adequate explanations were even given. Indeed, one of the problems that was repeatedly mentioned in the Robertson Panel report (see Ref. 2) was the "fast-track" problem, which clearly bothered both CIA and Air Force in 1953. And well it should, as one can readily learn for himself by reading Ruppelt's book (Ref. 1), or the only summary of radar sightings of objects tracked at multi-thousand-mph speeds as listed by NICAP (Ref. 1). A more recent case, that I have personally checked on, occurred at Patuxent River Naval Air Station on December 19, 1964, when two unidentified objects were tracked at speeds of over 7000 mph. Whereas the Navy released a statement attesting to the experience of the radar man and whereas the operating personnel stated that the set was not malfunctioning, Air Force spokesmen told Sen. Harry F. Byrd, who queried the Air Force on the case, that an inexperienced operator was on duty and the set was not working properly (Ref. 5).

And not only have American radars tracked high-speed objects executing maneuvers defying explanation, but so have radars of other countries. To cite one such case, South African Air Force radar tracked a target making repeated passes at speeds of 1000 mph over the Cape on May 22, 1953, under conditions that led the government to declare it officially unknown, a status that they have recently reconfirmed. In addition, there are on record, both in USAF files and in NICAP files, many cases of combined visual and air-borne radar sightings by military and commercial aircraft.

The famous Rapid City, S.D., Dakota, case of August 12, 1953 (Refs. 1, 3) could serve as a good example of unexplained Air Force sightings. After a UFO was spotted by a member of the Ground Observer Corps on night duty, two F-84's were vectored in to the location of the object, which showed on GCI ground-radar.
pilots got airborne radar look-ons and also saw the glowing objects, usually not too close on it. Many more such cases can be cited, but not after August 1953 when AF200-2 shut down further disclosures of military sightings.

Citation of foreign radar sightings above leads to the inevitable question of why foreign governments have not conducted independent studies of the UFO problem. There seems absolutely no question but that the UFO phenomenon is a global phenomenon, so why haven't England or France, or Australia, dug into this problem? I have no final answers, but I asked a French UFO investigator, Dr. Jacques Vallee, about the French situation in particular. He explained that whenever French investigators of the UFO problem made any appeal to their government, they were told that the United States Air Force had been carefully studying that problem for years and had shown that there is nothing to it! I am told that the situation in Australia is not dissimilar. Is it conceivable that AP200-2 has succeeded in reducing the percentage of unidentifieds not only here but all over the world? I strongly suspect not, though that is an inference I could not prove, only make plausible by many examples.

Air Force Regulation 200-2 was given a new number a few months ago; it is now called AP80-17. The only significant change was to permit the University of Colorado to gain access to the inevitable question of why unidentifieds. Let us hope that this simple important alteration will soon pave the way to clarification of radar sightings by military radar systems. But for years, AP200-2 has been a most effective barrier to free disclosure of precisely that type of observational data that would support the rationalization of the "debunking concept" for the radar sightings. Much more can be said about the radar problem, but here the blockage effect of the "debunking concept" that led to 200-2 has been the point of principal interest.

1953 REVISITED

Looked at in retrospect, and viewed against the large volume of unexplainable phenomena reported outside of military channels since 1953, the recommendations made by the five scientists who comprised the Robertson Panel seem most regrettable.

Are they to be faulted for their actions? I think not. The cases they reviewed were selected by someone else, presumably Air Force intelligence officers, or possibly CIA representatives (though I stress that I doubt this) and knowledge of no evidence indicating that the CIA than maintained, or now maintains, any scientific scrutiny of the details of the UFO phenomena). I feel entirely certain that if I had no prior knowledge of details of UFO cases and were suddenly asked to make a recommendation based on a mere three days' look at UFO cases, I would not end up describing them as the greatest scientific problem of our time. One might, however, wish that the Panel members had asked for a better chance to review more cases; and one can surely argue that it is by not having a good look at the whole problem out of the mainstream of our military intelligence channels and into some primarily scientific channels where the problem could have been more adequately examined.

The latter suggestion was, unfortunately, not made by the Panel probably because these were busy men who thought the whole business had actually been well checked out by Air Force personnel and Air Force consultants. Perhaps they were reluctant to accept as scientifically significant observations made outside the scientific laboratory. Perhaps there were other considerations.

But at any event, January, 1953, brought a marked turn of events. Bluebook operations under Capt. E. J. Ruppel, it seemed to have been heading in 1952 towards some kind of systematic investigation methods that might have brought the whole problem out into full glare of scientific light. But after AF200-2 came out in August, 1953, and Ruppel left the Bluebook staff shortly thereafter, a true period of "dark ages" began at Bluebook, and good reports kept coming in, as one can easily see by going over those files. But contrived "explanations" became the order of the day, and debunking to reduce public interest in the flying saucers went on apace. Organizations such as NICAP attempted to force the problem out into the open, but their efforts were treated by Air Force personnel as if they amounted to crackpot activities, a viewpoint which I found rather well established in Air Force circles when I began an intensive examination of this problem in April, 1966. Whether this attitude has since altered appreciably behind scenes, I cannot say. I might note, however, that I have repeatedly stated to Air Force personnel concerned with the UFO problem that the NICAP investigations since its founding in 1956 are far superior to those of Bluebook, and I maintain repeated observation here. It is based on a great deal of first-hand experience and on the basis of careful examination of many cases investigated by NICAP and Bluebook, respectively. Prior to June, 1966, I had no first-hand knowledge of either NICAP or Bluebook. By July, 1966, it had become very clear that Bluebook has been operated on an almost incredibly non-scientific basis, whereas NICAP's work merits high praise, especially when measured against the shoestring budget on which they have operated.

THE CONSPIRACY HYPOTHESIS

I must comment next on one very intriguing aspect of the give-and-take between the Air Force and groups such as NICAP, namely the question of the "conspiracy hypothesis." Among those who have done a substantial amount of checking of UFO reports, there invariably develops great concern over what I term the "coverup versus foulup" controversy.

Some feel, on the basis of considerable knowledge of UFO history, that there are so many well-documented instances in which Air Force personnel have obfuscated in their
handling of UFO cases that there must be a grand conspiracy, a high-level coverup of some sort. NICAP, and especially its director, Major Donald E. Keyhoe, have cited dozens of instances that seem to suggest such a high-level coverup. At present, I cannot subscribe to the grand-coverup hypothesis.

I do not believe, as do some UFO investigators, that the CIA or still higher security groups "know all about the UFOs," know that they are of extraterrestrial origin, and are concealing this from both the public and science. Rather I have seen a large amount of evidence, much of it compelling in its nature, that leads me to reject the grand-coverup hypothesis. I believe it is instead a grand foulup, accomplished by people of very limited scientific competence, confronted by a messy and rather uncomfortable problem. What Air Force officer, American, British, Russian, or Chinese, would care to admit that in his country's airspace there are maneuvering objects of unknown nature far exceeding in performance characteristics anything his friends are flying? I have told Air Force personnel quite directly that I think it's a foulup, not a coverup, and until I see new evidence to the contrary I shall subscribe to this view.

As a result of close scrutiny of the operating methods of Bluebook, after seeing at firsthand how little scientific expertise has been utilized at Bluebook, and after finding no one in any Air Force office that I have visited who exhibits any appreciable knowledge of the full history of the UFO problem, I have slowly formed my own picture of what has probably happened in this long-standing coverup vs foulup controversy. I sense that groups like NICAP who have been actively investigating the UFO problem over the years have been incapable of imagining how incompetently the problem was actually being handled within the Air Force. They could only imagine that every-thing they knew was surely also known to Bluebook investigators, and that all those spurious explanations defying elementary scientific principles could only be the efforts of not-too-careful officers assigned to put out the coverup propaganda.

But after seeing what has gone on at Bluebook, after talking with higher-echelon personnel at WPAFB who were almost unaware of what was being done in the J-man (major, sergeant, secretary) operation, and after being assured in the most convincing manner that Bluebook has been an extremely low priority project (one of about 206 in the Foreign Technology Division of WPAFB where it has lain in recent years) form a very different picture. My picture of all this is no cloak-and-dagger conspiracy, no effort to prevent the public from knowing the "real nature" of the UFOs, no front organization named Bluebook concealing a higher-level investigation of the UFOs. Instead I see just one incompetently and superficially investigated case after another swept under the rug.

Bluebook, without conspiratorial finesse, has succeeded in hoodwinking us in their most successful tactic being called the "five-day delay." After an important sighting that has somehow gotten the wire services (many of us wonder how it is that certain cases make the grade while so many others go unnoticed), Bluebook and the Pentagon press desk just wait. Then, when press interest has gone through its characteristic half-life of about two or three days, they put out some "explanation" and add solemn assurance that the Air Force has investigated such and such a number of cases in the past ten years and of these such and such a tiny percentage have been regarded as unidentified, and the public and the editors shrug their shoulders once again, forget the sightings, and decide there sure must be a lot of nuts in the country to be reporting such outlandish things when the Air Force keeps on dutifully checking them and finding then all due to twinkling stars and meteors. It works. As editors, ask yourselves if it doesn't work.

And all the time groups like NICAP, having diligently dug out the facts, usually in far more detail than has Bluebook or its consultants, are left wondering how such atrocious official explanations could be palmed off on the public unless...and their suspicions that there must be a top-level coverup grow and grow. I believe that this, combined with inherent tendency for military personnel to play it safe and play it classified when in doubt about an uncomfortable situation, has generated the suspicions of a well-designed conspiracy. When jets are scrambled to try to follow a UFO, and all is later denied, I think it's just some colonel playing it safe. I do not, in my rejection of the hypothesis, fault those who have been driven to it by some faint faith in the image of scientific expertise so diligently shaped by innumerable Press Information Officers at the Pentagon and elsewhere. But in the area of the UFOs, that image appears to me to be a completely false image, almost laughably false. The United States Air Force most assuredly has a lot of top-notch scientific talent at its disposal. It just hasn't used any of it on the UFO problem for at least fifteen years, as far as I can see.

I have often wondered if perhaps the PIOs at the Pentagon press desks actually believe that, with all the engineering and scientific talent that can be found up at Wright-Patterson AFB, Bluebook must have a lot of that talent, too. This, at least, might explain how the Pentagon desk has dutifully passed on to us sometimes howling-mad local citizenry "explanations" of the most patently senseless nature in recent years. I might add that one additional strong argument against the high-level coverup hypothesis is the very ineptitude of Bluebook "explanations." If CIA and USAF really wished to conceal the UFO, they could very easily have assigned to the Bluebook office clever, scientifically trained officers who could have come up with absurd rather than absurd "explanations." This has clearly not been done. Finally, were there some frantic
effect on the part of CIA and USAF to plumb the secret of the UFOs, NICAP and even a person who has done any checking of strong cases of close-range sightings as I have done, would surely run into many cases where the key witnesses had been carefully interrogated by trained personnel out to get every last shred of evidence from a strong case. Quite the opposite situation prevails: Again and again one finds that even when key witnesses risked ridicule and reported a case to Air Force channels, no investigation of any kind was conducted. Let me cite a simple example that I checked just last week.

A report in the latest NICAP bulletin (Ref. 7) indicates that: "A UFO over the United Nations in New York City was reportedly seen on November 27, 1961. It was reported at least eight employees of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, who watched from their offices on the 17th floor of the 780 Third Avenue building at 11:00 a.m. on that day. The UFO was a rectangular, saucer-shaped object...which came southwest over the East River, then hovered over the UN Building...It flashed and winked like a string of lights. Witnesses mentioned were D. R. McCay, assistant general manager of ANPA and Mr. W. H. Leick, manager of the ANPA's Publications Department. I telephoned the ANPA office and spoke at some length with Mr. Leick about the sighting. He confirmed that eight or nine persons were on the 17th floor terrace watching the object hover over the UN Building for a number of minutes as it rocked and reflected the sun's rays with a golden glint before rising and moving off. I asked Leick if they reported it to any Air Force channels, and he said that A. A. LaSalle called a New York office of the Air Force and was assured that an officer would be in the next day to interview them. But no one ever came. This is indicative of the diligence with which the Air Force is seeking out evidence about UFOs. Over a half dozen responsible witnesses see an unconventional object hover over midtown Manhattan, they tell the Air Force, and it vanishes. Leick added that they also phoned a New York newspaper "which shall go unnamed," but "they weren't interested." It got to NICAP almost by accident, and NICAP sent up their standard witness-guestionnaires which Leick said they all filled out as carefully as they could.* If this were an isolated instance, it might be amusing; it is all too typical, unfortunately. So I don't see the outrages of a frantic race against time to secretly solve the enigma of the UFOs.

Incidentally, my phone call to Leick illustrated another point - it turned up one more of the many "hidden UFO reports" I have received. Leick and his wife, driving at night on the Ohio Turnpike several years ago, had seen a luminous, unconventional object with a circular array of lights. After hovering about 5 minutes, it took off in an oblique climb at very high speed. "I've never seen anything that fast," Leick told me. He had never reported it, having no desire to be ridiculed for his observation, he explained.

If my view is wrong, if there is a high-level coverup, then I am going to be one of a very large number of scientists both within this country and outside it, who are going to want to hear some fast explaining as to how a scientific problem of the potential interest of the UFO problem could be regarded as the legitimate domain of deception-operations unparalleled in previous history. But, to repeat, I just don't believe there have been such operations. (In a recently published book [Ref. 7], L. J. Stanton also rejects the "conspiracy hypothesis," but for reasons which seem to me to reflect incomplete knowledge of the facts of the case. Stanton's book can be recommended as a generally sound analysis of the history of the UFO problem and the shortcomings of the official investigations.)

Thus, it's not the UFOs but the Air Force investigation that is the big joke, as I now see it.

On June 7, 1966, at the end of my first visit to Bluebook, and after inordinately pouring over perhaps 150-200 cases selected at random from the 2,000 files, I stated to Brig. Gen. Arthur W. Cruikshank, Jr., commander of the Foreign Technology Division at AFPAF, that when the full picture gets out as to how the Air Force handles the UFO problem, "the Air Force will look very, very bad." I still regard this prediction as sound, ten months later. Gen. Cruikshank's response was laudable. He put three officers onto the task of carrying out a quick review of Bluebook. I extended all possible cooperation to that trio of officers last summer, and even now I heard no more. I subsequently found that Gen. Cruikshank (who seemed to be quite interested to hear a real live scientist in his office saying that there might be much more to the UFO problem than had ever met the Air Force eye) was transferred to another command on the West Coast as part of a routine shift of personnel. Therein one sees one more facet of the Air Force problem. No one has ever stayed with this problem long enough to sense its true dimensions. There have been a half dozen Bluebook officers since Ruppelt. None seemed to have had any appreciable scientific background. Only the chief scientific consultant has been present for eighteen years, and until recent months, Dr. Hynek seems not to have taken very seriously the enormous volume of important reports that one finds packed into the huge files in the Bluebook offices. And so years have slipped by and the UFO problem is still with us. Worse yet, credible UFO reports of close-range sightings are on the increase, and this despite the "ridicule lid" which callous Air Force discrediting has imposed.

**SCIENTISTS' VIEWS ON UFOs**

Having suggested that press and public have been misled by the CIA-requested debunking that Bluebook has carried out in the past dozen years, it is next in order to ask why scientists have not seen through the misrepresentations. Certainly at this writing one would be rash to suggest that more than a few percent of the country's scientists take the UFO problem seriously. If the true percentage is
larger, then I can only say that most of the supporters are keeping themselves very well concealed. By those scoff at the UFOs as a lot of nonsense or as an expression of the human need for miracles or as the mistaken observations of untrained laymen are both numerous and vocal.

In seeking an explanation of this pattern, one must again appeal to the Air Force Project Bluebook for having left scientists with no reason to doubt that the problem was being very thoroughly investigated. Scientists are busy people, always have more to do than they have time for, and when they read in the papers that Bluebook has explained away all but a tiny percentage of reports, and that for most of those explanations could probably have been found had there been more adequate information, they are not likely to pursue the matter further. Scientists, like Congress and the public, had no reason to suspect that all those Pentagon reassurances were baseless, so most of them ignored the problem.

Others, unfortunately, without any first-hand knowledge about the actual UFO evidence and without any personal examination of substantial numbers of UFO reports, have felt free to speak ex cathedra that "people have a need for miracles, so what's more natural in a scientific age than scientific miracles," and so on. Many, seeing the highly visible cultist and crackpot fringe of believers in UFOs, out on the basis of their personal knowledge, with some interest, though none seems to have pursued the matter as a full-time effort. None could be rated a Nobel prize-winning scientist, none are leaders of American science, I suppose; and most have been reluctant to speak out on the basis of their personal knowledge, though they have suspected that scientific values were being ignored in the neglect of the UFO question. I was, myself, in roughly that last category until I decided, a year ago, to try to make an intensive study of the problem and see if there really was anything to all those reports that seemed to keep cropping up. Despite almost a decade of intermittent checking of local UFO reports near Tucson, I had seen too few instances of strong cases to feel free to extrapolate very far. I was entirely unprepared for what I found almost immediately upon making a personal check of NACAP's operating methods and case files, and upon doing the same at Bluebook. I feel sure that my reaction will be paralleled by that of many other scientists just as soon as they can be persuaded to personally look into the actual nature of the UFO evidence. Without that, theSearch get them to do so, I am finding, is not as easy as one might hope.

I might say that I have never met a scientist who has made what I could regard as an adequate investigation of the UFO problem who is not inclined to sneer at the problem. If I did find one, I would be extremely interested to hear his arguments.

There is one scientist who has written and lectured a great deal about UFOs, and who has certainly looked at a lot of cases without being convinced that the UFO problem involves anything of great scientific interest. That is Dr. Donald Menzel, former director of the Harvard College Observatory. Dr. Menzel has published two books on the UFOs, both aimed at explaining UFOs chiefly in terms of misinterpreted meteorological and astronomical phenomena (Refs 8, 9). I am deeply puzzled by those books, especially the more recent one.

My puzzlement stems from realizing that Dr. Menzel's background in physics and astronomy is well-attested by his authorship of a number of texts and references in those areas. Despite that background, when he comes to analyzing UFO reports, he seems to calmly cast aside well-known scientific principles almost with abandon, in an all-out effort to be sure that no UFO report survives his attack.

Refractive processes are quite well understood in optics, and the refracting properties of the atmosphere are surely as familiar in astronomy as in meteorology, if not more so. Yet "explanation" after "explanation" in his books, Menzel rides roughshred over elementary optical considerations governing such things as mirages and light reflections. For instance, the interesting observation made by Dr. Clyde Tombaugh, in August, 1949, who along with two members of his family saw a puzzling array of pale lights move rapidly through their zenith sky in Las Cruces, New Mexico, and disappear into the southeastern sky, is casually attributed by Menzel to "reflections of ground lights against the boundary of an inversion layer in the air." The difficulty that these lights were rapidly moving in orderly fashion across Tombaugh's sky Menzel explains (Ref 9, p. 269) by asserting that it was produced by "a ripple in the thin haze layer." That is, "this ripple, tipping the haze layer at a slight angle, could have reflected the lighted windows of a house which..." the ripple progressed in a wavelike motion along the layer, the reflection would have moved as did the rectangles of light." Now this might work with a layer, but to anyone who is at all familiar with the physics of reflection and particularly with the properties of the atmosphere through which generations of astronomers successfully watched a large number of astronomical events, the suggestion that there are "haze layers" with sufficiently strong refractive index gradients to yield visible reflections of window lights is simply absurd. But, in Menzel's explanations, light reflections off of atmospheric haze layers are indeed a sight to behold. This, I say, I simply do not understand, since one is not dealing here with some subtle shade of opinion. Such a near-normal refraction process does not happen in the atmosphere - and no one should know this better than an experienced astronomer.

Refractive distortions of stellar images are a familiar source of trouble to astronomers,
and the circumstances governing these distortions are rather well known. Certainly the order of magnitude of refractive displacement and oscillations is well known. Yet Dr. Menzel speaks in detail (Ref. 9, p. 61) of a "mirage of Sirius" which he, himself, reportedly observed while flying in an Air Force aircraft in the Arctic, in which refraction effects are supposed to have enlarged Sirius to an apparent angular diameter of about 12 minutes or more of arc (approximately, he asserts, to a sphere a foot or two in diameter at a distance of 300 feet). Just how refractive index gradients with the axial symmetry necessary to enlarge a stellar image into a circular disc of such relatively enormous diameter could ever develop within our atmosphere, Arctic or otherwise, is not hinted by Menzel, nor does he confront the puzzle of how, as he flew along, his steadily changing optical path always provided him with this kind of a refractive index pattern of axial symmetry despite looking through steadily changing air paths! But having made his point, he uses it as the basis of discounting UFO sightings by experienced pilots who, he asserts, repeatedly see refraction phenomena of just the same type. This is nonsense.

The important Nash-For tenberry sighting of July 14, 1952, in which the pilot and co-pilot of a Pan-American DC-4 observed six red-glowing disc-shaped objects maneuver at high speed and in unconventional manner below their plane over Chesapeake Bay, is readily explained by Menzel (Ref. 9, p. 256 ff) as searchlights hitting an "inversion layer" of what is a thorough study of the situation showed," but as one reads along, it becomes clear that all of his arguments apply only to formation of the familiar nocturnal layer that hugs the earth's surface. Yet the two experienced Pan American pilots distinctly describe (and Menzel's book, p. 256, reiterates this) the way in which they suddenly "abruptly began a steep climb to an altitude above that of the plane," an appearance quite out of question for an hypothetical searchlight shining on an hypothetical inversion layer near the earth's surface. But many other details of the sighting, clearly stated by Nash and Fortenberry, such as the sharp-edged nature of the glowing discs, and their impressive formation-holding maneuvers, are glossed over in Menzel's inversion-layer explanation. Such easy neglect of salient features of the cases he treats marks many other examples that could be cited.

Menzel's explanation of the famous Chiles-Whitted sighting is another excellent illustration of his methods of argumentation. An Eastern Airlines DC-3, piloted by Capt. C. S. Chiles with J. B. Whitted as second officer, encountered a high-speed rocket-like object approaching them out of the northeast in the early morning hours over Montgomery, Ala., on July 24, 1948. The object was described as having a length of over 100 ft and thickness twice that of a B-29 fuselage; it had something resembling blue-glowing ports and a fiery wake streaming from its rear. It passed the aircraft, rocking the DC-3 as it did so, it pulled upwards into a steep climb and passed out of sight through the broken cloud deck overhead. All of these details are on record with the Air Force and are recounted in Menzel's book (Ref. 9, p. 108). Menzel suggests that this was a fireball (intensely bright meteor...). He noted the reported rocking of the DC-3, and completely ignores the un-meteor ical pull-up and vertical climbout. But what is most difficult to understand, from an astronomical point of view, is that he goes on for several pages indicating that since that incident occurred near the time of the Delta Aquarids meteor shower, these pilots were fooled by a fireball from this shower. Now first of all, few showers have meteors large enough to reach the fireball class (brighter than -3 magnitude), and the Delta-Aquarid stream is not one of the showers noted for this. But much more surprising is that Menzel clearly failed to check his computations of the position of the shower radiant, for had he done so he would have found that the Delta Aquarids were at culmination about 40° above the southern horizon, whereas the Eastern Airlines DC-3 was heading towards the northeast. Had Chiles and Whitted seen an Aquarid meteor in the skies ahead of them, it would have given the appearance of moving in the same general heading as their plane, whereas all accounts, including Menzel's own version, describe the huge glowing object as coming directly at the aircraft! Thus there is a clean-cut error of about 90° in Menzel's Aquarid meteor explanation. But Menzel closes his pat discussion of this case (Ref. 9, p. 112) with the statement that "...there can be no doubt that Chiles and Whitted misinterpreted the appearance of an unusually brilliant meteor..."

The phenomenon of anomalous propagation of radar within layers of strong gradients of humidity and temperature is well understood. To determine whether this phenomenon can occur, one consults radiosonde data to see just what index gradients prevailed. Menzel discusses a number of UFO reports in which he invokes anomalous propagation, but in no instance does he present evidence that he has examined any quantitative aspects. With qualitative arguments, false alarms are also reported occasioning confusion about what he calls "...anomalies which are almost non-existent in Menzel's disposal of UFO sightings. In some instances, he attributes airborne radar echoes to phenomena which are unknown to military pilots and unexplainable in terms of meteorology and physics. For example, in the Important Port Huron, Michigan, case of July 29, 1952, ground radar detected a high-speed unknown and then the radar in the nose of one of the F-94's vectored into the unknown picked up an echo and locked-on; finally the pilot himself saw a fast-moving glowing object in that location. Menzel (Ref. 9, p. 160) easily explains the visual effect as the star, Capella, and the ground-radar fix and radar lock-on he explains away as "phantom returns caused by weather conditions." Evidently he did not examine the available radiosonde data for that date and area, as I did, for there was absolutely no chance of anomalous propagation causing false ground returns of auroral origin, and this object that originally picked up this fast-moving and oddly maneuvering target. But still more perplexing is his suggestion that the airborne lock-on by
the F-94 was due to "weather conditions."

Index gradients adequate to give appreciable super-refraction or subrefraction are unknown in the free atmosphere, and it will be seen that even supposing such returns would occur even with powerful index gradients unless there is some solid radar-returning object in the beam. Near the earth's surface, objects of one sort or another that provide these false targets of solid nature; but aloft there are no such solid objects lying around to throw back a spurious echo. The result is that "ground returns" are entirely unknown aloft, and one need only ask an experienced Air Force pilot to confirm that Menzel's hypothesis of the Levelland case, one finds him re-using the ball lightning explanation to account, on the next page, for another case, the Loch Haven Dam case of October 25, 1958. He ignores completely the point that there, too, the car engine was stopped, but the witnesses' report of a large luminous object, estimated at 100 feet or so in length, hovering over a bridge structure, he attributes to more ball lightning. To make the latter seem to fit better, he refers to the object as a "ball," despite the witnesses' remarks that it looked more like a "Navy blimp" (Ref. 10, p. 192). Also ball lightning is a luminous mass only a foot or two in diameter, so how Menzel feels it can attain a size of 101 feet is far from clear. But the real irrelevancy of the entire "explanation" emerges only when one runs down the weather map for the day in question and finds that a large high-pressure area set over the East Coast, precluding anything like the kind of atmospheric electrical activity so casually invoked by Menzel.

I could easily go on at much greater length with specific objections to Dr. Menzel's methods of explaining UFO cases, but the above should suffice to suggest the nature of my strong objections to his writings on this subject. I simply do not regard them as substantial scientific analyses of the UFO phenomena. I believe they should be ignored.

However, they have not been ignored at all. One can find references in the writings of other scientists who cite his work as the authoritative analysis of the UFO problem, and I can only presume that those others who have accepted his conclusions have not examined the actual details of his arguments, for the latter just will not withstand close scrutiny. In my opinion, and in the opinion of a number of other scientists, Dr. Menzel has had a baleful influence on scientific progress towards solution of the puzzle of the unidentified flying objects. I believe that Air Force officers have patterned many of their "twinkling star" and "fireball" explanations after those to be found in Menzel's books — and perhaps one can only say that for officers with very limited scientific background to take his writings as reliable was not unreasonable, in view of his prestigious affiliations and his past publications on many scientific topics. But the latter considerations notwithstanding, his writings on the UFO problem are, in my opinion, scientifically unsound. The sooner a large number of other scientists take a close look at the astonishing nature of his analyses, the sooner they will be put aside as having no real relevance to the solution of the UFO mystery.
shoehorn all UFO reports into the corona-and-ball-lightning pigeon-hole; but a large amount of magazine and press coverage has recently been given to his arguments, which is most regrettable in that it will further confuse the real issues. This readiness of editors to pick up the dubious arguments of engineers or scientists who offer arguments attacking the UFOs as nonsense, contrasts sharply, and rely with their general unwillingness to take seriously the much more solid efforts of groups like NICAP who are, in a sense, doing the very job that the journalists might well be doing — carefully reporting unusual events going on recurrently all over the country. But can one fault the journalists heavily on this score? Probably not, since once more one sees, at the bottom of all this, conviction that there really cannot be anything to all this talk about unidentified flying objects or else our Air Force would have found it out years back.

THE NATURE OF THE UFO EVIDENCE

Like most scientists, I prefer to base scientific conclusions on quantitative observations obtained from controlled experiments in the laboratory. But scientists don't always get their problems handed to them in such neat packages. Seismologists frequently have to go out and interview lay witnesses in "earthquake" areas in order to fill in details of the isoseismal patterns. Meteorologists can't make tornadoes in their laboratories; they must study them as they start to spin. Meteoriticists who try to locate the falls of meteorites often find laymen's reports confused and marked by certain characteristic errors of underestimate of distance, etc.; yet meteoricists do manage to locate strewn fields and putting together large numbers of lay reports and working carefully to sort out the grain from the chaff.

Similarly, in the case of the UFO problem, it is unfortunately going to be necessary for scientists to begin by listening carefully to the accounts of many untrained observers and to do their best to sort out the grain from the chaff. With experience, one learns to immediately drop off an interview with a poor observer, an inarticulate witness, or one who is over-dramatic about his account. With diligent searching, one finds that mixed in with the lay observations are some real cases of observation made by quite experienced scientists who try to locate meteorites often find laymen's reports confused and marked by certain characteristic errors of underestimate of distance, etc.; yet meteoricists do manage to locate strewn fields and putting together large numbers of lay reports and working carefully to sort out the grain from the chaff.

Cases like the interesting Red Bluff, Calif., sighting of August 13, 1960, where two California Highway Patrolmen stood less than a hundred yards from objects described as having a brilliant luster estimated at about a hundred feet in length, with huge lights on it, or the well-reported British case (Ref. 14) of Sept. 3, 1965, could not, by wildest stretch of any reasonable scientist's imagination, be attributed to ball lightning — and the more so when one notes that the weather conditions were so stable that the official Air Force explanation used that circumstance to try to blame each of those cases on inversion-refraction of stars. Nor could dozens of other sightings, many made under daylight conditions with perfectly clear skies, where the observers reported solid, metallic-looking objects moving rapidly in the free atmosphere (far from Klass' corona-producing power lines and defying reasonable explanation as "ball lightning").
sky were scoffed at by the academicians. In many parts of Europe, iron objects that had reportedly fallen out of the sky were venerated as church relics, and this bothered the academicians of the Enlightenment who were trying to break away from the supernaturalism of the past. Hence for years scarcely any scientists gave credence to these lay claims of witnessed falls.

But finally, in 1892, at L'Aigle, France, an unusual shower of meteoritic fragments occurred, and not only all the peasants attested to the sky, but many churchmen and local political officials added their testimony. So the French Academy sent an eminent physicist, Biot, to L'Aigle to investigate. Based on many persons' accounts, finally convinced the scientific world that stones do fall out of the sky. The Academy's initial reluctance to believe so odd a contention was heavily influenced by their notion of a beautifully simple, Clock-winder theory of the solar system based on the Newtonian synthesis. The idea of rocks and other debris skimming around amongst the orbits of the planets whose motions Laplace and Lagrange had so firmly accounted for, was to them distinctly uncomfortable. But Biot's analysis carried the day, and in 1803, the subject of meteoritics was opened as a legitimate scientific subject.

Similarly today, most of us find it uncomfortable to think that in our atmosphere there may be real objects of a most unconventional nature operating and maneuvering in a way that we cannot account for in terms of present-day knowledge. In our discomfit, most of us seem to take the easy way out and say it just can't be, and we even unbalance those who claim to have seen these things. William James put it painfully well when he said: "By far the most usual way of handling phenomena we have accounts to make for a serious rearrangement of our preconceptions is to ignore them altogether, or to abuse those who bear witness to them." Let us not, therefore, be hasty to say that I'm not in any position to sermonize on this theme; I'm sure I've been guilty of the same error in my own scientific work. The difference is solely that, in the case of the UFOs, I have now seen too much evidence to be able to ignore any longer the seriousness of the problem of our collective turning-away from all of these reports.

The 1803 episode that led to acceptance of meteorites is actually only a weak parallel to the present-day case of the UFOs. For the UFOs do not appear to constitute just one more geophysical or astronomical phenomenon of still obscure nature. Almost everyone who has carefully sorted through the evidence is forced to consider quite seriously the hypothesis that the UFOs are some form of extraterrestrial probes. I am not saying that such a hypothesis is made more uncomfortable by the insignificant fraction of the actually available evidence that they are aware of. They tend unconsciously to think that the total existing evidence cannot be more conclusive and consequential than the scraps of information they have themselves read, mostly in newspapers. This reaction plus the very low a priori probability of the extraterrestrial hypothesis tend inevitably to make most scientists balk at taking that hypothesis seriously. I understand this.

But the actually available evidence pointing rather strongly in that strange direction is an iceberg of credible reports of close-range sightings by reliable people, an iceberg whose tiny visible portion belies its true bulk and significance. The heart of the problem is how to get large numbers of top-notch scientists to dive down and examine with great care the enormous bulk below the surface, the large body of evidence that exists but has not been posterized for scrutiny. The problem must be more conclusive and consequential than the scraps of information they have themselves read, mostly in newspapers. This reaction plus the very low a priori probability of the extraterrestrial hypothesis tend inevitably to make most scientists balk at taking that hypothesis seriously. I understand this.

Nevertheless, trying to put aside all the preconceptions that I tend to share with orthodoxy fellow-scientists, and trying to keep my eyes fixed on the actual evidence and the astounding volume of the UFO evidence that I have examined in the past twelve months, I am forced to join many others who see in the extraterrestrial hypothesis the only presently plausible explanation for the now-available facts. I repeat, however, that I treat it only as an hypothesis, subject to rejection if facts so rule.

Even to hold this as merely an hypothesis is to invite the charge of going far beyond the available evidence, I've found. This is an understandable charge, yet not really a defensible charge. I have noted some of my colleagues making the mistake of judging the "available evidence" by the insignificant fraction of the actually available evidence that they are aware of. They tend unconsciously to think that the total existing evidence cannot be more conclusive and consequential than the scraps of information they have themselves read, mostly in newspapers. This reaction plus the very low a priori probability of the extraterrestrial hypothesis tend inevitably to make most scientists balk at taking that hypothesis seriously. I understand this.

But the actually available evidence pointing rather strongly in that strange direction is an iceberg of credible reports of close-range sightings by reliable people, an iceberg whose tiny visible portion belies its true bulk and significance. The heart of the problem is how to get large numbers of top-notch scientists to dive down and examine with great care the enormous bulk below the surface, the large body of evidence that exists but has not been posterized for scrutiny. The problem must be more conclusive and consequential than the scraps of information they have themselves read, mostly in newspapers. This reaction plus the very low a priori probability of the extraterrestrial hypothesis tend inevitably to make most scientists balk at taking that hypothesis seriously. I understand this.

But the actually available evidence pointing rather strongly in that strange direction is an iceberg of credible reports of close-range sightings by reliable people, an iceberg whose tiny visible portion belies its true bulk and significance. The heart of the problem is how to get large numbers of top-notch scientists to dive down and examine with great care the enormous bulk below the surface, the large body of evidence that exists but has not been posterized for scrutiny. The problem must be more conclusive and consequential than the scraps of information they have themselves read, mostly in newspapers. This reaction plus the very low a priori probability of the extraterrestrial hypothesis tend inevitably to make most scientists balk at taking that hypothesis seriously. I understand this.

Because, as I have now said almost ad nauseam, so much of the misrepresentation of this problem must be laid at the door of Air Force Project Bluebook, I urge that a full-scale congressional investigation be prepared immediately to examine the actual problem of this problem. Following the protests of many citizens in the Michigan area (after some moderately interesting sightings in March, 1960), the Michigan Congressman pressed for and secured a hearing before the House Committee on Armed Services last year. But if there was ever a one-sided hearing, this was it. The three persons testifying were persons already having an obvious vested interest in telling Congress that the problem has been in fairly good hands - Air Force Project Bluebook Chief Consultant, Dr. J. Allen Hynek, and another, Bluebook Officer Major Quintana, and Bluebook Chief Consultant, Dr. J. Allen Hynek (see Ref. 12). Whereas NICAP has been pressing...
for a chance to present its (strong) case before a Congressional committee for years (see, for example, the summary of those efforts in Ref. 1, p. 177) that no vote was taken to testify before the April, 1966 hearings before the Armed Services Committee. Fortunately, a number of NICAP members submitted material for the record, somewhat alleviating the otherwise Air Force dominated record of those hearings, but no NICAP representatives were asked to testify in person.

I would emphasize that, at this very date, NICAP and many serious investigators of this problem have information enough on hand for a half-dozen Congressional investigations. What is needed is some pressure from the press for immediate clarification of the status of this 20-year-old mystery that has been swept under a rug of ridicule and misrepresentation by Project Blue Book. And the fastest way to get clarification will be, I now believe, a Congressional investigation. Clearly this will not solve the problem as a scientific problem; but I fear that the existing scientific faith in 20 years of Blue Book is so strong that we shall not see anything like adequate scientific attention given to the UFOs until Congress sorts out the incredible history of Bluebook mishandling of the UFO problem and thereby awakens scientists to the fact that they have been misled for two decades about what may well be the greatest scientific problem of our times.

THE UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO PROGRAM

Some will surely object that to urge a Congressional investigation at a time when the new University of Colorado program is just getting underway is unnecessary. I do not think so. First of all, I have repeatedly said and continue to say that the Colorado program is not nearly large enough to cope with the apparent dimensions of this problem. I believe that, once that program gains some momentum, it will move towards the same serious concern for the UFO problem that I now hold. But I am uneasy, frankly, at the very limited manpower resources available to the Colorado group, and they are now about a third of the way through their initial contract-period of 15 months. As I understand it, there are, at present, only four full-time persons on that program, none with training at the Ph.D. level; and the fractional-time of the several others (mainly psychologists) contributing to the program averages, as I understand it, less than 30 or 40 per cent. Several weeks ago I spent several days with three of the full-time members of the Colorado team and made directly to them the same point I am here making, namely, that this program warrants far more scientific attention than their program is currently able to provide. It is most encouraging that they will soon add two or three more members with considerable scientific training, but even this will scarcely make the Colorado effort at all commensurate with the importance of the UFO problem.

Even if the Colorado program could quadruple its scientific staff in the next few weeks, I would still be saying that we must get more good people onto this problem. It is far too important a problem to leave in its present state, and only a large increase in high-caliber scientific manpower attacking the UFO enigma will suffice to make real progress on it.

TRANSFER OF RESEARCH RESPONSIBILITY

I believe that the primary responsibility for UFO investigations ought to be taken from Air Force hands and turned over to some strong science-oriented agency. NASA would seem to be a very logical group for this.

Curiously, I have said this both in NASA and fairly widely-reported public discussions before scientific colleagues (e.g., Ref. 13); yet the response from NASA has been essentially nil. Perhaps they, too, are sure that this is just a nonsense problem and has no relation to their space programs, their "search for life in the universe." NASA is busy telling us that there is high probability of life in the universe, but it's all far out there, not here. Frankly, when one looks long and carefully at the UFO evidence, one wonders if perhaps it's not conceivable that some of it has found us, rather than vice versa. But, to date, my own efforts to get NASA to consider that intriguing possibility seem to have been ignored. Even attempting to get a small group within NASA to undertake a study-group approach to the available published effort seems to have generated no visible response. I realize, of course, that there may be semi-political considerations that make it awkward for NASA to fish in these waters at present - but if this is what is holding up serious scientific attention to the UFO problem at NASA, this is all the more reason why Congress had better take a good hard look at the problem and re-examine the deck.

Interestingly, in the course of my months of digging into the UFO problem, I have learned from a number of unquotable sources that the Air Force has long wished to get rid of the burden of the troublesome UFO problem and has tried twice to "peddle" it to NASA, but without success. I regret that I am not free to quote my sources on this, but I regard them as entirely credible. An Air Force wish to get rid of the UFOs would be entirely compatible with the firm impression I have formed from many lines of evidence that no one in any position of importance within the Air Force views the UFOs as real or significant.

Such a position is compatible, too, with all that I have been able to learn about how the University of Colorado program came into being. Everything points to this: that the Air Force regards their UFO responsibilities as a public relations liability that they would like to have done with, once and for all, and Colorado may help them unload it. The request for a group within the Air Force Scientific Advisory Board (AFSAB) to meet and review the UFO problem did not come from the Systems Command within which Bluebook operates. It came from Gen. E. B. LeBailly, Director of Science, Secretary of Air Force Office of Information (SAFOI). Gen. LeBailly's request was made on Sept. 28, 1965 (see Ref. 12, (SAFOI).
sights all over the Midwest. That wave made headline news throughout the country, and Bluebook’s “twinkling star” explanation was held up to ridicule when the Director of the Oklahoma City Planetarium gently misread his star charts and blaming the sightings on stars that weren’t even in the Midwest skies.

This made headlines, too, and many editorials in the Midwest were critical of USAF’s handling of the incident. If the behind-scenes response to this had been Air Force concern to try to do a better job of checking a real scientific problem, the Systems Command could easily have found several dozen men right there at Wright-Patterson AFB who could have stepped in and instantly upgraded the Bluebook operation by one or two orders of magnitude.

No such action followed. Instead, it was the general in charge of USAF public relations who asked AFSAB to review the situation, which they did on February 3, 1966 (Ref. 12, p. 586). An AFSAB-appointed group, the O’Brien committee, devoted only a day to their deliberations and did not even invite the testimony of Bluebook’s chief scientific consultant. The committee thought that skepticism may be some kind of measures of their scientific concern for the seriousness of the UFO question. It was this group that recommended establishing a “university team” approach, which eventually became the one-university approach now centered at Colorado.

All that I have seen in conclusion that this whole effort was directed chiefly towards getting the Air Force out from under an onerous burden, the public-relations liability of the UFOs. The Systems Command might have thought it made sense to do so at the time.

An AFSA-appointed group, O’Brien committee, devoted only a day to their deliberations and did not even invite the testimony of Bluebook’s chief scientific consultant, both of which points may be some kind of measures of their scientific concern for the seriousness of the UFO question. It was this group that recommended establishing a “university team” approach, which eventually became the one-university approach now centered at Colorado. All that I have seen in conclusion that this whole effort was directed chiefly towards getting the Air Force out from under an onerous burden, the public-relations liability of the UFOs. The Systems Command might have thought it made sense to do so at the time.

In the context of the UFOs almost as much as I have puzzled over the UFOs themselves in the past year. And I have discussed these matters with many knowledgeable persons in forming the above opinion. I would be quick to agree that much evidence points to a time, back in the early 1950’s, when many USAF people, some in high places, suspected that the UFOs might be extraterrestrial, though I cannot begin to lay out that evidence here. But once the turning point of the Robertson Panel and the 1953 CIA debunking order was rounded, and personnel had been rotated and shuffled a few times, I believe that the Air Force fell victim to its own UFO propaganda. I think that, as one Bluebook officer was replaced by another and high-level commands changed, no one was left, except the chief scientific consultant, who had any knowledge of how things had gotten switched over to the debunking policy.

And, from my discussions with the chief scientific consultant, Dr. J. A. Hynek, I gather that even he paid little enough attention to the entire problem that he did not regard the 1953 events as very critical.

Pointing further in the same direction is the fact that I found no evidence that anyone at higher levels at WPAFB was, by 1966, even aware of the Robertson Panel report. In my third visit to Bluebook, on July 30, 1966, Maj. Quintanilla informed me that the CIA had reclassified the Report and that consequently I would not be getting my Xerox copy (they sent it down to Washington by courier, since the CIA had no copy, and evidently did not know that WPAFB was talking about when a clearance to release the copy to me was requested of CIA!). So at that point I asked Quintanilla if the then commanding general of the Foreign Technology Division within which Bluebook has operated, Brig. Gen. A. W. Cruikshank, had ever asked him for the Bluebook file on the Panel. He said Cruikshank had not, and I asked if the Division’s Chief Scientist, Dr. A. J. Cacciopo, had ever asked to see it, and Quintanilla said he had not. It is my belief that personnel turnover has occurred so fast that, for a good many years, none of the people having direct responsibility were clearly aware of the role of the CIA decision of 1953, that the task had simply been downgraded to its low present status, and that Bluebook has been run by people who believed what they read in the papers — their own UFO propaganda.

If there had been anyone looking at the continuing input of UFO reports in a competent scientific manner, if anyone had been thoroughly familiar with radar propagation physics, meteorological optics, natural phenomena, aerodynamics, etc., and testing each new report against the broad spectrum of scientific considerations that one has to invoke to sort out
reports of Australian sightings, and again they are much like those occurring over and over in this country - discs and cigar-shaped objects, metallic looking structures often with domes on them, etc. Persons whose reliability I am given to accept describe UFO reports in South America with frequency and nature like those in France, Australia, England, and elsewhere.

American newspapers print very little domestic news from foreign countries and virtually no UFO reports from abroad, so most Americans are startled when told that it appears that UFOs are appearing all over the world. I just received a carefully prepared 45-page report from New Guinea, written by an Anglican missionary in the Papuan Territory there, summarizing a fascinating series of reports, several at close-range, in New Guinea in 1959. I had heard of these before, but seeing Rev. Cruttwell's lengthy original report increased my readiness to believe that all those sightings at Boilani, Menapi, and Zamarai may actually have occurred! When I get packets full of current Australian press clippings on sightings, I read and keep a scrapbook and, like, I find it hard to maintain my provincial skepticism and grow suspicious that perhaps all those reports are really as real as the ones I'm continually checking by telephone from Tucson. Before you accuse me of gullibility, take a look at the foreign UFO clippings yourselves. They may make you a bit uneasy, too.

There is a danger here that I'd better confront. You editors probably think that you know what is going on in this country, and that you're aware of an occasional UFO report from here and there, but you may be thinking that my remarks about reports "pouring in" are rather overdone. My reply is simple - if you read only what comes over your wires, you'd never guess what is really going on in the world of UFO reports, here or abroad. The only way to get a glimpse of what is actually happening is to subscribe to a clipping service that is cutting local press stories from the Riverside Enterprise, the Eagle Valley Enterprise, the Marion Weekly Leader and so on (just to read off the names of a few on the clippings I just received, courtesy of NICAP's clipping-service arrangements). If you read only the New York Times, your own paper, and the wire copy, you won't have even a tiny fraction of the connotation of the experience long ago came to realize that UFOs are a lot of nonsense and almost never file wire stories on such a lot of nonsense in while they will, for reasons that are not always clear; but, by and large, I'd estimate that only one or two per cent of the locally-reported UFO sightings are read about beyond the Readership area of the nearest small-town paper. This is part of the reason why this problem is being ignored. If each day's papers in each major city carried an adequate account of all of the U.S. UFO reports for the preceding 24 hours, the citizenry would be up in arms in a week demanding that Congress find out what was going on. But the bottom of the iceberg floats along unseen because wire editors have long since learned that these reports are just "silly in season" stuff; so who cares what some farmer out in Sauk Center saw just above his barn last
night. (I am reminded that Ruppelt mentions in his book, Ref. 1, that for a brief period in 1952 Bluebook subscribed to a clipping service but they got so many reports they couldn't file them all and were obliged to cancel the subscription.)

I talked with an African student on our campus recently and was amused to hear that sightings not dissimilar to those occurring rather regularly in Iowa and Oregon and Georgia are reported in Africa. Yes, I believe that when all the facts are in, it will be clear that unconventional objects are hovering low over farmhouses and power plants and vehicles in nearly every corner of our globe, and have been doing so with mounting frequency during recent years—while officialdom and journalists and scientists have ignored the "peasants." Must we wait for a L'Aigle?

Or will you editors press for action now?

SOME ILLUSTRATIVE UFO REPORTS

There is no satisfactory way of presenting a fair picture of the now-available UFO evidence without going into much detail in recounting many cases, discussing credibility of witnesses, and carefully assessing the plausibility of each of a number of alternative hypotheses to account for each given sighting. Space will not permit such an exhaustive presentation here. If you seek a published sample of the cases discussed in that publication, see Ref. 1, The UFO Evidence, edited by A. H. Hall of NICAP. It describes over 700 cases from the NICAP files, and has the material cross-filed in a number of very useful ways. I have personally checked on a fairly large sample of the cases described in that publication and can state on that basis that the accuracy and reliability of the book is impressively high. To someone unfamiliar with UFO cases, it will be indicated that the following comprise a minute fraction of the full record. The points emphasized will vary from one case to another, since they have been selected for a variety of reasons.

Case 1. Portage County, Ohio, April 17, 1956.

Near 0500 on 4/17/66, two Portage County sheriff's deputies, Dale Spaur and W. D. Neff, were routinely checking an abandoned car south of Ravenna, Ohio. Suddenly a large luminous airborne object advanced from a wooded hill, hovered over the object for an illuminating the pre-dawn darkness, and then moved off a short distance. The deputies radioed the desk and were told by the dispatcher to follow the object until a camera car could overtake them. Then began a peculiar pursuit that eventually took the deputies entirely out of Ohio into Pennsylvania and stretched over more than 70 miles and lasted almost an hour and a half. Two other law enforcement officers, Wayne Huston of the Palestine, Ohio, police force and Frank Panzarella, Conway, Pa., police officer became involved in the pursuit before it was over. The object was described by the officers as about 40 feet in diameter, brightly luminous, and seemed to have something like a fin on its rear upper surface. A diffuse conical luminosity extended from its undersurface. I have personally interviewed Neff, Huston, and Panzarella, and NICAP's Pittsburgh Subcommittee has done a very extensive (125 p.) report on many aspects of this one important case.

The object varied in elevation from a few hundred feet above terrain to an estimated 4000 ft as it moved along, and it reportedly moved from one side of the highway to the other in motions that match no conventional object. Huston joined the chase when he intercepted the transmissions to the Portage Co. dispatcher's desk, realized Spaur and Neff must be coming his way on Route 14, went out and parked to watch up the highway to the northwest, and soon saw a luminous object moving along followed by a speeding car. As the object and car passed, he swung in behind, got into radio communication with the deputies who were in the object ahead, and stayed with them until the end of the chase in Conway, just northwest of Pittsburgh. At Conway, the officers spotted a local policeman, Frank Panzarella, who was observing the object, and they pulled up beside Panzarella. Shortly thereafter the object shot up vertically at very high speed and passed out of sight, according to the testimony of all four officers.

The Bluebook investigation of this case would have been left at no more than an original four-minute phone call from Major Quintanilla to Spaur (in which Quintanilla sought to convince Spaur he had seen Echo satellite go over and then transferred visual attention to Venus which was then rising in the southeast) except for local press concern over the case, local and public interest generated by detailed reporting of the incident in the Ravenna Record-Courier, led, through several stages, to a request from Ohio Congressman William Stanton for Bluebook to send someone to Ravenna to make a personal check. NICAP taped that interview, and, having listened carefully to it, I can summarize it as a rather bulldozing attempt of Maj. Quintanilla to persuade the officers that it was only Echo and Venus that they saw. They were not impressed.

The Echo-Venus explanation still stands as the official Bluebook explanation of this case, despite the efforts of NICAP, Dr. J. A. Hynek, the Record-Courier and myself to secure revision. The fact that Officer Huston saw the object coming in out of the northwest clearly rules out his seeing Venus, yet at the time the first two officers had been following the object for a much longer time than Echo required to transit the full sky. This, plus the four-witness description of vertical ascent at
the termination of the sighting are calmly swept aside by Bluebook with its Echo-Venus "explanation."

On September 30, Col. Hayden P. Mims, Congressional Inquiry Division, sent a letter to Congressman Stanton telling Stanton that a further review of the reports confirmed the original Echo-Venus explanation. My own interviews with three of the principal witnesses were made subsequent to Mims' letter, and I carefully queried each man as to whether the Air Force had ever gone back to them to check further on their accounts. Not one of the three had been interrogated since the original interviews in May. In late July, 1966, I asked Quintanilla to let me see Huston's crucial testimony, but was not permitted to examine it in full. Huston told me in October that he had been interviewed by an investigator sent by USAF who took full notes on the crucial point that Huston saw the object coming down Route 14 from the northwest. Yet this point is blandly ignored in the Bluebook Echo-Venus explanation.

Despite the absurdity of the Echo-Venus explanation and despite open criticism of it from the cited sources, that explanation still stands in the official Bluebook records. Congressman Stanton was forced to accept the assurances tendered him that the Air Force had carefully evaluated this case, and the law-enforcement officers had to take the brunt of such ridicule and pressures as all this brought to them. There are many more details pertinent to this case that are fully documented in the 125-page report prepared by William B. Weitzel, a University of Pittsburgh instructor who headed the Pittsburgh NICAP Subcommittee's thorough investigations of this case. Few cases better illustrate the unreasonableness of Bluebook's approach to the UFO problem and their incompetence in investigations. My memorandum and my correspondence to WPAFB asking for rectification of this case have never been answered. It was my dismay over the Mims letter and Bluebook's refusal to alter their stand on this case that led me to begin open and pointed criticisms of the Air Force investigations in October 1966 (Ref. 13).


This case has been rather fully reported in many places, notably in a book by J. G. Fuller (Ref. 16); and a number of other good reports and discussions of it can be found in House Document 55 (Ref. 12). After several preliminary sightings that I shall omit to save space here, the principal sighting by Exeter policemen Eugene F. Bertrand and David R. Hunt and by an 18-year-old boy, Normus J. Muscarello, took place at about 0200 on Sept. 3rd. I have personally interviewed Bertrand and Hunt and have discussed their reliability with Exeter Chief of Police R. D. Irvine. Omitting many details, the men saw an object, estimated at almost 100 feet long, carrying a number of bright blinking lights, hovering motionless and hovering silently over a farmhouse until it soundlessly went away.

Maj. Quintanilla's first explanation for this was "twinkling stars." When the officers wrote to Bluebook, protesting such an explanation which would hold them up to ridicule and place in jeopardy their reputations as reliable officers, the explanation was switched to involve a night-adsorbing aircraft. When it was next determined that the aircraft in question was not even operating that night, Maj. Quintanilla altered his explanation to one involving a B-47 refueling operation near Pease AFB. When, finally, police and the actual time of that operation and thereby established that the refueling operation was over by the 0200 time of the main sighting, Quintanilla finally classified it as Unknown.

A revealing history.


Many more cases are on record in which the witnesses did not so assiduously press for correction of Bluebook's unreasonable explanations. One witness in an Akron sighting, owner of a local air service company, Ernest Stadvec (Ref. 17), told me in an interview concerning his sighting that once Bluebook came out with a press release that he had been looking at the star Capella and that this was the correct explanation of two fast-moving luminous objects he sighted from the air in his private plane, he wanted to forget the whole thing and save himself further embarrassment. His description would not remotely fit "Capella," since one object descended rapidly from a high elevation, the other climbed out under his plane and shot off in directions not even close to Capella's location at the time. Stadvec said the Air Force explanation "made me look like an idiot," and he went on to tell me of other subsequent pilot sightings in that area that were not reported publicly because of the way the Air Force had handled his sighting.

After the second object sped off at very high speed, Stadvec states that he contacted FAA Cleveland and the control tower operator told him by radio that a fast luminous object had been sighted visually and on FAA radar; but the latter was denied to the press the next day.

Case 4. Red Bluff, Calif., August 10, 1940.

A rather detailed account of this sighting can be found in Ref. 3 (see p. 61, 112, and 170). I have interviewed one of the two California Highway Patrolmen who were the principal witnesses and have spoken with two other persons in that area who were involved in the incident. CHP officers C. A. Carson and S. Scott, driving east at 2300 on a back road south of Red Bluff suddenly sighted what they first took to be an aircraft about to crash just ahead of them. Pulling their patrol car to a rapid stop and jumping out to be ready to render whatever assistance they could, they were astonished to see the long metallic-looking object abruptly reverse its initial steep descent, climb back up to several hundred feet altitude and then hover motionless. Next it came silently towards them until, as Officer Carson put it to me, "it was within easy pistol range." They
had their pistols ready and were debating whether to fire when it stopped. Attempts to radio back to the nearest dispatcher failed due to strong radio interference, an occurrence that recurred each time the object came close to them during the remainder of this 2-hour-long sighting. Huge bright lights at either end of the object swept the area, incident involving a sighting of a low-altitude hovering disc with red lights, seen by a Red Bluff physician during that same period, but will omit details here.

The northern California valley area was the scene of a number of other very interesting sightings in the period August 13–18, many of which NICAP has documented and cited. In my own checking of the Carson-Scott sighting, I discovered that the Carson-Scott sightings, involving a sighting of a low-altitude hovering disc with red lights, seen by a Red Bluff physician during that same period, but will omit details here.

Page 2: Beverly, Mass., April 22, 1952

Just one year ago today, an exceedingly interesting sighting occurred at about 2100–2110, well within a populous urban area, near the intersection of Salem Road and Beolier Road, Beverly, Mass. One of NICAP's most thorough investigators, Raymond E. Fowler of Wenham, Mass., checked this case carefully, and it was found that about 200 yards from the adjoining intersection, viewed directly across the athletic field of Beverly High School, three brightly lit oval-shaped objects, estimated to be perhaps 20 feet in diameter, were circling in an oddly pulsatory motion directly above the high school building. Mrs. Modugno estimated they were only about 20 feet above the roof, when I queried her on this point. One of the women, Miss Brenda Maria, age 22, whimsically waved her hands as if to beckon them toward the group; one object immediately left the circle and moved towards them, hovering only about 20 feet above one of them. Fowler's full report conveys some of the blue book explanations that reissued this incident of great interest. I call attention to one additional interesting "hidden UFO report" involving a sighting of a low-altitude hovering disc with red lights, seen by a Red Bluff physician during that same period, but will omit details here.
to the fact that this case contains actions that might be loosely described as "contact" if one interprets the seemingly immediate response of one of the objects to Miss Maria's waving as anything more than adventitious. Other such instances, involving seeming "response" can be cited, though they are too few in number to justify any strong generalizations.

Case 6. Goodland, Kans., March 5, 1967

I have interviewed both Editor Tom Dreiling of the Goodland Daily News and Goodland patrolman Durl Rouse concerning their joint sighting of a torpedo-shaped object that maneuvered over that western Kansas town not many weeks ago. Rouse had been observing the object (or possibly more than a single object) for some time before contacting Dreiling about 0200. It had multicolored flashing lights and an intensely bright beam fore and aft on its 50-60 foot main body. This object is in the category of the non-silent UFOs; it made a noise that Dreiling described as like a "huge vacuum cleaner," adding that he'd never heard any aircraft or helicopter making a noise remotely resembling this. The object passed over the Dreiling residence at an estimated altitude of 1500 ft. Rouse, using field glasses, saw structural details including a central shaft with top and odd color-banding. I am unaware of any official explanation of this sighting; Bluebook investigates only cases reported directly to the Air Force.

Case 7. Davis, Calif., February 13, 1967

At about 11:15, two young women driving back to their homes in Woodland, Calif., after a Sacramento shopping trip, noted a bright light which both took to be an aircraft landing light at first, before they even exchanged comments on it. As they left the Sacramento Freeway (Hwy. 80) to turn off on Mace Blvd. to head north to Woodland, the object seemed to head for their location, and continued to close with their car until it came to within a (very roughly) estimated 100 yards. By this time, the driver, Miss Karen Prather, and her passenger, Miss Carol Richied, both of whom I interviewed, had become somewhat frightened, and Miss Prather had accelerated to over 80 mph in a futile effort to move out of what had seemed like the diving approach of an aircraft. But as the object approached, both knew it could not be an aircraft, for the "big light" became resolvable into three separate lights in triangular array. Both described these lights as "huge." Just as it appeared that it might move right into their car, the object tipped up, displaying a disc-like base with one central red light and five or six dimmer white lights. As the disc tipped its nearer edge up, it simultaneously executed a quick turn to the southwest and sped off towards Davis, eventually passing out of sight in the lights and haze over that city, audible over the noise of Miss Prather's speeding Mustang, they stated.

The girls reported the incident immediately to the Woodland office of the California Highway Patrol, and from the latter office it got to the Woodland Daily Democrat. The following day a California Highway Patrolman contacted them and stated to them that they should not take seriously the kidding they were probably receiving, for he had seen an object answering to the same description at about 1945, only about 30 minutes after the girls' sighting. To date I have been unable to secure the name of that officer. A Davis NICAP member is pursuing the case, I understand, and hopes to get an open confirmation of his sighting. Reports that other motorists in the same area saw this object are being investigated, but no other witnesses have been located to date.

Case 8. Near Cincinnati, Ohio, February 11, 1967

A number of independent sightings on the evening of February 10/11, 1967, in suburban areas north and east of Cincinnati were checked by L. H. Stringfield of that city. After receiving his report, I personally interviewed three witnesses, confirming the highlights of Stringfield's more complete report. At several localities that night, a glowing, reddish, cigar- or football-shaped object was described as moving overhead. But most interesting were the accounts given to me in telephone interviews with Michael McKee, age 21, and Miss Sharon Hildebrand, age 19.

They had seen what appeared to them as a domed or disc-shaped object hovering over a creek-bed in a wooded area near Milford at about 0145 on the 11th. McKee, using a railroad searchlight he had in his car, illuminated the weakly-glowing object and found it to be highly reflective. No sound came from it as it hovered only an estimated 100 feet away. He started to walk toward it to examine it more closely, but Miss Hildebrand became very frightened and哭了 to him not to go, so he returned to the car. (McKee felt willing to say to me that he did not need very much persuading to return to the car.) Miss Hildebrand's father mentioned to Stringfield that his daughter was still in a state of shock when the two returned to her home. Police were notified and investigated about an hour later, finding no object, but noting that tree branches were broken off in a roughly circular area matching the 30-ft diameter estimated by the two witnesses.

One of the other witnesses who reported seeing only airborne objects, Mr. George Dover, of Wyoming, Ohio, told me by telephone that he had seen a red-glowing object pass near his house, heading towards the general location of Milford just before 0100 that same night. Other accounts will not be cited here, since I have not personally checked them.

Case 9. Richmond, Va., June 24, 1966

This is another sighting by a law-enforcement officer. In general, one notices the pattern that UFO reports tend to come primarily from persons whose vocation takes them out of doors a great deal or who are engaged in some form of observational work. There are more nighttime UFO observations than daytime observations (reasons unknown), and a substantial
number of nighttime cases involve sheriff's deputies, police officers, and watchmen. There is nothing surprising in this.

At about 0330, Richmond patrolman William L. Stevens was cruising on the edge of Richmond when he spotted some yellow and green lights a few hundred feet in the air. Driving closer in his patrol car to secure a better look, he found that the lights were alternately green and yellow, in a string around the object, and the entire object seemed to be enveloped in a haze or mist of some unusual nature.

As he neared it, the object moved off ahead of him. He continued following and stayed with it for over six miles before it accelerated and sped away. When I interviewed Stevens by phone, he stated that it moved as if it were "playing a game" with him, always maintaining about the same lead-distance ahead of him, despite his altering speed several times. At one point he was driving at 110 mph. Two other officers in Henrico County also noted that the object moved off at perhaps 100-125 feet long and over 30 feet in diameter. The lights were alternately green and yellow, in a string around the object, and the entire object seemed to be enveloped in a haze or mist of some unusual nature.

As a postscript to this latter point, and further commentary on the widely encountered sensitivity to ridicule that has evolved from years of "explanations" by Bluebook, plus hometown newspaper ridicule growing out of the mismatch between original citizens' reports and subsequent Air Force statements, I might quote from a clipping that happens just to have come across my desk. It is a clipping from the Record Searchlight for February 17, 1967, concerning some unusual sightings he and other local police officers have made recently in the Shasta area. I omit the sightings, since I have not checked them, but note that brown is quoted, in a purely matter-of-fact way as saying "he knows what has happened to other law officers who reported seeing flying saucers; They were chased by the publicity." That may be a bit too strong; but I know from much personal experience in interviewing witnesses that witness after witness has been embarrassed by calls from Air Force debunkers of their accounts. It's high time that this pattern was terminated. It will be terminated only when some truly competent personnel not committed to Ufo-debunking are made responsible for investigations.

Case 11. Randolph, Vt., January 4, 1965

This was another case originally checked out by NICAP investigator R. E. Fowler. At about 1715, by Richard S. Woodruff, Vermont State Pathologist and Professor, College of Medicine, University of Vermont, was returning to Burlington from grand jury testimony in Brattleboro. His driver was a Vermont State Trooper whose name has been released to NICAP but not released publicly. Driving north between Bethel and Randolph, on Hwy. 12, the two suddenly noticed a sharply-defined object, glowing with a reddish-orange light, streaking across their path at perhaps 200 feet above terrain. It passed from west to east in a matter of seconds, making no noise audibly over their own engine noise. No sooner had it passed out of sight to their east than a second similar glowing object streaked past, and finally a third, the total duration of the sightings being only about 30 seconds. They estimated the distance to the objects at one-half to one mile; but in the twilight, their estimates, according to Dr. Woodruff, with whom I have discussed the incident, were probably not too reliable.

Both were entirely certain these were not aircraft or astronomical objects, and they noted that the objects climbed slightly as they moved eastward. The angular diameter corresponded to a baseball at arm's length or perhaps a bit larger, according to these witnesses; i.e., many times the angular diameter of the moon. The skies were clear and stars were visible. Four men driving in another car on the same highway reported seeing three similar objects at some time and place, and gave generally similar descriptions, as did also H. E. Wheatley, Chairman of the Randolph Board of Selectmen, who saw the phenomenon while driving about a mile north of Bethel.

NICAP obtained from Maj. Marston M. Jacks, of the Pentagon Office of Information, on January 27, 1965, the Bluebook evaluation: meteors of the Quadrantid meteor stream. Actually the radiant-point of this stream was, at that time, about on the NW point of those observers' horizon, so any Quadrantids moving in the east-to-west manner described by all witnesses would have been invisible due to the very trees above whose tops these three glowing objects were observed moving. Secondly, the reported angular diameters are completely out of accord with that of stream meteors, and the passage of three such objects along essentially identical trajectories within 30 seconds or so strains the meteor hypothesis still further. Dr. Woodruff, emphasizing that he is quite familiar with meteor phenomena stated, in comment on the Bluebook evaluation, "If I had thought that there was any possibility that the three objects we saw were meteors, I never would have mentioned the matter."

Case 12. Cherry Creek, N. Y., August 10, 1965

This is a case where I have not been able to make contact with the principal witnesses by phone, but a rather thorough NICAP report is available, and even more interesting, this is one of the small fraction of all cases which Bluebook has put in its so-called Unexplained category. Finally, it illustrates a phenomenon found in so many UFO cases that it cannot be ignored: panic reactions among animals in the vicinity of a closely seen UFO. I have a special file of such animal-reaction cases, which I am assembling because these cases seem
kicking their stalls at almost exactly the same instant as Officer Bertrand and young Muscarello spotted the object coming in over trees at the Dining farm. Bertrand, when I asked him, was unsure whose reaction was first, his or the horses.


It was Frank Mannor's dog which first reacted to the glowing object that became the center of the famous "swamp gas" controversy of last spring. Mannor, on going outdoors to see why his dogs were barking so unusually at 2000, spotted a luminous object "coming down at a forty-five," towards a nearly wooded swamp. The object reportedly hovered momentarily and then descended below his line of vision. With his son, he walked out towards the spot, and spotted it again, glowing in the swamp, several hundreds of yards ahead. He stated that it seemed to be sitting in a patch of mist, about 10 feet off terrain, was domed in shape, and had a coral-like or quilted structure to its surface. Suddenly the light turned blood-red and then blinked out, according to the accounts of Mannor and his son. In the meantime, others had been summoned, including police, who reported seeing the glowing object in the swampy wooded area.

(I have tried twice to reach Mannor by phone to confirm details of his sighting. The first time his wife informed me he was not talking to anyone as a result of all the ridicule he had received. The second time, their phone was unlisted or disconnected. I have heard a NICAP taped interview with Mannor in which he confirms the main features as reported in the press and corrects Life's erroneous drawings of the shape of the object that he saw. It had a flat bottom, he stressed.)

At a large press conference, Bluebook's scientific consultant Dr. J. A. Hynek, proposed that all this was due to swamp gas. The source he cited for his authority was Hinnaert, a Dutch astronomer, whose book mentions will-o'-the-wisp but goes way back to an early 19th century scientist to find a corroborating witness. Swamp gas is methane, and it remains a chemical mystery how it sometimes ignites by natural processes, giving evanescent flickering flames a few inches high over marshy areas, mainly in summer when methane reaction rates are high. A colleague who earned his Ph.D. collecting salamanders in that very area said he'd never once seen swamp gas burning, even in the summer when production rates are maximal. The Dexter case involved a luminous object "the size of an automobile" described as descending into the swamp and then glowing so brightly it was visible for hundreds of yards away through the brush and trees, scarcely a close fit to swamp gas. Furthermore, low temperatures at that time of year could support only extremely low methane production rates, and the winds that night were about 3 mph, which would have precluded accumulations of more than trace amounts under any conditions.

Probably no one UFO "explanation" has brought the Air Force more ridicule than this swamp gas case. "Swamp gas" has become almost...
a symbol of public ridicule of the Bluebook contributed explanations. I attempted many months ago to persuade Bluebook to change that to an Unidentified, but was emphatically told by Maj. Quintanilla that any changes would have to come from Dr. Hynek, not him, since the Air Force had absolutely nothing to do with that one. Dr. Hynek, when I then pressed him to consider retracting it on his own, indicated that perhaps that might be a good idea, but has not done so to date.

Case 13. Damon, Texas, September 3, 1966

Less than 24 hours after the Edexter incident, two Brazoria County deputy sheriffs were cruising near Damon, Texas, when they spotted what they first took to be a gas-well fire in the distance. As the lights separated and then floated up into the air, Deputies Billy E. McCoy and Robert W. Goode took increased interest. They decided to drive via back roads to investigate, and had pulled over to the side to check again with binoculars when suddenly the lights seemed almost instantaneously to shoot towards their car. The lights were only about 150 feet from them at an altitude of perhaps 100 feet above the field. I have interviewed both men, and despite their being experienced law enforcement officers, they did not conceal the fact that this sudden approach frightened both of them.

The object was extremely large; one compared it to the size of a football field, though not its length as 200 feet or more. Its vertical thickness at its domed center section they thought to be 40 to 50 feet. A very bright purple light on the object illuminated not only the ground near the object, but even the inside of the patrol car. Goode was driving, and his left arm was on the outside of the car. Despite the overalls, gas-well shirt and coat, he sensed burning of the exposed arm in the moment before they darted off as fast as the patrol car could go. McCoy locked back as Goode drove off, and the object was seen to shoot off at high speed back in the direction from which it came, and then veer upwards and disappear aloft. The Bluebook office assembled data on the location of the star Antares and on local inversions, and at one stage this was their tentative explanation for this highly un-astronomical sighting. But the final evaluation that now stands for this one is Unidentified.

Yearly, and sometimes in between, Bluebook puts out assurances that in the (tiny fraction of cases in their) Unidentified cases are none that "defy explanation in present-day scientific and technological terms." When one examines some of the officially Unidentified cases like the Damon Case, or the Edexter or Cherry Creek, or the famous Socorro case, or any of a number of other officially Unknown cases that are not remotely like anything in our present day technological or scientific knowledge, one wonders just what Bluebook's repetitively reiterated phraseology is supposed to mean.

Case 14. Salt Lake City, Utah, October 3, 1961

A multiple-witness daytime sighting of a solid, metallic-looking disc was headline news in the Salt Lake Tribune of October 3, 1961, in the Bluebook office assembled data on the location of the star Antares and on local inversions, and at one stage this was their tentative explanation for this highly un-astronomical sighting. But the final evaluation that now stands for this one is Unidentified.

A multiple-witness daytime sighting of a solid, metallic-looking disc was headline news in the Salt Lake Tribune of October 3, 1961, in the Bluebook office assembled data on the location of the star Antares and on local inversions, and at one stage this was their tentative explanation for this highly un-astronomical sighting. But the final evaluation that now stands for this one is Unidentified.

The object was extremely large; one compared it to the size of a football field, though not its length as 200 feet or more. Its vertical thickness at its domed center section they thought to be 40 to 50 feet. A very bright purple light on the object illuminated not only the ground near the object, but even the inside of the patrol car. Goode was driving, and his left arm was on the outside of the car. Despite the overalls, gas-well shirt and coat, he sensed burning of the exposed arm in the moment before they darted off as fast as the patrol car could go. McCoy locked back as Goode drove off, and the object was seen to shoot off at high speed back in the direction from which it came, and then veer upwards and disappear aloft. The Bluebook office assembled data on the location of the star Antares and on local inversions, and at one stage this was their tentative explanation for this highly un-astronomical sighting. But the final evaluation that now stands for this one is Unidentified.

Yearly, and sometimes in between, Bluebook puts out assurances that in the (tiny fraction of cases in their) Unidentified cases are none that "defy explanation in present-day scientific and technological terms." When one examines some of the officially Unidentified cases like the Damon Case, or the Edexter or Cherry Creek, or the famous Socorro case, or any of a number of other officially Unknown cases that are not remotely like anything in our present day technological or scientific knowledge, one wonders just what Bluebook's repetitively reiterated phraseology is supposed to mean.

The original Bluebook explanation, released by the Pentagon press desk, was that Harris had seen either a balloon or Venus. I discussed balloons with Harris at some length; he obviously had seen a lot of them, large and small, in his flying experience. He was quite positive that a balloon was out of question. He said that when he was first told that a Pentagon Air Force spokesman had suggested it was Venus he was viewing, he had pointed out again that his account emphasized that at one stage of the sighting the object clearly lay at his 6000-ft altitude, between him and
distant terrain. He said that, at the time of that Air Force announcement, he had made some jaundiced public statement to the effect that he's a bit worried about the safety of our nation if there are people down there in the Pentagone who think you can fit Venus into the Salt Lake Valley, between him and Mt. Nebo.

I had checked the present status of the Harris report in Bluebook, June, 1966, and proceeded to tell him that it is now officially classified as a "sundog." I shall not repeat his comments.

One can easily take this sighting and show how unreasonable both the "Venus" and "sundog" explanations are. Venus lay in the southeast sky at an angular altitude well above Harris' horizon, and would be quite difficult to spot without diligent searching. But Harris saw the object towards the south-southeast, "right down Runway 160°", and it was on his horizon when he had climbed to 6000 ft. Similarly the sundog explanation is nonsensical. The altitude of the noon sun at Salt Lake City on that day was about 40°, and sundogs, if there had been one, would have occurred to right and left at essentially that same angular altitude, far above the position in the sky where Harris and others saw the object hovering. Furthermore, the skies were almost cloudless, the observers emphasized. This case is just one more of hundreds of glaring examples of casually erroneous Bluebook explanations put out by untrained men and passed on to the press and public by PIO's who are equally untrained and cannot recognize elementary scientific absurdities when they see them. Yet just this kind of balderdash has left the bulk of the public with the impression that UFOs can't exist, since the Air Force has disproved virtually all the reports they've ever received.

**Case 10. Central Indiana, October 3, 1958**

In the records are many (probably well over two hundred) cases where UFOs "buzzed" cars, and there are also several instances, from various parts of the world, where unidentified objects have passed over railroad trains in a manner suggesting something more than random coincidence. One interesting example involves a Monon Railroad freight train that was repeatedly overflown by four glowing discs during a protracted episode early on October 3, 1958. I have interviewed three of the five train crewmen, confirming details to be found in the NICAP report and in a more complete account by Frank Edwards, who originally investigated the sighting. It is a very involved sighting, since the objects followed the train, maneuvering back and forth near it for an hour and ten minutes; hence only a sparse outline will be given here.

The objects were first sighted a bit after 0300, well ahead of the train, crossing the path of the scheduled freight as it was near Wasco, Indiana. Cecil Bridge, fireman, sighted them first, and quickly pointed them out to the engineer, Harry Ott, and the safety man in the cab, Morris Ott. Shortly thereafter, the objects executed a turn and came in towards the train obliquely, passing right overhead at a height estimated at something like 100 feet or so. The men in the cab had radioed the caboose crew, and congratulated Robinson in the caboose cupola told me that he was looking right down the line of cars as the four disc-like things swept over the train. He estimated their diameters as 30-40 feet. My interviews with Eckman, Bridge, and Robinson cannot be fully summarized because all of the maneuvers that then unfolded would require too much space to recount. At one time the train was switching cars at Frankfort, Ind., and during the 10-15 minute operation, Robinson said that the objects seemed to have "landed" a mile or so back up the line. He could make out sparks or glowing lights, but not much detail. After the train resumed the objects followed them again, and did not break off and leave until the train reached the vicinity of Kirklin, Ind. I checked carefully whether there was substance in reports that they had been told to keep quiet about this sighting; all three emphatically denied this. They had not been interviewed by any USAP personnel about this sighting. I believe them in saying that no wire-story coverage on this important case was ever filed.

**Case 16. Washington National Airport, July 19 and 26, 1952**

One does not have the full picture on UFOs and their official investigation until he has studied carefully many of the cases in the latest 1949's and early 1950's, prior to the 1953 turning-point of the Robertson Panel and CIA debunking order. In the past year, I have rather carefully gone over several dozen important cases from that period, and have run down witnesses in many "famous" cases in the case of the Washington Airport incidents, I have never located any witnesses for personal interviews, but the basic facts of this most famous of all UFO episodes are well attested in press records which I have gone over, so personal interviews are not so crucial here.

I shall not attempt a full recounting, since so much went on that even a chapter in F Sutton's book (Ref. 2) does not do justice to it. The principal points deserving emphasis are these: Unknown returns were picked up on as many as three separate radars in the Washington area, at times the three sets having compatible echoes. Visual observations of these fast-moving objects were made from ground and air, especially the latter. Despite frantic confusion on both of these two occasions, the record is moderately clear as to what saw what and where. The CIA radar controllers, to this day, insist that the echoes were good hard echoes, quite unlike familiar ground-returns caused by anomalous propagation under inversions. The official explanation put out at the time was that the radar returns were due to anomalous propagation, and the visual sightings were caused by refraction effects due to the same inversions responsible for the radar anomalies.

I have examined the radiosonde data for both nights, have computed the refractivity index gradients, and find that, after making allowance
for lag effects in the radiosonde, radar ducting could not have occurred. The suggestion that an inversion of the sort exhibited by the radiosonde data for that night at Washington caused the reported visual effects is absolutely absurd. First of all, the inversion was a very weak one by mirage standards, so that even the ground observers could not have seen mirages. But worse, the optics of mirages and the "optics" of radar ground returns are significantly different in several respects, so that false targets would not now lie in the same place in the sky to a visual observer and a radar observer. Furthermore, the most important visual observations were not on the ground but in the air by several knowledgeable radarmen, including one jet pilot who was vectored close to one of the radar targets moving over the capital.

Finally the temperature data aloft at aircraft altitude were not even remotely capable of producing anything like what was described by the pilots.

These 1952 "explanations" have never since been challenged, and the summary analysis of this case that Bluebook still sends out when queried on the case is a verbatim assemblage of the hasty remarks made by frantic officers trying to get the Air Force off the hook in that tight squeeze of July, 1952. I even found a passage in the currently distributed case summary which asserts that "unfortunately the only day for which weather data was obtained was for 26 July 1952," precisely the assertion I found appearing on a memo dated 29 August 1952 from Capt. James (a radar officer) to Capt. Ruspelt (copy of memo in Bluebook file) in the same place in the sky, a dozen sheets of dog-eared paper further on in this very same file that Maj. Quintanilla gave me, I found the allegedly missing weather ground returns are significantly different in several respects, so that false targets would not now lie in the same place in the sky to a visual observer and a radar observer. Furthermore, the most important visual observations were not on the ground but in the air by several knowledgeable radarmen, including one jet pilot who was vectored close to one of the radar targets moving over the capital.

Finally the temperature data aloft at aircraft altitude were not even remotely capable of producing anything like what was described by the pilots.

On the basis of several extended telephone discussions with Kenneth Arnold, the private pilot who reported this era-opening UFO sighting, and on the basis of examination of weather data for that day, I must categorically reject the long-standing Air Force explanation that this was a "mirage." Dr. Menzel, in his second book, also subscribes to this hypothesis. The radiosonde data for that date show no strong inversion afloat of the type that would be required to produce even a mild mirage, but there's no indication that either Bluebook or Menzel used any quantitative considerations in arriving at their explanation. Furthermore, Arnold described the objects as slowly climbing as they fluttered along at high speed from the Mt. Rainier area to near Mt. Adams, a roughly 45-mile distance which he timed them covering at a speed of about 1,000 miles per hour. (Scientists will be amused to be told that in the official Bluebook summary analysis, this speed is quoted as "1656.71 miles per hour." At first the objects were viewed by Arnold against outlier peaks on Mt. Rainier, that put their altitude at roughly the same as his flight altitude of about 9500 feet. But by the time the discs reached the Mt. Adams area, Arnold stated that the lead objects in the string of nine had ascended to perhaps 13,000 to 14,000 feet near Adams and hence altitude increase implies so large an increase of angular altitude that the possibility of any naturally occurring inversion accounting for these apparitions on a mirage basis is wholly out of the question. And beyond all this, one has to ask just what Bluebook and Menzel would like to suggest as the real objects whose images were refractively distorted into these moving discs? Their azimuth changed position by almost ninety degrees in the roughly minute and a half that Arnold watched them pass by.

To suggest that he was watching an azimuthally moving mirage through such a sector is patently absurd. Yet this is only more of the same absurdity that marks many more "explanations" in Bluebook files and in Menzel's books.

Charles B. Moore, Jr., working with several amateur observers, made balloon observations of upper winds, as a part of a high-altitude balloon flight that day. Through a series of steps that will not be fully recounted here, and especially to a whitish elliptical-shaped object that was moving at high angular velocity from southwest to northeast. In about 60 seconds this object moved off to the northeast, and just before passing out of sight in the 25-power telescope, its altitude angle began to slowly increase! Another balloon was immediately released to double-check the winds, but no high-speed upper jet was present to blow anything along at anything like this object's speed. I have discussed this early sighting with Menzel several times. Dr. Menzel easily accounts for the whole thing on p. 33 of Ref. 8: "What Moore saw was an out-of-focus and badly astigmatic image of the balloon above," caused, he seems to tell his reader, by "lenses of air" aloft. Nonsense.

Space does not permit touching here on even a fraction of the significant early sightings that should have turned Air Force scientists toward serious attention to the UFO problem as early as 1950. Those cases can be found, in quantity, in Ref. 3, and many are fairly well treated in Ref. 1. The evidence, viewed in retrospect, is strong that unconventional objects have been around for 20 neglected years, their general nature not altering significantly in that period. I cannot begin now to pursue that extremely important related question: What about prior
to 1947? But, in brief, the answer to that appears to be that there are some observations extending back to before the turn of the century that seem so similar to 1967 UFOs that it is probable that the UFOs of that period may have been present for decades. Needless to say, if this is true (or highly probable) by more complete analysis of the old records, it has exceedingly important consequences.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS

As reports such as the examples just cited have come in over the years, editorial criticisms of official UFO investigations have not been absent. There has been a small, but steady, flow of editorial questioning as to whether the Air Force is really looking into this problem adequately. Occasionally these comments have carried real barbs. NICAP, in its bi-monthly bulletin, The UFO Investigator, reprints editorial remarks from time to time. Since AENN members will find these of interest, I insert a number extracted from the NICAP publication and other sources at this point:

"If I had any doubts about the public's interest in unidentified flying objects, I've put them aside...what it boils down to is that many, many persons agree with NICAP's hypothesis that the UFOs are 'real objects,' 'under the control of living beings.'" - Charles H. Ball, Aviation Editor, Boston Traveler.

"Do you ever get the feeling that when it comes to flying saucers, the Air Force makes its denials six months in advance?" - Seattle Times.

"...the public is entitled to the best answers available. Possibly a national hearing on the matter, long sought by dedicated saucer-watchers, wouldn't be too bad an idea." - Springfield, Ohio, Sun.

"The Air Force says all sightings can be explained in terms of known phenomena, but adds that it can't explain 63% of the reports it has had. Which reminds us of the English Astronomer Royal, who spoke up in 1937 just before the Soviet Union startled the world with its first Sputnik launching: "Space travel is utter blige." - Dallas Morning News.

"If we can't dismiss things at the moon and other planets, it is possible that other planets are thinking things by earth...There are many reports by UFO pilots who, in flight, have encountered UFOs with fantastic flight patterns. These objects are not apsides, nor are many of the intelligent people who have sighted phenomena in the sky." - Meriden, Conn., Journal.

"If some of these flying objects are indeed planetary spacecraft, it is logical to assume that governmental officials, assuming they do have such evidence, may be keeping the news quiet for several reasons: they might have drastic emotional and economic effects." - Medford, Oregon, Mail Tribune.

"...but whatever the reason may be why the Air Force spokesmen are becoming less vocal...the time is long overdue for the government to disclose to the public all that it knows about UFOs." - Alameda, Calif., Times-Star.

"Attempts to dismiss the reported sightings under the rationalism exhibited by Project Blue Book won't solve the mystery, however, and serve only to heighten the suspicion that there's something out there the Air Force doesn't want us to know about. If Project Bluebook officials want the UFOs to go away they'd be well advised to wish on another star." - Richmond, Virginia, News-Leader.

"There is a strong belief that the military chiefs know more about unidentified flying objects than they are letting on, but are keeping it a well-guarded secret so as not to worry the public." - Shawville, Quebec, Entity.

"It's about time for Congress to hold a public investigation of this mystery....The Air Force is still admonishing everybody to imagining things." - Houston Chronicle.

"The time is long overdue for a candid disclosure of findings." - Aurora, Illinois, Beacon-News.

"...well-conducted congressional inquiry can help establish the facts and quiet needless public alarm." - Indianapolis News.

"If there is any substantial evidence that any of the sightings can be attributed to objects either intra- or extra-planetary the Air Force should reveal it to us." - Cincinnati Enquirer.

In these sample quotes one notes an undercurrent of concern that perhaps UFOs are not being investigated adequately. Within just the past month or so a large number of UFO sightings of very unusual nature near Houston, Texas, have evoked similar comments, brought out in a good series on the problem that has run in the Houston Tribune. People down there are beginning to ask whether anyone is really checking into all these phenomenal sightings.

I base my comment on a year's detailed inquiry when I say that the answer is that no one in our Government has been taking the problem seriously enough to carry out an adequate investigation. An uneasy citizenry will find, when the facts are out, that their reports were
ignored and ridiculed and forgotten.

Note in the quoted editorials a recurrence of the hypothesis that officials at high levels do know about the UFOs and are guarding the public from some panic-triggerring news. This is as far from the true situation that I find the suggestion laughable. Nobody in Washington is protecting anyone from panic. The Air Force, NASA, August scientific bodies, and all the rest, know the UFOs are a lot of nonsense.

There is no hidden truth to be disclosed because the agency assigned the responsibility to check the problem of the unidentified flying objects has incompetently done its job, has fallen victim to its own propaganda in the past dozen years, and has misled us all, since 1953.

The quotes above contain a number of pleas for a truly thorough Congressional investigation. This, I now believe, is the only approach at all capable of quickly escalating scientific study of the UFO problem to the top-level status I believe it warrants. And no stimulus for Congressional inquiry would be as potent as some firm editorial pressure from all sides of the country.

IS IT POSSIBLE THAT THE UFOS ARE EXTRA-TERRESTRIAL PROBES?

Scattered through the comments just cited, one finds remarks indicating that there may be a few editors who are speculating on whether the UFOs are extraterrestrial in origin.

I believe, on the basis of my intensive study of the UFO problem, that this hypothesis must, in every extremely serious scientific attention.

Let me hasten to interject that I am quite familiar with all of the standard reasons as to why this hypothesis seems very remote. The solar system seems to harbor no good niches for evolution of sentient life. Recent disclosures of the lack of magnetic fields near Mars and Venus, demonstrations of the extreme tenuity of the Martian atmosphere and of the high temperatures of the Venusian atmosphere, and all else that we know of our neighbor-planets seems to argue cogently that the solar system is a most unlikely place to generate a second life-system in addition to ours - certainly unlikely to have a life-system that has gone far past us.

Within the past half-dozen years it has, somewhat amusingly, become scientifically respectable to take as axiomatic that in the billions of stellar systems within just our Galaxy alone, life must have evolved again and again, taking routes that may have gone far beyond our present civilization, culture, and technology. One can now say that safely in a scientific assemblage. But all that sentient life must be said to be way out there - not here!

The principle scientific objection to thinking that we might (ever) be visited by beings from other stellar systems is tied up with the energetics of propulsion. Edward Purcell, of Harvard, has presented a delightfully devastating analysis of the difficulties of interstellar travel (Ref. 18, p. 121 ff). I certainly am not one to give substantial rebuttal to his arguments except in one lame (but conceivably relevant) way. All of his and many others' arguments against feasibility of interstellar travel are necessarily couched in terms of present-day scientific knowledge and technology. To be sure, Purcell's type of argument seems to grant every benefit of doubt to the other side by looking far into the foreseeable future and still demolishes the idea of interstellar travel. But that adjective, "foreseeable," may be just the rub.

Perhaps there are levels of technology so vastly superior to any we can now imagine that they can be done which we now regard as quite out of the question. Clearly, that is an easy argument, by which one could soon be saying that everything and anything is possible. I certainly do not resort to such arguments in my everyday work, and I should like to add that I don't care for science-fictioneering in general.

But after a year of scrutiny of highly unconventional phenomena credibly reported from all parts of this country and (I believe) from most of the entire world, I have been driven to consider possibilities that I'd ordinarily not give a moment's thought to in my own personal brand of logic. It is the UFO evidence that slowly forces the diligent UFO student to seriously consider the extraterrestrial hypothesis - evidence that I can only describe as extraordinary in its total nature. (I must confess that my chosen examples exclude a large amount of UFO phenomena - that experience teaches me to omit from any brief discussion. It is simply too baffling to lay before unprepared audiences.)

All over the globe persons in all walks of life, representing a wide range of educational and cultural backgrounds are reporting, often in the face of unpleasant ridicule, sightings of objects that appear to be completely real objects yet have characteristics that match nothing about which we have present knowledge. There are still a few persons who suspect these things must be secret Air Force test vehicles. They can forget that; no test pilot would ever dream of doing the things that these objects are repeatedly doing - hovering over speeding trucks loaded with gasoline, maneuvering low over populated areas, speeding alongside Texas sheriff's cars or diving down on top of trucks and tractors and motorbikes and trains. No American test vehicles would be checked out in Australia and Poland; no Russian test vehicles would be flight-tested in Canada or Brazil. The UFOs are most definitely not secret test vehicles of superlative nature, Arnold's June, 1947 sighting involved phenomena not dissimilar from 1967 sightings. No nation came out of World War II with a secret aerodynamic technology that could have produced the craft that Arnold and hundreds of others were looking in the summer of 1947. And then there is the whole chapter that I am here omitting concerning the pre-1947 sightings that go back to before the Wright Brothers.
And I cannot accept the psychological explanations, to which I have felt obliged to return again and again for further checking and further discussion with colleagues in psychology and related fields. My conclusion: objects that rock aircraft at times, that leave dents in soil and railroad ties, and splash when they dive into bodies of water are not likely to be projection phenomena. And all of the animal reactions argue rather strongly against human illusion or hallucinatory explanations. Multiple-witness cases rule out hallucinations, essentially by definition. Much more could be said, but armchair speculations about psychological interpretations don't hold much weight when one goes over the whole picture very carefully.

Other alternative hypotheses of hoax, fraud and fabrication account for a few, but a perceptually negligible number of UFO cases. Misinterpreted meteorological and astronomical observations and the like do account for lots of poor UFO reports, but experienced investigators learn to recognize these almost at a glance and dismiss them from further attention. It is the close-range sightings by persons whose reliability cannot be brought into serious question that carry the great weight. These are on the increase, and it seems that sightings in urban areas are on the increase. Almost no urban sightings can be found in the records for sightings of the late 1940's. In the past year there have been dozens of them. What does this all mean? What is happening? If you wish to know, do not ask Project Bluebook.

Pacing of aircraft and buzzing of cars goes on rather steadily. These cases so strongly suggest something vaguely resembling surveillance or reconnaissance that the student of the problem is forced to weigh the possibility that the UFOs are probes of some type that are engaged in something that we would loosely call "observation." There are many other categories of sightings suggesting the same tentative hypothesis. How can this be? There is, in my present opinion, no sensible alternative to the utterly shocking hypothesis that the UFOs are extraterrestrial probes from somewhere else.

WHAT'S TO BE DONE NEXT

We are 20 years behind in scientific study of this question.

Science has been assured so long that the Air Force has been studying the problem that scientists are not likely to suddenly start studying the UFO problem without new pressures to do so.

Probably nothing short of a full-scale Congressional investigation can put on record the abysmal shortcomings that lay behind these 20 years of assurances.

An adequate Congressional investigation can come only from outside pressures - which will not soon emanate from science.

You members of the American Society of Newspaper Editors are, in an ideal position to generate the pressures necessary to force Congressional investigation that will awaken scientists here and abroad to the real state of the UFO problem.

And then, but only then, will the problem receive the attention of the outstanding scientists of the world - who should have been devoting their efforts to unraveling this extraordinary problem for all of these twenty years that we have been ignoring this problem.

It has become my conviction that the problem of the unidentified flying objects is, indeed, the greatest scientific problem of our time.
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**PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER**

1. Name of observer: **M. R. J. Goodwin**
   Length: 1
   Width: 1
   Age: 23

2. Address of observer: **60 Wyndra Ave, Harboro**
   Length: 6
   Width: 6
   Phone: 984908

3. Occupation of observer: **PRESSE**
   Length: 4
   Width: 4

4. Date and time of observation: **14 09h5 2**
   Length: 7
   Width: 7

5. Duration of observation: **10 MINS NAKED EYE. 10 MINS BINOCULARS**
   Length: 13
   Width: 13

6. Observers location at time of sighting: **AT HOME**
   Length: 6
   Width: 6

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: **CLEAR WINDS SOUTH EASTERNLY**
   Length: 17
   Width: 17

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: **BINOCULARS 10 X 50**
   Length: 11
   Width: 11

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   **WESTERN SKY. 10° ABOVE HORIZON**
   Length: 14
   Width: 14

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    **BRILLIANT LIGHT**
    Length: 9
    Width: 9

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    **WHITE & RED LIGHT WITH HUE OF HAZE**
    Length: 16
    Width: 16

12. If there was more than one object:—
    (a) how many were there? **ONE**
    Length: 7
    Width: 7
    (b) in what formation were they?

13. What was the colour of the light or object? **WHITE & RED**
    Length: 9
    Width: 9

14. What was its apparent shape? **INVERTED CONE. SEE SKETCH**
    Length: 15
    Width: 15

15. Was any detail of structure observable? **NO**
    Length: 8
    Width: 8
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? NO
17. Was there any sound? NO
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) NOT APPARENT
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) NOT APPARENT
20. Was the object stationary? YES
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? 

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? 

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? NO

24. Where did object disappear? (e.g., in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) DISAPPEARED WHILE PHONIE REPORT

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) NO

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? NO

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) 

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. GREAT INTEREST IN AIRCRAFT - METEORS

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? NO

30. Name and address of organisation 

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. At first brilliant large white light followed by a large coloured light ahead. The large light disappeared and it diminished in size.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planets or stars</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. A meteorological balloon was released from MASCOT at 0920-0930 and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were nil.

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons).

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was...

39. The object reported could have been...

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

No1 Calli (Unit)  T.O. Meehan (Name)
18 Jul 67 (Date)  Lt Lt (Rank)
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: MAJOR G P BALL (RET) ....... AGE: JUST RETIRED

2. Address of observer: 58 WYADORA AVE, HAMBURG

3. Occupation of observer: RETIRED ARMY OFFICER

4. Date and time of observation: 14.09.45 Z AND 17.09.45 Z

5. Duration of observation: 10 MINS. AND 20 MINS.

6. Observers location at time of sighting: AT HOME AND EN ROUTE TO CONDAMINE ST, NORTH MANLY

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: CLEAR WIND, SOUTH EASTERN WINDS

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: BINOCULARS 10X50 ON FIRST OCCASION.

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon): 6-7 K Above Western Horizon

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise): BRILLIANT LIGHT

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? AS FOR MR. GOODWIN ON FIRST OCCASION, STAR WITH RED TINEE AT BOTTOM ON SECOND.

12. If there was more than one object:
   (a) how many were there? ONE
   (b) in what formation were they? YELLOW & RED

13. What was the colour of the light or object? INVERTED CONE, SEE SKETCH

14. What was its apparent shape? NO

15. Was any detail of structure observable? NO
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? NO

17. Was there any sound? NO

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) 60° W

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) SLOWLY WEST

20. Was the object stationary? NO

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? WESTERLY

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? YES

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? NO

24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) OVER WESTERN HORIZON

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) NO

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? NO

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/A

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. RETIRED ARMY ARTILLERY OFFICER

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? NO

30. Name and address of organisation N/A

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. AGREED WITH Mr. GOODWIN ON FIRST SIGHTING EXCEPT Cone CANTED APPROXIMATELY 10° FROM VERTICAL
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

   Aircraft type: NIL
   Heading: T
   Height: 000 ft
   Speed: K

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

   Aircraft type: CIVIL TRAFFIC WOULD NOT REMAIN IN AREA FOR THIS LENGTH OF TIME
   Heading: T
   Height: 000 ft
   Speed: K

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from MASCOT at 0300 on both occasions and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were NIL (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

39. The object reported could have been:

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

   No1 Bn   (Unit)   T D Meehan   (Name)
   18 Jul 67   (Date)   Lt   (Rank)
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/4/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: Mr. J. R. WHITE
   AGS

2. Address of observer: N. 1. WOODBURY AVENUE
   HARRISON, N. Jersey
   PHONE:

3. Occupation of observer:

4. Date and time of observation: 15/11/62 JULY 1962

5. Duration of observation:

6. Observers location at time of sighting:

7. Weather conditions at time of observation:

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation:
   VISUAL ONLY

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon):
   OVER WOODBURY BY N. BRIDGE

10. What first attracted observers attention? (eg, light or noise):

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?

12. If there was more than one object:

   (a) how many were there?
   (b) in what formation were they?

13. What was the colour of the light or object?

14. What was its apparent shape?

15. Was any detail of structure observable?
   NIL

RESTRICTED

../2
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? N/C
17. Was there any sound? N/C
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) Not Known
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) Unknown
20. Was the object stationary? Initially Stationary
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? WEST TO EAST
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? STRAIGHT PATH THEN DISAPPEARED
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? LIKE A LIGHT
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) MID AIR
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) NO
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? NO
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/A
28. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/A
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? NO
30. Name and address of organisation NO
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting SIGHTED ALSO BYILL MATE
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft Type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

- Pluton, 290°, 143.1°, 1.1°, 17.4°, 15:40

35. A meteorological balloon was released from [coordinates] and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were [details about phenomena, meteorite showers, etc].

37. Any other relevant remarks (e.g., about satellites, rockets, research balloons),

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Initials] (Unit)  (Date)

[Signature] (Name)  (Rank)
PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: Clement Trench
   AGE: 49

2. Address of observer: NR SHELLEY, Ko
   WOOLSTON CRAFT
   PHONE: 23666

3. Occupation of observer: Computer Bank NSW

4. Date and time of observation: 17/10/19 7:40

5. Duration of observation: 30 SECONDS

6. Observers location at time of sighting: Home

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: SKY CLEAR, MOON

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: WAXED EYE

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon). DURATION: 10 MILES - 2-3 deg above horizon

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise). LIGHT

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? LIGHT

12. If there was more than one object:...
   (a) how many were there? 1/4
   (b) in what formation were they? YELLOW

13. What was the colour of the light or object? CHANGE

14. What was its apparent shape? LIGHT 54/5

15. Was any detail of structure observable? NO
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? No
17. Was there any sound? No
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) Going Down
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) Slowly Down
20. Was the object stationary? Going Down
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? 10 deg W of South
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manœuvre at all? Straight Down
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? Light
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) Horizon
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? Yes 1-2 March
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) White Light Going Up and Down 10° Mer. West. Good View from House.
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. Flying Experience with YBs
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? No
30. Name and address of organisation. N/A
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. No
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

THE SOCIETY 210°

35. A meteorological balloon was released from

at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

...(comet, meteorite shower, etc.).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons).

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signature]

[Rank]

[Date]
### PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: **John Burke**  
   R.A.F., Age 24  
2. Address of observer: **7 Leonard St., St. Mary's, N.W.**  
3. Occupation of observer: **Post Office**  
4. Date and time of observation: **24-1-67 2100 hrs 27-1-67**  
5. Duration of observation: **Remains cloud free**  
6. Observer's location at time of sighting: **in drawing room and front garden**  
7. Weather conditions at time of observation: **(b) partly cloud free, partly sunny.**  
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: **No.**  
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon): **Wished not to describe.**  
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise): **Fell like object**  
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?  
12. If there was more than one object:  
   (a) how many were there?  
   (b) in what formation were they?  
13. What was the colour of the light or object?  
14. What was its apparent shape?  
15. Was any detail of structure observable?
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? 
17. Was there any sound? 
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) 
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) 
20. Was the object stationary? 
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? 
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? 
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? 
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) 
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) 
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? 
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) 
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. 
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? 
30. Name and address of organisation 
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from:

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were:

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

39. The object reported could have been:

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signature] (Unit) [Signature] (Name) [Date] (Rank)
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Forwarded are two reports of a UFO, together with Investigating Officer's report of the sighting at LINDENOW SOUTH, Gippsland Victoria on 8th July 1967.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl
1. The object was first reported to the Orderly Officer at RAAF Base EAST SALES on the evening of 8th July 1967 through the KISDALE Police.

2. It was subsequently established that three persons had observed the object on the night in question; Mr. Grocott, his wife, and their older son. During the course of the investigation it was revealed that the object had been sighted at fairly regular intervals over a period of from 6 to 12 months and had, in fact, been seen again on the night of 10th July 1967 by Mrs. Grocott and her younger son.

3. The weather conditions on both the 8th and 10th of July 1967 were typical of this time of year in GIPPSLAND: one to two eighths of cloud clearing between 1800 - 1900 hours, fog patches in the area, and an inversion in the LATROBE VALLEY which was not apparent on the intervening night of 9th July 1967. On the nights in question, the local Meteorological section had released illuminated weather balloons between 2000 and 2030 hours. Because of the time difference and the relative lack of movement of the reported object, it is considered that these were not the object observed.

4. One Vampire aircraft which landed at EAST SALES at 1730 hours on 10th July 1967 is the only reported air movement near the relevant times so this possibility has been excluded.

5. Reference to the Air Almanac revealed that the only body likely to be visible at this time in the indicated section of sky would be the planet Venus which should, however, appear white and would not, in any case, be consistent with the reported sighting as reported.

6. Mr. Grocott and his older son were not available for interview and Mrs. Grocott after her interview informed that her younger son had definitely seen the object but was "fairly excitable and tended to exaggerate".

7. In view of the apparently large number of sightings in the same area of sky it is considered that this object is some natural or man made phenomena. With the direction given from LINDSAY SOUTH, and the prevailing inversion present on the nights of both recent sightings, it is considered that this object is probably a reflection of the furnaces at the Hazelwood power station, where movement of smoke clouds could cause the "flashes" and colour changes described as well as small spatial movements.

(B.D. HARRIS)
Pilot Officer
Investigating Officer
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: MADELEINE CROWCOTT
   Age: 42
2. Address of Observer: LINDEN ON SOUTH
3. Occupation of Observer: HOUSEWIFE
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   PERIODICALLY OVER LAST SIX MONTHS SAT 20 JUL 1915 MON 10 JUL 1915
   08 JUL 10 JUL APPROX 30MM 10 JUL APPROX 5MM
5. Duration of Observation(s): 08 JUL APPROX 30MM 10 JUL APPROX 5MM
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
   IN YARD OF RESIDENCE AT LINDEN ON SOUTH
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): SKIES CLEAR ON BOTH OCCASIONS
8. Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   TELESCOPIC RIFLE SIGHT PROVIDED NO BETTER FOCUSING.
   AND INSOLUBLE INCREASE IN SIZE
9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   LOW IN WEST SOUTHWESTERN HORIZON - ON SECOND OCCASION MOVER TO NORT
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg, light or noise.
    UNUSUAL COLOUR
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    DEFINITE OBJECT
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
   ONE ONLY
13. What was the colour of the light or object.
   ORANGE GRADUALLY CHANGING TO RED SLOWLY DISSIPATE
14. What was its apparent shape.
   UNDE APPARENT
15. Was any detail of structure observable.
   APPEARANCE OF TAIL FROM BOTH SIDES
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious.
   NO
17. Was there any sound.
   NO
18. Height, or angle of elevation.
   5° ABOVE HORIZON
19. Speed, or angular velocity.
   NIL
20. Was the object stationary.
   YES
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
   NOT APPLICABLE
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?  
   **STATIONARY**

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?  
   **N.O**

24. Where did object disappear, eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon?  
   **UNOBSERVED**

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.  
   **N.O**

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?  
   **SAME OBJECT HAS BEEN SEEN INTERMITTENTLY OVER LAST SIX MONTHS**

27. If so, give details of incident(s)  

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.  
   **N.L**

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?  
   **NO**

30. Name and Address of organisation  
   **N/A**

31. Any additional information  

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.  
   **UNKNOWN AIR TRAFFIC AT TIMES SPECIFIED ON 08 JUL 61 AND 10 JUL 61**

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.
   **RAFE SALE S/N SALE - WEATHER BALLOONS RELEASED BETWEEN 2000 AND 2050 U.T. CLOUDS OR EMBOS**

34. Comments  
   **REFERENCE TO ALMANAC INDICATES THAT THE ONLY LIKELY BODY TO BE SEEN AT THESE TIMES IN THIS SECTION OF SKY IS THE PLANET JUPITER WHICH SHOULD APPEAR WHITE.**

Signature of Observer:  

Signature of Interrogator:  

**Note:** Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height, and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: GLENN GROVONST
   Age: 19

2. Address of Observer: LINCOLN, SOUTH

3. Occupation of Observer: LABOURER, CARPENTER

4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   Initially seen at 6:17 PM on 10th July 1965, last sighting at 5:30 AM.

5. Duration of Observation(s) at Time of Sighting
   Closely visible for 30 minutes, generally visible for longer.

6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting
   From back yard of residence at LINCOLN, SOUTH

7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)
   CLEAR NIGHT WITH STARS VISIBLE BEHIND OBJECT

8. Aids to Observation(s)
   TELESCOPE USED ON PREVIOUS SIGHTING, REVEALED RED TAIL
   NO APPARENT SIZE INCREASE

9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   ADDRESSES TO RISE FROM HORIZON & "HOVER" UP AND DOWN SLIGHTLY
   AT ABOUT 30° ABOVE HORIZON IN EL DI SK

10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg, light or noise.
    FLASHING LIGHT MUCH BRIGHTER THAN ANYTHING ELSE IN SKY

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    DEFINITE OBJECT

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
    ONE ONLY

13. What was the colour of the light or object.
    ORANGE

14. What was its apparent shape
    INDEFINITE

15. Was any detail of structure observable
    NO

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious
    NO

17. Was there any sound
    NO

18. Height, or angle of elevation
    OR ORBIT: 5-10° ELEVATION

19. Speed, or angular velocity
    HOVERS SLOWLY UP AND DOWN

20. Was the object stationary
    NO

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    N/A

RESTRICTED
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? 

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen NO

24. Where did object disappear, eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. NO

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously YES

27. If so, give details of incident(s) SIGHTINGS OF A STRANGE OBJECT FURTHER TO SOUTH WEST.

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 19. NO

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? NO

30. Name and Address of organisation NA

31. Any additional information NO

Signature of Observer

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

No known Air Traffic at Time Indicated on 10 July 7.

Other occasions to indefinite for checking purposes.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

RAAF East Sale.

34. Comments

Signature of Interrogator

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height, and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
MEMORANDUM

From: G.T. Dick

To: Department of Air

Attention: Intelligence - U.F.O. sighting

Subject: Intelligence - U.F.O. sighting

Date: 18 Jul 67

References: Our A1126

05 Jul 67

1. A report on an aerial object observed at

Strathpine on 04 July 67 is enclosed, together with

the explanation letter by Amberley.

2. This headquarters agree that the sighting may have

been the satellite ATS-2.

Ends: 2

20 Jul 1967

C.A.S.

Signature: G.T. Dick

Printed Name: G. T. DICK

Rank and Appointment: MAJ GEN INTELL

Phone Ext: 261
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL
OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: Thomas Cameron TAYLOR
   AGE: 21

2. Address of observer: St. Paul's CofE Boys' School,
   Strathpine Road, Bald Hills, QLD
   PHONE: 600472

3. Occupation of observer: SCIENCE MASTER

4. Date and time of observation: 040315Z to 040355Z

5. Duration of observation: 30 MINS

6. Observers location at time of sighting: IN SCHOOL GROUNDS

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: FINE CLEAR

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: N/C

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   STATIONARY, AT APPROX. 4-10°-25° ELEVATION, BEARING 300° M.

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    REFLECTED LIGHT

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? N/A.
    BAYLEYliIGHT, BUT SEVERAL OBSERVERS DESCRIBED DIFFERING SHAPES. FROM PINPOINT TO ELLIPTICAL, TE BANANATOE, PUCK (AS IN REMEMBER).

12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there?
    (b) in what formation were they?

13. What was the colour of the light or object? SHINY METALLIC

14. What was its apparent shape? SEE 11

15. Was any detail of structure observable? NO
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? No
17. Was there any sound? No
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) Estimated 20° - 25°
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) N/L - apparent
20. Was the object stationary? Slight oscillation
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? N/L
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? Remained basically stationary
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? N/L
24. Where did object disappear? (eg. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) In same position
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) Photographs taken
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? N/L
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/L
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. N/L confirmed by investigator
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? N/L
30. Name and address of organisation
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons) SATellite, ATS, A, D, 004:

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been A

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

No 82 Wing, HA (Unit)  
10 Jul 67 (Date)  
F. F. (Name) (Rank)
Headquarters Operational Command
RAAF
PENRI TH 1W NSW

REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
RQPCOM ASI 3/A/7

1. Further to this Headquarters signal A154 04JUL67, herewith are two copies of a report compiled as a result of a reported aerial sighting.

2. The sighting was made initially by a student of St Pauls School, BALD HILLS, Master PARTRIDGE, and was then seen by the Headmaster, Science Master, at least four other masters, and numerous students of the school. The writer visited the school and interviewed a number of observers, notably Mr J.T.C. TAYLOR, Science Master, and Master PARTRIDGE, who were at the opposite ends of a credulity scale. What each observer saw remained basically the same but with individual variations as to shape. Relative size varied from pinpoint to one eighth of an inch which largely negates most of the variables in shape. Position and movement were agreed upon by all observers.

3. One student, a Master JOBLING, used a camera but results obtained are inconclusive, for the quality of the film and camera lens used do not lend themselves to accurate definition at high enlargements.

4. The original observer, Master PARTRIDGE, has made several previous sightings and is a confirmed believer in the existence of extraterrestrial activities. He is not a member of a UFO society but wishes to join one. He uses a 9" reflecting telescope to aid his sky watching activities, and is a brilliant scholar, topping his class in all subjects.

5. The planet Venus has been visible during daylight hours of the past week but was in the Northeastern sector at an elevation of approximately 40° during the time of the reported sighting. No other stars or planets in the reported position were of sufficient magnitude to have been visible during daylight hours. The original estimate of 30° elevation in the Northwest was checked by the writer and confirmed as 20° to 25° elevation on a bearing from the school of 300° using a wrist compass.

6. Mr Ron CUSTARD of COOBY CREEK Tracking Station was contacted. He stated that shortly before the time of the observation a satellite — ATS 2 passed over COOBY CREEK at its closest to Earth in orbit from South to North, increasing its range from Earth as it travelled northwards. Whilst he would not commit himself unequivocally because of the great range of the satellite, he thought that it was conceivable that reflected light from the Sun could be seen possibly for some considerable time because of the very slow change of angle between the Sun and the satellite in their relation to the observers at that time.
There were no reported meteorological phenomena or aircraft movements which would have accounted for the sighting over such a long period of time. Hydrogen filled balloons from meteorological sources or adjacent high schools were ruled out because of the lack of apparent movement in a south westerly breeze at the lower levels and a westerly jet stream above 30,000 feet, unless the balloon was tethered. This however, is unlikely as the area over which the sighting was made is sparsely populated. Kite flying has not been considered because of the elevation. The school is situated on high ground overlooking a wide valley.

It is probable, although by no means certain, that the observations were of reflected light from the ATS 2 satellite. The discrepancies between this report and our original signal can only be explained by the verbal repetition of reports by telephone until they reach the writer.

(H.G. WALKER)
Flight Lieutenant
For Officer Commanding
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Herewith are reports of UFO's received from RAAF Base EDINBURGH FIELD SA.

2. The reports comprise copies of a collection of sightings forwarded by Mr C.O. NORRIS of the Flying Saucer Research Society in ADELAIDE. Mr NORRIS has stated that he will forward on a monthly basis, any future reports.

3. This Headquarters has no comment to add regarding these sightings which appear to have been collected over a considerable period.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Enclosed herewith is detailed report from RAAF EAST SALE on UFO sightings reported on the evening of 27th June 1967.

2. Earlier, these UFO sightings were given fairly wide publicity by the ABC and Melbourne press, but no information concerning the findings of the Investigating Officer has been released.

3. This Headquarters has nothing to add to the very excellent report provided by the Investigating Officer.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
Introduction

1. Widespread publicity by the press and radio of sightings of unusual lights in the sky on the evening of 27 Jun 67 caused numerous people to initiate official reports of these observations to the RAAF.

2. The Investigating Officer received a total of 24 reports, 21 of which occurred between 2100 and 2230 hours on 27 Jun 67. The other 3 occurred on different nights and are not considered in this report.

3. It would appear that three different types of light sources were seen; sixteen reports were in respect of one type of light source, three were in respect of a second light source, and two were in respect of a third source.

The Main Type of Light Source

Description

4. The object first appeared as a "large star like light" which rapidly increased in size to where it was described as being relatively about half the size of a full moon. It appeared to most observers as a ball of light which travelled nearly horizontally across the sky, slowly curving towards the earth at a shallow angle.

Colour

5. The colour most pronounced and lasting for about three quarters of its distance of travel was a brilliant green or bluish-green. It then seemed to change colour to a "hot-orange" or "reddish-pink" for its last one quarter of travel. Then it finally appeared to grow extremely bright and "burst" into a whitish-yellowish-orange colour after which it disappeared.

Trail Remaining

6. A trail of "vapour" persisted over its final path and around the point where it disappeared. This slowly moved into a "boomerang" shape, until it had gradually dispersed after fifteen minutes.

Location of Observers

7. The observers were listed in the numerical order of their reports, and their locations at the time of observation are plotted on the attached RAAF W.A.C. (3470) MELBOURNE.

Description by Observers

8. Probably the most accurate reports were described by observers 5, 6, 8, 15, and 18. From all the descriptions, it is deduced that the various observers reported one or more phases of the object's flight path as seen from their position. Details are :—
(a) Observers 1, 2, and 21 probably saw the green section.

(b) Observers 3 and 4 probably saw the section where it changed from bluish-green to pink-red.

(c) Observers 5, 6, 7, 8, 15, and 20 probably saw all or nearly all of the event.

(d) Observers 9 and 10 probably saw only the reddish portion just before the end.

(e) Observers 14 and 18 probably saw the brilliant end flash and subsequent trail.

(f) Observer 19 probably saw the vapour trail only.

9. Nearly all observers agreed that the nearlyhorizontal path and colour of the object, was most unusual and not like the normal "shooting" or "falling" star type of object, which they had all seen at some time.

Time of Occurrence

10. The time of the "finish" was logged at 2155 hours EST by observer 18. Another accurate time was taken by observer 6 as 2152 hours. All the other times were only approximate, but generally as they were between 2145 and 2200 hours it is considered that only one such event occurred at about 2155 hours. No explanation can be offered as to why observer 7, who apparently saw the same event, gave the time as 2105 hours.

Estimated Position

11. All bearings noted by the observers on the land were approximations only and indicated that the object first appeared to the south east and travelled to the north, north east, or north west. Until a report was received from the observer 18, at sea on the MV "CORNWALL", no indication of the object's position was apparent. However, the accurate bearings and times reported by observer 18 enabled a fairly accurate track of the object to be plotted as shown on the attached W.A.C.

Direction of Travel

12. From the bearings plotted from observer's reports, the general direction of travel would appear to be about 350°. This would satisfy the majority of descriptions of the object's path.

Distance Travelled

13. Assuming the bearings plotted are fairly accurate, the initial point where the object became visible would be about 200NM south of CAPE HOWE. With a direction of travel about 350° its final position when it disappeared would have been about 50NM south of CAPE HOWE. Thus the total distance travelled during observation would be about 150NM.

Estimated Speed

14. Estimations of speed varied, but probably the best impression was gained by a description of "slower than a shooting star, but faster than a satellite". Duration of the sightings varied from 1 to 35 seconds but probably the whole event from "start" to "finish" took between 10 and 30 seconds. Thus, over a distance of 150NM the speed of the object would be between 54,000 and 18,000 knots.
Estimated Altitude

15. From the position of observer 18, and accurate angle of elevation of the object at the point of disappearance was established as 28° above sea level. Assuming this point to be above latitude 36° 25' S, a triangle can be established with a base of length 7500 ft. The vertical side would then be 32,000 ft.; i.e., the altitude of the object when it disappeared would be about 239,000 feet.

Conclusions

16. The unusually bright moving light reported by the majority of observers was probably caused by a large object entering the earth's atmosphere at a high speed and relatively shallow angle. Heat generated by friction with the atmosphere probably caused the bright glow and change of colours. This object could possibly have been a large meteor or some man-made satellite or rocket casing which re-entering the earth's atmosphere subsequently burned up.

17. The path taken by the object is estimated to have been from a position about 3000 N. of C.A.P.E. NOBLE travelling on a heading of about 350° to where it disappeared about 500 N. of C.A.P.E. NOBLE. Its speed would have probably been between 16,000 and 54,000 knots and its altitude at the time of disappearance would be about 239,000 feet.

18. The vapour trail left behind after the object's disappearance was possibly caused by "smoke" generated in the process of its burning up and highlighted by the light of the moon, which was below the horizon to the east.

OTHER TYPES OF LIGHT OBSERVED

A Very Bright Initial-White Light

19. This second type of light was described by observers, 11, 13, and 16, two of whom stated that it seemed to originate from a very bright central spot with the appearance of a tail or some object behind it. The main feature which distinguished it from the first type was that it seemed to be closer to the earth and moved as if under some type of control. Observers 13 and 16 were travelling in a car at this time and stated that the light seemed to move over or near the vehicle before altering course and speed and disappearing.

20. The times of these events were given as 2105, 2130-2145 and about 2145 hours, occurring in order from NORTHERN to MINGALONG and then near CHRIST. Their duration was described as from 5 minutes to 40 seconds and about 5 minutes.

A Vivid Electric-Blue Light

21. This type of light was described by observers 12 and 17 as a very fast moving light. Its travel was reported to be in a horizontal plane low in elevation by 12 and as a series of horizontal and vertical movements by observer 17.

22. Duration on both occasions was very short, from 2 seconds to 8-10 seconds.

23. The positions of both observers were within about four miles on the PRINCES HIGHWAY near the Fernbank turnoff when they made their observations. Although observer 12 was uncertain as to the time, he thought that it may have been just after moonrise. If so, the time would agree with observer 17 who gave a time between 2220 and 2230 hours.
24. Observer 12 took an accurate compass bearing of the point where the light first appeared. This bearing was 110°N and was confirmed by the Investigating Officer.

Conclusion

25. There was insufficient evidence to provide any satisfactory explanation for these other types of light sources. It is possible that they may be associated with the first type described. It may even be that they were actually the same light; but to the observers, they appeared different.

AIRCRAFT MOVEMENTS

26. There were no aircraft movements reported in the vicinity or during the times of the sightings of the lights.

WEATHER AND NOONRAISE

27. The attached meteorological report indicated that, despite some ground radiation fog around SALE, the aerial visibility over GIPPSLAND throughout the period of the sightings was very good.

28. All observers stated that the night was very clear and visibility of the sky was excellent.

29. From the Air Almanac, it was determined that, throughout the area covered in the report, sunrise on 27 Jun 67 occurred at the following times:

   (a) GIPST - 2226 hours
   (b) SALE - 2232 hours
   (c) SAU REMO - 2238 hours

30. The moon rose from the east and was 18.4 days old at that time.

(R.K. STEWART)
Flight Lieutenant
UFO Investigating Officer
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Herewith reports from Mr M.H. ATKINSON and Mr and Mrs A. SOUTAR concerning the sighting from MORWELL of an un-identified flying object.

2. This Headquarters has no further comments to add to the Investigator's report.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
1. This report deals with an unidentified aerial object sighted in the NORWELL area at 1900 hours on 30th June 1967. Attached are statements made by Mr. and Mrs. A. SOUTAR and Mrs. H. ATKINSON.

2. On 30th June the three observers were standing on the front porch of Mr. and Mrs. SOUTAR'S residence which is located on the western side of the city of NORWELL (see attached map). At approximately 1900 hours Mrs. SOUTAR'S and Mr. ATKINSON'S attention was attracted by a noise, which was described by Mrs. SOUTAR as similar to the noise made by bursting a toy balloon, and by Mr. ATKINSON, as the same as the noise produced when a bullet passes through a metal sheet. Looking up, a stationary light was observed on a rough bearing of 180T. The light, according to Mr. ATKINSON, changed from a thin, wavering, vertical light to a circular shape and moved off in an easterly direction, emitting vertical puffs of smoke till it disappeared. The object was then roughly on a bearing of 135T from the point of observation. Mr. and Mrs. SOUTAR'S evidence tends to corroborate Mr. ATKINSON'S statement.

3. By reference to the attached map, it can be seen that, the HAZELWOOD power station bears approximately 180T from the observers' position, and, subduing the angular change of bearing of the object is a large industrial complex which operates on a twenty-four hour basis. The wind velocity on the night in question was 295/10, this wind would tend to blow the smoke from the SEC area directly away from the observers and give the impression it was rising vertically. At the same time any burning mass originating from the HAZELWOOD power station would appear to move roughly eastward with a slight downward trajectory.

4. The engineer at HAZELWOOD reported that no major circuit disturbances, which may have given rise to the noise or light described by the witness, was logged at the time of sighting. However, only major disturbances and breakdowns are logged so this does not preclude the possibility of the phenomena originating at HAZELWOOD.

5. Spotlight shooting is prevalent in the NORWELL area, and a combination of low broken cloud and a strong spotlight directed at the cloud base, together with the industrial smoke from the SEC area could produce the effects described by the observers.

Conclusion

6. Insufficient evidence is available to draw a satisfactory conclusion but it is highly probable that this "aerial object" was caused by a combination of disassociated, man-made, occurrences.

Signed

(RESTHALL J. TURE)
Flight Lieutenant
Investigating Officer

6 Jul 67
Observers' Position

Line of Bearing of Initial Sighting

Line of Bearing of Final Sighting
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

Name of Observer: MAURICE H. ATKINSON

Address of Observer: 91 CRINIGAN RD MORWELL

Occupation of Observer: LEADING HAND SET

Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)

1900 30 JUN 67

Duration of Observation(s): 30 SETS

Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)

38 14 S 146 24 E

WESTERN SIDE OF THE CITY, OF MORWELL

Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)

BROKEN CLOUD 3 TO 4 LIGHTS VIS 5-10 W/V 29/10 FINE

Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)

NIL

Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.

APPEARED IN MID AIR AT ABOUT 30° ELEVATION

What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.

SHARP CRACK

Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.

LIGHT

If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.

ONE

What was the colour of the light or object.

AMBER - WITH INTERMITTENT RED

What was its apparent shape.

VERTICAL AXIS TO Circular

Was any detail of structure observable.

NO

Was any method of propulsion obvious.

NO

Was there any sound.

NO APART FROM QEST 10

Height, or angle of elevation.

30

Speed, or angular velocity.

1/4 DISTANCES PER SECOND

Was the object stationary.

YES (INITIALLY)

What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.

NNE
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? [STRAIGHT PATH]

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? [YES] [SMOKE]

24. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon? [MID AIR]

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. [NIL]

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? [NO]

27. If so, give details of incident(s). [N/A]

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 19. [NO]

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? [NO]

30. Name and Address of organisation. [N/A]

31. Any additional information. [The object first appeared as a glowing vertical line which changed shape as it moved towards the east. Small red lights appeared at its periphery, and it appeared to emit vertical puffs of smoke throughout its journey.]

Signature of Observer [Signature]

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. [NO KNOWN TRAFFIC IN THE MORNELL AREA]

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. [RAIN BASE EAST SALE]

34. Comments. [FROM THE POSITION OF THE SIGHTING THE OBSERVER HAD A VERY LIMITED HORIZON DUE TO THE CLOSE PROXIMITY OF OTHER HOUSES]

Signature of Interrogator [Signature]

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height, and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Observer</td>
<td>Mr. A. Solitar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Observer</td>
<td>12-7 Helen St., Morwell, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of Observer</td>
<td>Storekeeper. Aust Paper Mills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)</td>
<td>30 Jun 67 1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Observation(s)</td>
<td>30 sets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)</td>
<td>Western Side of the City of Morwell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)</td>
<td>Fine - Broken cloud 3/8 to 4/8 VIS 5:10 W/N 290/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)</td>
<td>NIL - APPEARED IN MID AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
<td>APPEARED IN MID AIR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.</td>
<td>LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.</td>
<td>LIGHT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.</td>
<td>ONE ONLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object</td>
<td>ORANGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was its apparent shape</td>
<td>CIRCULAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there any sound</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation</td>
<td>30°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity</td>
<td>RELATIVELY SLOW (1/2 /SEC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the object stationary?</td>
<td>YES - INITIALLY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.</td>
<td>EAST</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon?

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments.

Questions 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height, and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Observer</th>
<th>MRS. ALEXANDER SOUTAR</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>52</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address of Observer</td>
<td>127 HENRY ST.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation of Observer</td>
<td>Houswif</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)</td>
<td>30 JUN 67</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration of Observation(s)</td>
<td>30 Secs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)</td>
<td>WESTERN SIDE OF THE CITY OF MELBOURNE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)</td>
<td>Fine - 3/4 to 7/8 Broken Cloud Via S-10M, W/V 290/10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aids to Observation(s) (Describe any equipment used in the observation)</td>
<td>NIL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
<td>ABOUT 30° ELEVATION ABOVE THE ROOFTOPS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.</td>
<td>NOISE - LIKE A BALLOON BURSTING</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.</td>
<td>LIGHT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.</td>
<td>ONE ONLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object.</td>
<td>ORANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was its apparent shape</td>
<td>CIRCULAR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there any sound</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation</td>
<td>30°</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity</td>
<td>RELATIVELY SLOW (12°/Sec)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the object stationary</td>
<td>YESTERDAY - INITIALLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass</td>
<td>EASTLY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. Smokes

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

27. If so, give details of incident(s)

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height, and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
MEMORANDUM
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For use within the RAAF only
Write or print clearly

FROM

TO

ATTENTION

SUBJECT

Headquarters Operational Command

Department of Air Secretary

Intelligence UFO Lighting

A report on a recent UFO sighting is

attached.

MEMORANDUM

TO

ATTENTION

SUBJECT

Intelligence UFO Lighting

A report on a recent UFO sighting is

attached.

Please.

The observed description of the object - "like an
old type beer barrel" may give us a clue.

But perhaps we should put it down as "unexplained".
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART I - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: GUNNAR William Arthur Theodore
2. Address of observer: BURRANJUCK VILLAGE
3. Occupation of observer: Carpenter with irrigation Commission and Water Com-
4. Date and time of observation: 12.40 am, 17th June, 1967
5. Duration of observation: 15 minutes
6. Observers location at time of sighting: 3.9/10 miles east
   of Bulme Highway intersection towards BURRANJUCK DAM
7. Weather conditions at time of observation: clear night & moon
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: seen with naked eye.
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   200 ft in air within 200 feet of roadway
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    red glowing light
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    red glowing object
12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there? 3/4
    (b) in what formation were they? N/A
13. What was the colour of the light or object? Strong red
14. What was its apparent shape? [4/4] SP. 444, wide, been barrel
15. Was any detail of structure observable? No

RESTRICTED
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? N/A
17. Was there any sound? Clicking noise
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation)... 200 feet
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) About 45 mph
20. Was the object stationary? Moving slowly and bouncy action from side to side.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?
General direction between North and East
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?
Turned left then continued on straight path
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? Blast of...
Familiar white light in a V shape
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)
Over the hills
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence)
No only his wife's statement
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? N/A
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/A
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 16 and 19.
Joined with RAAF for five years and followed object with his car
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? No
30. Name and address of organization N/A
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
Statements and police report attached.

RESTRICTED
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

| N/A |

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

39. The object reported could have been:

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

**END**

**NASH SQUADRON RAAF FAIRBAY**

(Unit) (Name) 21 JUNE 67 (Date) (Rank)

**RESTRICTED**
SUBJECT: Request for Police to interview persons concerned in sighting of unidentified Flying Object at Burrenjuck on 17-6-67.

REFERENCE: Telephone message received Yass Station 19-6-67.

I have to report that the request for Police at Yass to interview Mr. W. Cregan of Burrenjuck and obtain information in relation to the sighting of an Unidentified Flying Object on the Burrenjuck Road at 12.40am on 17.6.67, has now been carried out, and full statements have been made by Mr. William Arthur Theodore CREGAN and his wife Same Alice Veronica CREGAN, both residing at Burrenjuck Village. The statements obtained are here attached.

I have now ascertained that the property on which the alleged sighting of the unidentified object took place is owned by Ledgeworth Pty.Ltd. of Yass, and adjoins Bogalang Station and Dr. Pagan’s property. No person on the Ledgeworth property witnessed the flying unidentified object, and there has been no previous reports of a similar sighting.

On checking a Military map in relation to the course taken by the alleged unidentified object, it was last seen to be headed in the general direction of Murrumbateman over the back waters of Burrenjuck Dam, and not in a direction between Bowning and Yass as stated by Mr. Cregan, this direction given would have been too far to the north, it was a general easterly direction.

I made a close survey of the grassed paddock on the Ledgeworth property where the unidentified object was first seen and alleged to have emitted a blast of greyish light towards the ground, Nothing was seen to indicate that the object had been on the ground or had caused any scorching of the grass or earth with the blast.

I am of the opinion that the two persons alleging the sighting of the unidentified flying object, have given a reliable statement of what they saw, they are both matured persons, and highly respected citizens of Burrenjuck, and their report in this instance would be a genuine one. There is no suggestion that either of the two persons were under the influence of liquor at the time, and it would appear that they did both see something unusual in the sky early that morning, which matter could possibly be connected with other reported sightings of unidentified flying objects over the Sydney area later that same morning.

This file is here forwarded for your information and further attention as requested.

(A.B.Vale)
Sergeant 1/c
STATEMENT in matter of:  
Place: Burrenjoin Road  
Black Range  
Date: 20th, June 1967

Name: CREGAN William Arthur Theodore  
(Surname in capitals)  
Address: Burrenjoin Village  
Occupation: Carpenter with Water Conservation and Irrigation Commission - Burrenjoin Dam

I am a married man aged 55 years, a carpenter by occupation, formerly employed by the Water Conservation and Irrigation Commission at Burrenjoin Dam. I have not worked since February 1966 as result of back injuries received in the R.A.A.F at  
Pot Shot - Western Australia, and I have been receiving repatriation benefits since 1966.

At about 12.40am on Saturday morning the 17th, June 1967, I was driving my Holden sedan car No. 62N-930 at the time accompanied by my wife, Rose Alice Cregan. We had both been at the Soldiers Club at Yass, and was returning home to Burrenjoin. When travelling along the Burrenjoin Road, towards Burrenjoin Dam and on arrival at Skillever's Creek a measured distance of 3/10 miles east of the Hume Highway intersection, my attention was drawn to an object in the sky about a half a mile a head of the car on the left hand side of the road, my wife first drew my attention to the object which was then about 200 feet up in the air over an open grassed paddock and within about 200 feet of the roadway. The object I saw was a red glowing object, the colour was an orange red, the whole thing seemed to be a red glow, then I saw a blast of greyish white light in a V shape come from this object towards the ground, it was only of short duration, I commented to my wife that it looked like sky rockets, she said no its not sky rockets and it's not a plane. I then stopped my car and got out on to the roadway. I then made a close observation of the object, I saw that the object was a fair size in the distance it looked to be about six feet across. I saw that the shape was similar to an old style beer barrel which was lying on its side. I saw that the object was then moving towards Burrenjoin and parallel with the road, it was only moving slowly. I got back into my car and followed the object, I was travelling at about 45 m.p.h and was catching up to the object, I followed it for a measured 1 and 3/10 miles to a place where there is a rise in the road, and at this time I was then only about 200 yards distance off the object. I again stopped the car to observe this object. I then saw what appeared to be red lights flicking all around the object, it seemed to be the one light flicking all around the object, the flicking was much quicker than that used on aircraft. I had again got out of my car on to the roadway, and as I observed the object I could distinctly hear a clicking noise coming from the object, it was a

Witness: [Signature]

St 6417 V. C. N. Hight, Department Printer
noise similar to an amplified noise of car blinker lights, it
was quite an audible loud noise, but not excessively loud. As I
stopped my car I saw the object make a right left hand turn, and
it headed off towards some hills in a direction generally between
the towns of Bowning and Yass, the object was still only travelling
at a slow speed, it did not appear to gain or lose any height,
I did notice as the object travelled away from me it appeared to
have a bouncy action from one side to the other, it was only a
slight movement from side to side. I could hear the noise of
the object for a good half mile distance as it moved away. I
continued to watch the object for a period of ten minutes from the
last time I had stopped the car. The object continued on at its
slow speed in the direction of between Bowning and Yass. I then
got back into the car I had a conversation with my wife about the
object and then I drove home. I would say that I had the object
under my observations for approximately 15 minutes from the first
sighting of it.

I have never seen an object in the sky like this one before,
it was some foreign object. I would say that it was not any form
of aircraft that I know about, and I have had five years experience
with aircraft in the R.A.A.F.

On the night of sighting the unidentified object I had visited the
Soldiers Club at Yass, and I did not have any more than six middles
of beer during the 10 hours that I was at the club and in Yass. I
had my last beer at about 10. pm that night. I am not subject to
hallucinations, or any injury effecting my eyesight, or my mind.
I am quite convinced that what I saw that night was something
realistic, and was supported by my wife seeing the same object,
and my wife is an abstainer from liquor.

In the first instance I was not prepared to report the sighting
of this object, as I did not desire any publicity about it. but
on viewing the television news from the National Stations on
Sunday night the 18-6-67 it was stated that several sightings of
unidentified flying objects had been seen in the Sydney area early
on the previous Saturday morning, and I then decided to report the
matter of my sighting, as I felt that there was some connection
with the other reported sightings of the object.

Witness: 

(Signed) 

Signature:

J. B. Waglan

YASS, Police Station.
At about 12.40am on Saturday morning the 17th June 1967 I was a passenger in my husband's car travelling from Yass to our home at Burren Noack Village. My husband was driving the car, we had turned off the Hume Highway and had travelled about 4 miles along the Burren Noack Road towards Burren Noack, and as the car came to Skillen's Creek, I then saw a streak of something like a grey colour, it was not distinct light and it was not fog. I commented to my husband that it was a star falling. We both looked at it, it was in a paddock on the left hand side of the road. It was not very far inside the fence off the road, the streak of greyish colour quickly disappeared. I then saw a reddish coloured oval shaped glow in the sky, it was more like the shape of a child's rubber wading pool. It did not seem to be very high up from the ground, it could have been a few hundred feet. My husband then got out of the car to have a look at the object. He said to me that it could be a flying saucer. At the time I noticed that the moon was low in the sky in the west it was about a half moon, I knew I had not mistaken the object with the moon as the object was on the other side of the car to the position of the moon. From the time I first saw the red glowing object in the sky I saw that it had red flashing lights about it, the lights were blinking like car blinker lights. My husband got back into the car and we followed the object along the road for nearly two miles. My husband then again stopped the car and got out to look at the object. I then saw that the object had turned to the left, and was headed towards some hills. I did not get out of the car, I did not hear any noise from the object. We stayed watching the object for a good ten minutes. It was still in sight when we left to go home. The object seemed to be flying very slowly, it was too slow to be an aircraft. I would say that we got as close as 200 yards distance off the object when we stopped the second time. In the distance the object seemed to be about as big as a child's rubber wading pool, it was not a really big object. It was definitely not an aeroplane. I have never seen a similar object before.
I am a total abstainer from liquor, and not suffering any illness or eye-sight troubles which would cause me to see something that did not exist.
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A3 UFO SIGHTINGS REPORTED BETWEEN Bairnsdale and Sale on evenings of 8 and 10 Jul 67. PD
INITIAL REPORT IS A) FLAT SHAPE WITH FLASHING LIGHTS B) ELEVATION 20 DEGREES C) TRAVELLING FROM SOUTH TO SOUTH WEST PD INVESTIGATING OFFICER APPOINTED BT
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

Herewith is a report of an un-identified aerial object sighted by Mrs F.M. O'LEARY on 18th June 1967 at BULLEEN Victoria.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer... Freda. M. O'Leary............ Age.. 39....
2. Address of Observer... A. Robinson. Grove. Bulleen....
3. Occupation of Observer... Home Duties. Part-time Telephoneist
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   3rd June 1963. 12.15 a.m.
5. Duration of Observation(s).... Approx. 3 minutes.
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference)
   I was standing on front porch. If possible, or by known landmarks.
   My home. as shown on sketch (approx. 7 miles high).
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s).... Clear.
8. Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   None.
9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   Over horizon.
10. What first attracted observers attention, eg light or noise.
    Bright light.
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Light.
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation.
13. What was the colour of the light or object... Yellow to red.
14. What was its apparent shape.... Round.
15. Was any detail of structure observable. No.
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious... No.
17. Was there any sound... No.
18. Height, or angle of elevation... Approx. 45°. Angle.
19. Speed, or angular velocity... Took approx. 3 minutes from A to B.
20. Was the object stationary... No.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    North. East. To West.
2. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or maneuver at all? 
   East

3. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? YES

4. Where did object disappear, as mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.
   Mid-air

5. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.
   The light was also observed by my daughter, aged 16.

6. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No

7. If so, give details of incident(s).

8. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19.

9. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? No

10. Name and address of organisation.

11. Any additional information.
   The brightness of the light was seen first through closed venetian blinds. My first thought was that a helicopter was in trouble. I went outside to observe. The object was a small disc which slowly seemed to turn out, leaving a trail of smoke or vapour about. 
   Signature of Observer: J. O. Henry

12. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.
   NO AIRCRAFT IN VICINITY AT THIS TIME (6:40 PM)

13. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.
   NIL

14. Comments: Observer was amazed at brightness of light which penetrated closed venetian blinds and woke daughter. Unable to assess origin.
   Signature of Interrogator: J. O. Henry

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 4 to be answered by interrogator.

note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
RESTRICTED REPORT OF UFO SIGHTING ID BETWEEN 040325Z AND 040352Z A BRIGHT AND SHINING CIGAR SHAPED SILVER OBJECT WAS SIGHTED BY HEADMASTER CMM SCIENCE MASTER CMM AND NUMEROUS STUDENTS OF SAINT PAULS SCHOOL STRATHPINE ROAD BALD HILLS QLD PD OBJECT AT FIRST REMAINED STATIONARY FOR SOME TIME CMM DRIFTED NNW FROM BALD HILLS CMM THEN ACCELERATED TO VERY HIGH SPEED IN SAME DIRECTION PD NIL NET BALLOONS RELEASED IN AMBERLEY BRISBANE AREA PRIOR TO 040500Z PD WILL ARRANGE INTERVIEWS WITH WITNESSES 05JUL AND REPORT
RESTRICTED AI126/SOINTELL

(A) INTELLIGENCE

(B) UFO SIGHTING REPORT FROM AMBERLEY

JKC) BETWEEN 040325Z AND JPRPETTZ A BRIGHT AND SHINING CIGAR SHAPED OBJECT WAS SIGHTED BY HEADMASTER CMM SCIENCE MASTER CMM AND NUMEROUS STUDENTS OF SAINT PAUL'S SCHOOL AT BALD HILLS NEAR BRISBANE

(D) OBJECT REMAINED STATIONARY FOR A TIME CMM DRIFTED NNW FROM BALD HILLS CMM THEN ACCELERATED TO VERY HIGH SPEED IN SAME DIRECTION

(E) WITNESSES NOW BEING INTERVIEWED AND EVALUATION FOLLOWS ASAP
SIGHTINGS OF UNUSUAL AERIAL OBJECTS

1. Herewith reports on UFO sightings submitted by the following people.

J.D. O'BRIEN, Yarrambat, VIC
J. ROSE, East Kew, VIC
M.J. BOYD, Thomastown, VIC
W. RITSON, Newnham, TAS
Mr POTTER, Trevallyn, TAS.

2. Comments by this Headquarters have been annotated at paragraph 34 of the reports. Forwarded for information.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: JUDETH VICTORIA O'BRIEN     Age: 37
2. Address of Observer: "Nullinbah" Yankoon Rd Yarrambat
3. Occupation of Observer: Secretary
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time) 9.03 PM 3/5/1967
5. Duration of Observation(s): APPROX. 5 MINUTES
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
ON ROOF OF RESIDENCE   YANKOON RD YARRAMBAT APPROX: 30 MILES WEST OF TOWNSHIP OR DIAMOND CREEK
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s) CLEAR, VERY SLIGHT BREEZE
8. Aides to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
NONE
9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
OBSERVED FIRST FROM WINDOW OF HOUSE, JUST GOING ACROSS SKY
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
LIGHT
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
LIGHT
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation.
ONE ONLY
13. What was the colour of the light or object. WHITE LIGHT
14. What was its apparent shape. LIGHT TOO BRIGHT TO DISCERN
15. Was any detail of structure observable. NO
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious. NO
17. Was there any sound. NO
18. Height, or angle of elevation. APPROX. ISOFI - HARD TO ESTIMATE, ABOUT THE SPEED OF JET AIRLINER GOING ACROSS SKY
19. Speed, or angular velocity. NO
20. Was the object stationary. NO
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
SOUTHEASTERLY DIRECTION THEN VEERED WEST
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?  

```
DEVIA TED ONLY AS STATED IN PREVIOUS ANSWER.
```

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?  

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.  

```
OVER CITY.
```

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.  

```
N\O.
```

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.  

```
N\O.
```

27. If so, give details of incident(s).  

```

```

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19.  

```

```

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?  

```
N\O.
```

30. Name and address of organisation.  

```

```

31. Any additional information.  

```

```

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.  

```
AS ABOVE.
```

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.  

34. Comments.  

```
ASSESS AS BUFG, CIVIL FLIGHT.
```

Signature of Interrogator.  

```

```

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

---

note... Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.

```
MR D. RUPP OF WOOPS HARE, YARRABAT, SAW A SIMILAR OBJECT AT 7AM THE FOLLOWING MORNING.
```

---
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer...Julian Enot. (A. M. Age...50...
2. Address of Observer...35 Muntag St...El...Kent, Victoria...
3. Occupation of Observer...Non-Worker...Engineer...
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   22nd May...1967...6 P.M. to...6:10 P.M.
5. Duration of Observation(s)...Ten Minutes
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own
   position by map reference
   if possible, or by known
   landmarks)
   G.L. At Junction Riverside Drive with Muntag St. on Western Side of
   Munro in Line with Telegraph Pole Outside House
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)...Clear...
   North and East...Light...Cloud...South...East
8. Aids to Observation(s)...(Describe any equipment used in the
   observation)
   None...No...Time...To...Obtain...Binoculars...Compass...Pencil
   As object was going out of sight into cloud
9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from
   behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   Overhead
10. What first attracted observer’s attention, eg light or noise.
    The light appeared at the eastern side of...
    Star as drawn on sketch
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Spherical and bright...Like...A...Star
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and
    what was their formation.
    One...Only
13. What was the colour of the light or object...White
14. What was its apparent shape...Spherical
15. Was any detail of structure observable...No
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious...No
17. Was there any sound...No
18. Height, or angle of elevation...60° to Vertical
19. Speed, or angular velocity...450° in...5 minutes
20. Was the object stationary...No
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks
    or points of the compass.
    N.E.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen.

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments:

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

note...Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: Mr. H. J. Boyd................................. Age: .........
2. Address of Observer: 10. Poplar Street, Thomastown......................
3. Occupation of Observer: ..............................................
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   7/5/67: APPRX. 1200/1300 hours...................................
5. Duration of Observation(s): APPRX. 1 hour............................
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map
   reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
   at: above address...................................................
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)
   clear sky - nil cloud .............................................
8. Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   Binoculars..............................................................
9. Where was object first observed, e.g. overhead, coming from behind a hill,
   over the horizon, etc. ..............................................
   HIGH IN THE SKY TO THE NORTH-WEST.........................
10. What first attracted observer's attention, e.g. light or noise.
    Starlike flashing..................................................
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    definite object like star...........................................
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their
    formation............................................................
13. What was the colour of the light or object..................................
    LIKE STAR ........................................................
14. What was its apparent shape... Round..................................
15. Was any detail of structure observable... No..........................
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious... No..........................
17. Was there any sound... No..........................................
18. Height, or angle of elevation... VERY HIGH..........................
19. Speed or angular velocity... Moving slowly to south-east.............
20. Was the object stationary... No....................................

.../2.
What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass...

From north-west to south-east.

21. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? Moved slowly in straight line.

22. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No

23. Where did object disappear, e.g. mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon. Mid-air

24. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. Nil

25. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. Nil

26. If so, give details of incident(s).

27. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras. 18 and 19. Nil

28. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? No

29. Name and address of organisation.

30. Any additional information. Nil

31. Comments. Possibly to be checked nothing.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. Nil

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. Nil

34. Signature of Observer. Signature of Interrogator. A.H. Woodward.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Name of Observer</td>
<td>Mrs. T. Nissen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Address of Observer</td>
<td>2 Walkers Ave., Devonport, Tasmania.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer</td>
<td>Home duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)</td>
<td>Approx. 061015 GMT, 1 May 1967.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s)</td>
<td>Approx. 1 minute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map</td>
<td>Observed through window of house - naked eye.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reference if possible, or by known landmarks)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)</td>
<td>Fine and cloudy - plenty of stars visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s) (Describe any equipment used in the observation)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Where was object first observed, e.g. overhead, coming from behind a hill,</td>
<td>S.W. from house, just above tree top level - appeared to be over prospect.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>over the horizon, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, e.g. light or noise.</td>
<td>Just happened to see light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.</td>
<td>Appeared as light at least 12&quot; in diameter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their</td>
<td>One light only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>formation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object.</td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape.</td>
<td>Similar to a very large car tail light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Was there any sound.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation.</td>
<td>Just above tree top level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Speed or angular velocity.</td>
<td>Stationary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Was the object stationary.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass...

Stationary

Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

Stationary

Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No

Where did object disappear, e.g. mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

Disappeared then reappeared in same position but smaller in diameter.

Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

No

Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

If so, give details of incident(s).

State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to para. 18 and 19.

Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

Name and address of organisation.

Any additional information.

Signature of Observer.

Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting

2 Viscount departed Launceston runway 32 for Hobart, at 061016 and 061024 respectively. (VH-FVK and VH-EMQ).

Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

Launceston Airport - No Met. Balloons released during period.

Comments: Aircraft sighting.

Signature of Interrogator. J.H. Gibbs. 9/12/20. 8/5/61.

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
REPORT ON AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED.

POTTER

1. Name of Observer: --------------------
3. Occupation of Observer: --------------------
4. Date and Time of Observation: (Time given in 24 hour clock zonal time)
   052115  E.S.T.  MAY 1967
5. Period of Observation (s): 2 to 3 minutes.
6. Manner of Observation: (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks, and describe any equipment used in the observation).  
   MOVBRAY DRIVE-IN - naked eye

7. Where was object first observed, e.g. overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   Over Horizon

8. What first attracted Observer's attention e.g. light or noise.
   Light

9. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
   Light

10. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
    One only

11. What was the colour of the light or object.  
    Bright White.

12. What was its apparent shape
    
13. Was any detail of structure observable.  
    No.

14. Was any method of propulsion obvious
    No.

15. Was there any sound
    No.

16. Height, or angle of elevation
    30°

17. Speed, or angular velocity
   Twice the speed of a Boeing 727.

18. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 16 and 17.

Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do so.

.../2...
Report on Aerial Object Observed (Contd).

19. Direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
   - Approached from N.W. - described an arc to S.E.

20. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all.
    - Straight path

21. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. Trails of white light.

22. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.
    - Behind cloud in far S.E. corner of sky

23. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.
    - No - except family also observed same

24. Weather conditions experienced at time(s) of observation(s).
    - Fine and clear

25. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

26. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

27. Any additional information

Questions 25, 26 and 27 to be answered by interrogator.

P. Le Grande  A/F.S.O. I
T.O.R.  061625 E.S.T.

Assessed as meteoric sighting
RESTRICTED UAPD UFO SIGHTING SW OF SALE AT APPROX.
272030K HAS BEEN REPORTED BY INITIAL REPORT IS STRANGE LIGHT OR
BURNING OBJECT ON HORIZON REPORT INVESTIGATING OFFICER APPOINTED

--

UFOS P/J UFO SIGHTING SW OF SALE AT APPROX.
272030K HAS BEEN REPORTED BY INITIAL REPORT IS STRANGE LIGHT OR
BURNING OBJECT ON HORIZON REPORT INVESTIGATING OFFICER APPOINTED

AC
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A report of a recent UFO sighting
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336
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

(Operational Command ASI 3/4/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: NESKELL
2. Address of observer: 4, Police St.
3. Occupation of observer: Police Constable
4. Date and time of observation: 22 Nov 1968 30 Pt exactly
5. Duration of observation: approx 7-8 min
6. Observers location at time of sighting: Kenra about 3 miles from Bly
7. Weather conditions at time of observation: clear night, no wind
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon)
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise)
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
12. If there was more than one object:
   (a) how many were there?
   (b) in what formation were they?
13. What was the colour of the light or object?
14. What was its apparent shape?
15. Was any detail of structure observable?
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious?

17. Was there any sound?

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation)

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity)

20. Was the object stationary?

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen?

24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence)

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s)

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and address of organization

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

Aircraft type: **NONE**

Heading: T

Height: 000 ft

Speed: K

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

Aircraft type: **NONE**

Heading: T

Height: 000 ft

Speed: K

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from... at... and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were... planetary... (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported could have been Jupiter, which closely resembles the UFO, and should have appeared stationary.

39. The object reported could have been...

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

---

32. B. FRANK...(Unit) 28 APR 67...(Date)

33. PFC B. O'CONNOR...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

34. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

35. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

36. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

37. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

38. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

39. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)

40. PFC O'Connor...(Name) 28 APR 67...(Date)
MEMORANDUM

RAAF FOR 16/3

FROM

TO

ATTENTION

SUBJECT

INTELLIGENCE UFO DETECTIONS

A report of a UFO sighting made by
Mr. T. Ward, a Astronomical Observer, at
Rockham NT, on the 25th May 1967, is attached.
UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT SIGHTING

At 0229 hours on Thursday May 25th 1967, Australian Central Time, an Unidentified Flying Object (U.F.O.) was sighted in the Southern Sky.

The object, which appears in the diagrammatic sketch above, was moving at great speed from the North-West to the South-East and at the low elevation estimated to be about 25 degrees.

The object was first sighted inside, from a hall-way passage, through opened, glass lowered windows and then observed from an opened kitchen door-way, which discounts any possibility of it being a reflection.

It was well established when first seen and the whole sighting was approximately 40 seconds.

Although this is my first sighting of such an object, it didn't follow the general pattern of varied flight movement, but rather a dead level path across the horizon, slowly breaking up and disintegrating which to me favours the idea that it may have been a rocket casing or some other man-made hardware.

The low trajectory ACROSS and PARALLEL to the horizon seems too great an angle for the entry of a meteorite.

The length of the object just can't be comprehended, but appeared very large.

It finally disintegrated into one small, red object and then disappeared.

A full moon was directly overhead, very high, but giving good surface visibility and 1/8 Cirrostratus was the observed cloud conditions to this spectacular sight.

Allan Wood...... (MET. OBSERVER)
Meteorological Office
Daly Waters
Northern Territory
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Enclosed herewith are three reports concerning the sighting of an un-identified flying object by three 15-years old youths, and the report by the interrogating officer, Flight Lieutenant A.G. GREIG, previously a GD Navigator.

2. Subsequent enquiries by No 2 Stores Depot confirm that there were no aircraft in the vicinity at the time. However, the Meteorological Bureau report having dispatched a weather balloon at 0810 hours on the day of the sighting and, because of the prevailing weather conditions, would probably have been in the area of the UFO sightings.

3. It is, therefore, assessed that this sighting was a meteorological balloon.

Encl

(L.B. BROWN) Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of Observer: A. BRAIMAN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of Observer: 52, BROADST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer: SCHOOLBOY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, eg, light or noise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Was there any sound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Was the object stationary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen.

24. Where did object disappear, eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

27. If so, give details of incidence(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 18.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments. I was quite impressed by these youths who obviously saw something. Now they thought was strange. Only one, one of them, thought it was S.H.O. MAN, BE, No, Aircraft, No noise. Could be heard. RVE. TV. NOISE IN THE IMMEDIATE VICINITY. They reported the sighting on their first free day.

Signature of Observer

Signature of Interrogator

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of Observer: PHILIP STEPHENS, Age: 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of Observer: 31 EMERY AVE, YAPGANA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer: SCHOOLBOY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Where was object first observed, e.g., overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, e.g., light or noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Was there any sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Was the object stationary?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen.

24. Where did object disappear, eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 13.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments.

Signature of Observer

Signature of Interrogator

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of Observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of Observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>There was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, eg, light or noise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Was there any sound.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Was the object stationary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>That was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen.

24. Where did object disappear, eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence, such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 18.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

NIL OBSERVED

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

MACCOT AND BANKSTOWN AERODROMES

34. Comments. The object appears to be of special interest and was watched for many seconds. The description of the object is as follows:

Signed by B. Newman

Signature of Interrogator.

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
Date of sighting: Monday, 27/5/67
Time: 8:47-54 a.m.
Location of sighting: Bankstown Boys' High School
Object sighted at: Approx 15° East of due North
Approximate distance of Object: Undeterminable, at least 3 miles
Altitude of Object: Approximately, 1,500′, near stratus clouds
Dimensions of Object: Undeterminable
Speed of Object: Very slow (function of distance)
Direction of flight: Uncertain, appeared to be going northward
Description of Object: When first sighted it was definitely elongated appearing to be conical
(possibly due to false light as it was highly reflective), but several times during the sighting its brightness increased considerably becoming the brightness of Venus when at opposition at night (possibly due to a change in altitude). However, when the object appeared to be in contact with stratus clouds it caused shining brightly, appearing as a very small black dot. For the remaining few minutes it remained as such until out of vision.

Tactics: When first sighted, the object was 15° east of North at an elevation of approx 10° above the horizon. During the 7 minutes of the sighting it dropped 5° and moved northward 10°.

Names and Addresses of Observers:
A. Kirkman, 57 Brennan St, Yagoona
P. S. Chiu, 31 Emery Ave, Yagoona
P. Evans, 55 Rich Rd, Bankstown
Age: (15, 15, 15)
INVESTIGATION OF U.F.O. - INTERROGATOR'S COMMENTS

1. The attached report was made by the locally sergeant at Balsheim on 20th June 67. The police noted this was the first opportunity to report since the sighting on the 29th May.

2. As the attached report was made in collusion it was considered to be of no advantage to interview each lad separately, accordingly, they were interrogated together. They are in agreement that the report signed by Mr. Kinnear is correct.

3. They were first attracted by the highly reflector light, one lad (EDM) thought it was an aircraft but as it moved so slowly they considered it very strange. They finally agreed that it could not be an aircraft as the object moved so slowly and they stated that they have observed many aircraft in similar situations which disappeared from sight much more quickly than did this object. This offers a reasonable assumption in the light of the estimated height of the object.

Balsheim aerodrome could not confirm or deny the presence of an aircraft in this vicinity. SQA officers at Meteor requested that any approach for information on aircraft movements should be made through our ATC organizations.

5 May 67
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Forwarded are reports of sightings of un-identified flying objects sighted in South Australia during May 1967. The reports were received from the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society in ADELAIDE.

2. This Headquarters has nothing further to add to these reports.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
**Name:** W. R. Fishcer  
**Address:** Lot 429, THE STRAND,  
REYNELLA, South Aust  
**Age:** 27  
**Occupation:** Radio Technician  

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where were you at the time?</th>
<th>Date and Time of sighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On front verandah of home address above, (initially)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*0450 on 5-5-67*  
*Approx 0500 on 5-5-67*  
*0546 on 5-5-67*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What direction was object from you?</th>
<th>What angle was object above horizon?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EAST</td>
<td>Approx. 70° - 80°</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction object was moving</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Shape</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slightly West of Due South.</td>
<td>See notes.</td>
<td>Star Colour</td>
<td>No Visible Shape, only lights.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Could you estimate speed of object?</th>
<th>What was the weather at the time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traversed an angle, from my position of approx 30° in approx 1 (one) minute.</td>
<td>Calm, no clouds visible - bright stars. Cool</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witnesses:</th>
<th>Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. W. O'Grady</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What were your personal feelings at the time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was, &amp; remain, firmly convinced, that object &amp; at least, was under control, &amp; acted with purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using with/without my name.

Signed  
W. R. Fishcer  
Date 5-5-67
At precisely 0450 hrs. on Monday 8.5.57, I left my home by the front door to walk to work, a distance of about 2 mile.

From the front verandah, which faces roughly East, I glanced up to check weather conditions. The sky was clear of clouds & perfectly calm, with clear, bright stars.

At this time I noticed what at first appeared to be a satellite moving in a direction slightly West of South, & approximately 70 to 80 degrees above the horizon. I watched this for about 20 seconds, during which time its course seemed steady. It then wavered in its course, still on roughly the same heading, but veering four or five times from side to side, & slowed to half speed. For another 30 secs it proceeded on across course, one which I took note of by selecting a star for which it was heading. As it neared this star's position it slowed further - & then stopped.

During this time I had walked some 100 yards up the Strand toward work - & I continued to watch it. The only time I took my eyes from it was to relieve any chance that I was 'seeing things'. I watched its progress both walking & standing still. No shape at all was visible, only a light which, once stationary could not, at least by me, have been distinguished from a star of clear, medium brightness. I refer to this as OBJECT 'A'.

During the next 3 to 10 minutes the object remained stationary & I took the opportunity to fix its position with several surrounding stars of good brilliance. Then, at about 0500 hrs. I detected a flash of light directly above my head.

Glancing up I saw a second, very definite flash of white light of 1 to 1½ sec duration. A half minute later, two more flashes came from the same position, their size & brilliance equivalent to about twice that of the brightest star. I have noted this as OBJECT 'B'. A minute or two later I detected a movement in OBJECT 'A'. It moved North, increasing its distance from the adjacent star by more than half - about two or three degrees of travel - & then returned. This was repeated several times up until sunrise. I arrived at work at 0511, & pointed the object out to Mr. W. O'GRADY who agreed that it appeared to move at odd times to a slight degree.

At 0545 we both saw directly above, a third object, OBJECT 'C'. I checked the time immediately as 0545. We were standing on the front porch of 508/501 Transmitter building, & this object came from behind the Western side of the building, heading due South at a speed such that it disappeared over the horizon in 30 mins. It was far brighter than any star, & much bigger - some five or six times any star. It appeared to be much lower than either of the previous objects, & its colour varied between white & red, or orange - not pulsing, but rather twinkling. It seemed to wave very slightly, & Mr. O'GRADY agreed to this, however I could not present a strong case against this being a satellite, except to say that I personally did not think so. I feel it was to low, somewhat less than a mile, too big, & too bright to be so. No shape was visible.

This third object I saw again two nights later at precisely the same time & on roughly the same course.

[Signature]

18.6.57
**NAME:** K. R. Smith  
**ADDRESS:** 70 Moscoo St  
**AGE:** 16  
**OCCUPATION:** Teacher  

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

As we were driving along a country road, I noticed a car approach. I did not observe any lights. It was travelling at a good rate of speed. We overtook it on the left side of the road. The vehicle was in exactly the same position as we were parked. I realized the car to be much faster than our car.

**Where were you at the time?**  
Date and Time of sighting 7/9/67  
8:10 PM

**What direction was object from you?**  
South

**What angle was object above horizon?**
1. East
2. West
3. South

**Could you estimate speed of object?**  
Very fast

**What was the weather at the time?**  
Calm and clear

**Witnesses:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W. S. Smith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?
Slightly scared, but cautious and also curious

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not necessarily publish them using my name.

Signed: [Signature]

Date: [Signature]
**AUSTRALIAN FLYING SAUCER RESEARCH SOCIETY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>OCCUPATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Higgin</td>
<td>19 Sunbird Ave, Loncon</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Typist Clerk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard Higgin</td>
<td>23 Inverness Ave, Streth</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

Driving from Murray Bridge to Mannum at 2 am. Roger noticed two very bright lights, to the right of our the road. Appeared to be round, resembling a street light. Seemed to move while the other stayed still. We had driven past the shop. The two objects moved behind us, across the road. They seemed to cruise slowly towards the ground. Then stopped. The third object remained in the same spot. We drove further along the road and turned to watch the objects. By this time we were had gone over the crest of the hill and all we could see, was a brilliant glow, which seemed to light the sky up. We waited to see if the world would fall but nothing happened.

**Where were you at the time?**
- Between Murray Bridge & Mannum

**Date and Time of sighting**
- 28th of May 1967, Approx 2 am.

**What direction was object from you?**
- To the right of us, then behind us.

**What angle was object above horizon?**
- 30°.

**Direction object was moving**
- Approx East to West

**Size**
- 25 ft diameter

**Colour**
- Very bright, pale yellow

**Shape**
- Round

**Could you estimate speed of object?**
- Three objects. One stationary. The other two were doing about 30 mph.

**What was the weather at the time?**
- Clear

**Witnesses:**
- Roger Topsfield
- Robert Topsfield
- Mary — temporary address.

**Names**
- Roger
- Robert
- Topsfield

**Addresses**
- Flumney

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

- No one.

**What were your personal feelings at the time?**
- Very Excited.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed [Signature]

Date 30-5-67.
This object was high in the sky.

We drove further along the road.
The objects moved across the road.

These two were approx 20 ft from ground.

Very bright, yellow-white color.
### Australian Flying Saucer Research Society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S A Carson</td>
<td>L Country Rd, Elizabeth</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>Store Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

I saw an object and believed it to be some vehicle in trouble. So I crossed river to assist and when I searched for it amongst trees it had disappeared.

#### Where were you at the time?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date and Time of sighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burning, Landing, SA</td>
<td>16/5/67 11:30 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### What direction was object from you?

Direction object was moving: **No Movement.**

Size: **Ground Level.**

Colour: **Red.**

Shape: **Unknown.**

Could you estimate speed of object? **Stationary.**

What was the weather at the time? **Clear.**

### Witnesses:

#### Names

#### Addresses

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?

**Frightened:** I could not understand how it could vanish without trace.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed: **S A Carson**

Date: **30/5/67**
Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

See attached notes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where were you at the time?</th>
<th>Date and Time of sighting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above Address</td>
<td>Tues. 2/5/67 6.50 a.m.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What direction was object from you?</th>
<th>What angle was object above horizon?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Almost due East</td>
<td>See Description</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction object was moving</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Colour</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Could you estimate speed of object?</th>
<th>What was the weather at the time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>See Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than free gravity fall</td>
<td>Near sunrise - clear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witnesses:</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Addresses</th>
<th>Tuesday evening newspaper &quot;News&quot; reported other witnesses.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wife - Norma P. Chester</td>
<td>Names</td>
<td>As Above.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Son - Peter G.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?

Interested.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society should not/may publish them unless/withholding my name.

Signed L. R. Chester

Date 6/5/67.
Description of sighting on 21/5/67.

About 6.50 a.m., my wife first saw a white light & called me. I saw a white light cigar shaped at a distance almost due East from our home and declined at an angle of approx. 20-30°.

I estimated the distance away as some 5-10 miles and the height as several thousand feet (about 3-4 more of the height reached by Dornier 7 jets on route to Sydney from West Beach).

My wife and I observed the light for some 4-5 minutes in all, and were able to watch its movements by reference to our telephone wires which provided a pair of horizontal lines in the field of view.

A. Light inclined at about 30° to horizontal and was moving slowly downwards following a slightly curved path (see sketch).

B. At about its original observed height, the light tilted towards the vertical and continued to drift downward.

C. About this time we noticed a circular globe-like light at the front
of the region. My wife thought it flashed on and off a few times, as the light drifted downward.

D. The light was near vertical at the elevation of the telephone wires. About this time we also observed intermittent lights at the rear or if the object was leaving a luminous trail.

E. Object tilted some 10° or so backwards from the vertical, then curved back again to the vertical, and finally disappeared behind the horizon of the hills at approx. 6:55 a.m.

Mk. The size of the object is difficult to estimate but may be similar to that of a Vincent in route to Sydney from West Beach, and 70 seconds east of my home.

Sketches:

A. 9° 50 a.m. near drift

B. 6 90 a.m. gate rise light

C. 6 45 a.m. straightened up
NAME: V.E. GREGSON
ADDRESS: 31 Ramsey Ave, Seacombe Hlms
AGE: 66
OCCUPATION: Farm Renovator

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

Whole sighting approximately two mins to disappearance of object.

Hills object disappeared behind

Where were you at the time?
Miller St, Seacombe Hlms

Date and Time of sighting
1-8-67 6.50 A.M.

What direction was object from you?
East

What angle was object above horizon?
Perpendicular

Direction object was moving
East

Size
2 ft. 10 in.

Colour
Golden with strange tint

Shape
Very fat cigar shaped

Could you estimate speed of object?
Approximately the speed of skin ride

What was the weather at the time?
Clear sky in East

Witnesses:
Names
Addresses

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?
Normal.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed: V.E. GREGSON
Date: 1-8-67
NAME: Bernice Harris
ADDRESS: 11 Websterley Terrace, Ascot Park
AGE: 20
OCCUPATION: House Duties

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

- WEST -
- SOUTH -
- NORTH -
- EAST -

Watched out of sight -
Sighted this side of Moon
Appeared to pass just under Moon

Looked like a huge star, small shafts of light around.

Where were you at the time?
Hanging clothes on the line

What direction was object from you?
I was looking west at the setting Moon

Direction object was moving
- SOUTHERN TO NORTHERN

Size
- AVERAGE

Colour
- Blue

Shape
- ORINARY STAR

Could you estimate speed of object?
I don't know, but watched for about five minutes

What was the weather at the time?
Cloudless - Clear & Fine

Witnesses:
Bernice Harris

Could you give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects?
I have not seen others at any of the spots that occurred.

What were your personal feelings at the time?
Amazed

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them with/without my name.

Signed Bernice Harris

Date: 3/5/67
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N.A.</th>
<th>M. THIELE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADDRESS</td>
<td>19 KATHICK TCE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPATION</td>
<td>House Duties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

**Where were you at the time?**

Hanging clothes on the line

**Date and Time of sighting**

MAY 15’ 9:20 A.M.

**What direction was object from you?**

Slightly W. S.W.

**What angle was object above horizon?**

**Direction object was moving**

Eastly.

**Size**

Weather balloon type

**Colour**

White

**Shape**

Practicity round

**Could you estimate speed of object?**

No idea.

**What was the weather at the time?**

Glorious clear blue sky & Sunny.

**Witnesses:**

James Mclliffe

**Names:**

James Mclliffe

**Addresses:**

1A-5 ARBOUE

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

**What were your personal feelings at the time?**

Shocked.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall/not/publish them without/withholding my name.

**Signed:**

[Signature]

**Date:**

Aug. 11. 1947.
The Director of Air Force Intelligence,  
Department of Air,  
CANBERRA.

REPORT OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

The attached copy of a report by the Third Officer of the MS SEAWAY KING is forwarded for your information and any action you may consider necessary.

/ Director of Naval Intelligence.
The Hydrographer,
R.A.N.,
IBM Building,
Kent Street,
SYDNEY

U.F.O. REPORT

Enclosed is a self-explanatory letter and report

from Mr B.J. Ditcher, Third Officer of M.S. Seaway King.

(G.F. HUMPHREY)
Chief of Division

o.c. Mr B.J. Ditcher,
M.S. Seaway King
Union S.S. Co. of N.Z. Ltd,
G.P.O. Box 534,
Sydney

1 MAY 1967
SYDNEY
m. a. "Seaway King",
Union S. S. Co. of N. Z., Ltd.,
C. P. O. Box 531,
SYDNEY,
16th April, 1967.

Dear Sir,

Please find attached the report of unidentified flying objects seen by myself and my Bridge lookout on 5th April, 1967. I appreciate that this will be of hardly any interest to your particular branch, but perhaps you could pass it on to someone who is interested in this type of occurrence.

Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

THIRD OFFICER.
At 2130 hrs E.S.T. on 5th April, 1967, three separate and distinct comet-like objects were seen to appear bearing 275° (true) from the ship. They were seen as red exhaust trails, and were at an altitude of between 17° and 20°. The objects were moving parallel to the horizon, and were visible for about 25 seconds. Their apparent movement was North North East, and they faded from view after merging bearing 025°. They were moving at great speed.

At the time of observation, I was on the compass platform and able to take accurate bearings.

The ship's position was 41°32' S, 148°44' E, course 187°, speed 16 knots.

Weather conditions – wind S x W 14 knots, sea slight, swell low, sky cloudless, Vis very good, barometer 29.72, air temp 54°.

The incident was recorded in the ship's log book, and was observed by myself and Able Seaman Johnson (Bridge lookout at the time.).

BRIAN J. DITCHER,
THIRD OFFICER,
M. S. "SEAWAY KING"
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS + INVESTIGATIONS

1. Forwarded herewith are reports on Un-identified Flying Objects as follows:

   (a) group of reports and covering letter from Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, ADELAIDE;

   (b) report and colour slide of investigation of sighting in NAMEROOK VIC by Mr J. WHITEHEAD;

   (c) report on sighting by Mr M.F. CASEY.

2. With regard to the sightings at (a), these apparently have not been investigated by RAAF authorities but only by the civilian organisation.

(E.E. MILDEY)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
The Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, Adelaide.

Address all correspondence to the
MON. SECRETARY, BOX 1457 G.P.O. ADELAIDE, SOUTH AUSTRALIA.
World wide association with similar research groups affiliated with C.A.P.I.O. Australia and N.I.C.A.P. Washington, D.C.

30th April, 1967.

Flying Officer Harris,

Dear Sir,

I must apologise for the delay in sending on to you the following report forms, but it takes a little time to get all the people together.

There was also a tape and the people concerned spoke about the engines of the craft that stopped while the object was in the near vicinity.

Now I was in Aircrew during the war and it was when I was in Geraldton W.A. 1942 that I saw for the first time an unusual craft and from that time on I have been very interested in the subject of unidentified objects. It was wonderful news for me when the subject was brought forward in the late forties.

I have in my possession many report forms and tapes of personal interviews with people who have sighted such things, I have lectured all over Australia and appeared on TV Radio and the press. I am telling you this because I would like to put all the evidence to your service as I consider the time is more than right to put the story to the public.

There are many good magazines from other countries and I am sure you are aware of this fact as the R.A.A.F. does keep a dossier on the subject of U.F.O.'s. I have discussed this with members of Parliament, if you care to make some arrangements for me to bring the report forms and tape to be studied and to take copies then I would only be too pleased.

My enthusiasm is not fanatical but the evidence is overwhelming and I feel should be looked into correctly.

Yours Faithfully,
Colin Harris

* QUARTERLY MAGAZINE * The Australian Flying Saucer Digest *
Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

No. 1. UFO descending very rapidly and straight up approach. Very bright, odd in a shape of a disc which gave out blue to purple than green and yellow.

No. 2. Pulled a glow along each bank. (Not moving)

No. 3. Touched off from the ground approach 15-20 ft in diameter. Also of a flat disc shape. This also gave out similar glows, spots, etc. also some different colours (green, orange, yellow etc.). When I say a disc shape, I mean this is the formation of the above glow and spots were shaped.

Where were you at the time?

WHERE: EYE MILK HILL AND MINVALARA.

Date and Time of sighting

30/3/67 8:30 - 10:30.

What direction was object from you?

NORTH

What angle was object above horizon?

60°

Direction object was moving

STATIONARY

Size

15-20' DIAM

Colour

Similar to the morning light

Shape

Disc shape

Could you estimate speed of object?

Very fast.

What was the weather at the time?

Balm and clear.

Witnesses:

ADRIAN WILLIAM SMITH

Names

Adrian William Smith

Addresses

84 MOSCO W S A.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall act/try to publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed: A W. Smith

Date: 19/4/67
1. Test shape
   Smooth and gleam
   6 level.

   No object could be seen
   with No 2.

2. 5-6 Yd.

3. Purple Glow
   4-5 Yd.
   Reaction of crude

Ground level
**Name**

**Address**

**Age**

**Occupation**

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible. The object that we saw was an orange in colour and it was the size of the plate placed on my table. As it moved back to the clouds after a few minutes it passed back into the clouds. While it was still in sight, the object was still above, but then it moved back to the clouds and disappeared from view.

Where were you at the time? Date and Time of sighting

What direction was object from you? What angle was object above horizon?

Direction object was moving Size Colour Shape

Could you estimate speed of object? What was the weather at the time?

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall may publish them using withholding of my name.

Signed

Date
Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

The object was définably between 400 feet & roughly 5 or 600 feet above ground.

Where were you at the time?

Date and Time of sighting: 15-4-67 - 23:00 hours.

What was the weather at the time?

Could you estimate speed of object?

What shape was object above horizon?

What was the weather at the time?

Could you estimate speed of object?

What shape was object above horizon?

Direction object was moving:

Size:

Colour:

Shape:

WITNESSES:

Name: Wife - as above
Addresses: same

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed: John B. Matthews

Date: 15-4-67
NAME: JEAN HELEN SANT  
ADDRESS: 21 CROMPTON DRIVE WATTLE PARK SA  
AGE: 35  
OCCUPATION: HOUSEWIFE

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible:

A bright orange object, very large & low in the sky, quite round on the bottom, but the top appeared to be uneven. There was also a sort of streak on the side, it hovered quite still for a few minutes, until we saw the red trail lights of a plane coming round towards the object. Immediately the plane came on the scene the object seemed to turn on the spot, it then looked like two circles, which moved out over the sea at fantastic speed. By the time the plane came clearly ahead of us the object had completely disappeared.

Where were you at the time?

SITTING ON TERRACE, OVERLOOKING SUBURBS & COASTLINE

What direction was the object from you?

DIRECTLY AHEAD

What angle was object above horizon?

STRAIGHT UP, BUT WELL IN OVER THE SUBURBS

Direction object was moving:

HOVER EASTWARDS FOR A FEW SECONDS LIKE ELLIPSE THEN HOVERED FOR QUITE A MINUTE, THEN BECAME MOVING OUT OVER SEA

Size:

LIKE ELLIPSE

Colour:

BRIGHT ORANGE

Shape:

BOTTOM HALF QUITE ROUND, TOP HALF UNEVEN

Could you estimate speed of object?

NO, BUT IT MOVED FANTASTICALLY FAST, HAVE NEVER SEEN AN AIRCRAFT

What was the weather at the time?

FINE AND CLEAR

Witnesses:

MY HUSBAND.

RONALD GEORGE SANT

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

1 PERSONALLY DON'T KNOW ANYONE WHO SAW IT, BUT THE POLICE TOLD ME A GENTLEMAN FROM GRANGE HAD ALSO NOTICED.

What were your personal feelings at the time?

I was absolutely fascinated, I really felt that it was certainly a sound of some sort, and was definitely being controlled.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not may publish them using without hiding my name.

Signed:  

JEAN H. SANT  
Date: 16-4-67

File No.:  
Classification:
When I joined my husband the object was partially obscured by corner clouche, the upper surface and bottom of which glowed like fire. At first I thought it was an impression of a rectangular object. The weather was fine warm, clear, and still.

I could not estimate speed, it had not the velocity of a falling star, nor did it hang pendant-like the moon, which at first I said it must be. However, I remembered that the moon was in its first quarter which seems to rule out identifiable object out of calculation. Unfortunately I did not watch for more than a very short time. I did not notice the episode out of my mind until I read the reports in the morning news paper.

Margeret Choate, housewife.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction object was moving</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Colour</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>north west</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Could you estimate speed of object?</th>
<th>What was the weather at the time?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no, but moved away at high speed</td>
<td>very light scattered clouds</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witnesses:</th>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Addresses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self</td>
<td>Margeret Choate</td>
<td>26 Sayer St, South Melbourne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My wife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time? Fascinated

up until now I was sceptical

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not publish them using withholding my name.

Signed

Date 19-4-67
Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

While driving my car with six occupants, I observed a flying saucer in the small town of Dawson at approximately 8:45 P.M. on the night of Saturday, 18-3-67, at a distance of several miles north of Peterbrough. I and my other passengers sighted this object, which resembled a small missile in shape and stood just above the hillsides and close East moving in a northerly direction. We observed it for the next three miles of travel and, as entering the gap through the range, the object then appeared to the North East as we were flying along the road East. It was certainly not a star and too high above the landscape to be a helicopter flight.

Where were you at the time? Dawson, not Dawson, on the main road between Dawson and nasch.

Date and Time of sighting: 18-3-67 at 8:45 P.M.

What was the weather like? Warm, mild night, no clouds.

What was the weather at the time? Warm, mild night, no clouds.

What were you personal feelings at the time? Very much attention and wasn't a star or a light.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed: D.Y. Dunn

Date: 20 April 67
### Australian Flying Saucer Research Society

**Name:** Richard Wannan  
**Address:** 23 Broadway, Collingwood, S. Y.  
**Age:** 65  
**Occupation:** Telephone Technician

---

Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

I saw what I first thought was a shooting star, then realized that the trail did not disappear as a shooting star usually does, as it approached me from a N. W. E. direction. I realized it was more like a vapour trail, only much wider and denser, in fact more like smoke, it gradually turned to a lasting circular shape overhead, disappeared to the E.W.

As it approached I thought I could see a sort of orange light, but could not be certain as it was going away. I could definitely see an orange light. There was no engine noise or orange light, I watched it for about 2 minutes, but the trail remained for some time.

---

**Where were you at the time?** 
On the front lawn

**Date and Time of sighting**
27 April 1967 3:45 am

**What direction was object from you?**
N. W. E.

**What angle was object above horizon?**
56° 15′

**Direction object was moving along**
Circling from W. W. S. towards E. N. E.

**Size**

**Colour**
White Smoke

**Shape**

---

**Could you estimate speed of object?**
Approximated beyond the speed of sound

**What was the weather at the time?**
Very clear, very bright, moonlight.

---

**Witnesses:**

**Names**

**Addresses**

---

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

---

**What were your personal feelings at the time?**

I think the fact that there was no engine noise

---

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society may or may publish them using/or withholding my name.

Signed

**Date** 28/4/67
Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

The object was about the size and colour of the planet Mars. It appeared to be revolving as one side was a brighter red and disappeared at about two second intervals, it also hovered slightly. We drove to a prominent hill in Peterborough in the hope of getting a better view but due to smog, over the town it was slightly obscured. We then travelled to the west of the town stopping briefly to obtain a compass. By the time we had cleared the town the object had gone.

Where were you at the time? | Date and Time of sighting
--- | ---
Peterborough Cemetery | 3-4-67 at 8.15 p.m.

What direction was object from you? | What angle was object above horizon?
--- | ---
West | 10°-15°

Direction object was moving | Size | Colour | Shape
Stationary but hovering slightly | Large star | Red | Round

Could you estimate speed of object? | What was the weather at the time?
--- | ---
Clear & Calm

Witnesses:
John Sayer
60, P.O. Peterborough

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?
We could not find any logical explanation for the object.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall—not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed

Date 21-4-67
Please state briefly what you saw. Use additional sheets if necessary and draw a sketch if possible.

The object was about the size and colour of the planet Mars. It appeared to be revolving as one side was a brighter red and appeared 'disappearing' at about two second intervals, it also hovered slightly. We drove to a prominent hill in Peterborough in the hope of getting a better view but due to smog over the town it was slightly obscured. We then travelled to a road to the west of the town stopping briefly to obtain a compass. By the time we had cleared the town the object had gone.

Where were you at the time? Peterborough Cemetery
What direction was object from you? West
What angle was object above horizon? 16° - 15°
Direction object was moving Stationary but hovering slightly
Size Large Star
Colour Red
Shape Round
Could you estimate speed of object? 
What was the weather at the time? Clear & Calm

Witnesses:
John Sayer
Names
Addresses

Please give any information you have of anyone else who may have seen the objects.

What were your personal feelings at the time?

We could not find any logical explanation for the object.

I give the above details to the Australian Flying Saucer Research Society, understanding that the Society shall not/may publish them using/withholding my name.

Signed

Date 21-4-67
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: JEAN HELEN SART
   Address: 21. CROMPTON DRIVE, WATNE PARK
   Occupation: HUSBAND
   Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time):
   16-4-67 9.45 PM
   Duration of Observation(s): 5 MINUTES

2. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks):
   A.T. THE A. SAVE ADDRESS
   ON TERRACE AT REAL OF HOUSE
   Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): FINE... F. CLEAR

3. Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation): None

4. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   DIRECTLY AHEAD

5. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
   LIGHT

6. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
   AS A LIGHT

7. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation. ONLY ONE OBJECT, UNTIL IT APPEARED TO TURN OVER. THEN THERE WERE TWO CIRCLES OF LIGHT

8. What was the colour of the light or object.
   BRIGHT ORANGE

9. What was its apparent shape.
   A CIRCLE

10. Was any detail of structure observable.
    ONLY A SOFT RAY TAIL ON THE LOWER HALF OF ONE SIDE

11. Was any method of propulsion obvious.
    NO

12. Was there any sound.
    NO

13. Height, or angle of elevation.
    VERY FAST

14. Speed, or angular velocity.
    VERY LOW IN THE SKY

15. Was the object stationary.
    YES

16. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    EAST... NORTHERLY... STATIONARY
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? 

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? 

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon. 

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. 

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. 

27. If so, give details of incident(s). 

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. 

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? 

30. Name and Address of organisation. 

31. Any additional information. 

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. 

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. 

34. Comments. 

Signature of Observer. 

Signature of Interrogator. 

Questions 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator. 

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: Jim Whitehead
   Age: 16 years

2. Address of Observer: BANGOR via GOOLE

3. Occupation of Observer: Farmer

4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time):
   Approximately 2130 hours on Monday 23rd January 1967.

5. Duration of Observation(s): 20 minutes.

6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting: Lat 35° 05' S, Long 146° 55'E.

7. Weather Conditions at Time(s) of Observation: 5/8 - 7/8 Strato-
   Cumulus Base 2-5000', 6/8 Alto-Cumulus Base 12000'.
   Intermittent Rain Showers.
   (From EAST to WEST Meteorological Sect).
   Observer stated that it was overcast although some stars could be
   seen above.

8. Aids to Observation(s): "HANNA" 35mm camera using Kodachrome X film
   38 at 1/8 sec.

9. Where was object first observed: Stationary viewed from rear of house.

10. What first attracted Observer's attention: Light orange glow in sky.

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object: As a light
    source with some shape.

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was
    their formation: Two objects were observed beside one another.

13. What was the colour of the light or object: Light orange.

14. What was its apparent shape: Crescent shape with circular shape to
    left.

15. Was any detail of structure observable: No.


17. Was there any sound: No

18. Height, or angle of elevation: Approximately 10° elevation.

19. Speed, or angular velocity: Quite fast.

20. Was the object stationary: Yes but two movements toward and away
    from the observer were seen.

21. What was the direction of flight: Approximately 240°N - 060°E.

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all:
    Remained on straight path.

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen: No (See slide).

24. Where did object disappear: Faded away to South West.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments: Photograph.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously: No.

27. If so, give details of incident(s): NIL.
State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. Not applicable.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena: No.

30. Name and Address of Organisation: Not applicable.

31. Any additional information: See map showing directions of sighting.

JIM WHITEHEAD

(J. WHITEHEAD)
INVESTIGATING OFFICER'S REPORT

AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED IN THE HAMBOK AREA JANUARY 1967

1. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting: Nil.

2. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area: RAAF EAST SALE - Weather as per Question No 7.

3. Comments: Line of sight 1 is a fairly accurate bearing of the first sighting. Line of sight 2 is an approximate bearing of the Photographic view.

It is considered that a probable cause of the phenomenon seen is the reflected lights of large towns from the low cloud base in the direction of view. The variation in NT of the cloud base could cause the apparent movement of the light source observed.

17th April 1967
K. B. Smith
Flight Lieutenant
Investigating Officer
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

Mr., M. F. Casey
269 McKinnon Road, McKinnon, S.E.14, Victoria

1. Name of Observer

2. Address of Observer

3. Occupation of Observer

4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   10.30 a.m., Wednesday, 12th April, 1967

5. Duration of Observation(s)
   10.39 a.m. to 10.40 a.m.

6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own
   position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
   Cnr. Kooyong and Glenhuntly Roads, St. Caulfield

7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)
   Fine day, very slight cloud, very high

8. Aids to Observation(s)
   No aids

9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from
   behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   Object was very high in sky in southerly direction at an angle of approx. 45°

10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    My attention was directed to the U.F.O. by a friend who first sighted it at
    9.00 a.m.

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object. It appeared as
    a very white object or it could be described as a very white light about 6" in
    diameter, when in flight it appeared to be about 6 feet long at that great height.

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and
    what was their formation.
    Only one object

13. What was the colour of the light or object
    White

14. What was its apparent shape
    Round at first, then when it moved, cigar shape with no wings or rudder

15. Was any detail of structure observable
    No, only round.

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious
    Not at first

17. Was there any sound
    No

18. Height, or angle of elevation
    Unable to estimate heights

19. Speed, or angular velocity
    See report on back

20. Was the object stationary
    See report on back

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks
    or points of the compass
    Original was approximately over
    Moorabbin; its flight was towards Port Melbourne where it disappeared
My attention was first directed to the U.F.O. by Charles Postolka who saw it at 9.00 a.m. He was so disturbed by its presence that he called at my garage to point it out to his very close friend Jan Zejbrlik — when Jan Zejbrlik saw it he immediately called me to have a look at it.

I was unable to offer any reasonable explanation and called on passers by to offer an explanation without success.

However after observing this object for about 10 minutes I went back to my work and then the men still watching cried out 'its flying'. I immediately ran outside and saw an U.F.O. heading towards Port Melbourne at a very fast speed, where it disappeared.

I have given this UFO considerable thought and at the time I estimated that it disappeared in seven seconds. The approximate distance was seven miles which sets the speed at 3,600 M.P.H.

I have since observed several aircraft passing over our garage and they appear to be going so slow that if you were in a hurry you would be inclined to get out and walk.

These are the names of those who watched this UFO with me.

Charles Postolka 87 Darling Road, East Malvern
Jan Zejbrlik 4 Druitt Street, South Oakleigh
Jack Day 0/- 649 Glenhuntly Road, South Caulfield
Norm Jones " " " " 
Ray-Arneil " " " " " 
Mick Gilfoil " " " " " 

PS If someone from another Planet saw one of our spacemen walking at about 2000 MPH and reported it, I feel sure they would be ridiculed in the same way as most of us who claim to have seen these unidentified flying objects.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?  

Straight path  

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? No.  

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.  

In cloud over Port Melbourne  

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.  

Nil  

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No.  

27. If so, give details of incident(s). Nil.  

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 16 and 19.  

See answers to 18 & 19 on back  

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?  

No  

30. Name and address of organisation.  

Nil  

31. Any additional information. See back  

Signature of Observer. M. F. Corrington  

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.  

Melbourne  

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.  

Melbourne  

34. Comments.  

Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to attempt to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
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INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL

OBJECT OBSERVED

(Operational Command ASI 3/4/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: Mr. R. H. WEBBER
   Age: 46

2. Address of observer: 5th Civil Defence & Emergency Services
   Parade Rd. Devon NT
   Phone: 3057

3. Occupation of observer: Controller Civil Defence

4. Date and time of observation: 1st April 1967 2100 hrs approx

5. Duration of observation: About 10 mins

6. Observers location at time of sighting:
   Airfield Club
   Vestas Beach, DARWIN

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: Clear

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: Nil

9. Where was object first observed? (e.g., overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon)
   Long way out to sea, came in from NE-quarter direction
   Colpys Bay

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (e.g., light or noise)
    Bright steady light which was too bright for aircraft use light. At first thought it could have been a star. Although starlike it was much brighter

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? Light

12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there? Not applicable
    (b) in what formation were they?

13. What was the colour of the light or object? Red

14. What was its apparent shape? None

15. Was any detail of structure observable? No
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17. Was there any sound? No.

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) 25°. Character change when it stopped in a direct line from St. Charles to Fort Charles Light.

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) It took several minutes from first observation to 175. It then remained stationary for about one minute before disappearing at very high speed.

20. Was the object stationary? No.

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? S.W. direction about 7° to left of St. Charles Light. The object could be seen between the trees on St. Charles just prior to its disappearance.

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? Yes. 17-32.

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? No.

24. Where did object disappear? (e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) Over horizon behind St. Charles.

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No.

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/A.

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. N/A.

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? N/A.

30. Name and address of organization N/A.

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. N/A.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planet</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mars</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at 11:15Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phenomenon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A (comet, meteorite shower, etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Any other relevant remarks (e.g., about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signature] (Unit) [Signature] (Name) [11 April] (Date) [Signature] (Rank)
**REPORT ON AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED**

1. **Name of Observer.** Ernest Maxwell SHIPWAY
2. **Address of Observer.** Lot 2 Derby Street, East Minto, NSW
3. **Occupation of Observer.** Motor Mechanic, Ingleburn Garage, Ingleburn
4. **Date and Time of observation.** (Time given in 24 hour clock)
   - 17 APR 67 2000 and 2200 hours zonal time
5. **Period of observation(s).** 30 minutes each period
6. **Manner of observation.** (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks, and describe any equipment used in the observation).
   - See attached copy of Gregory's Sydney Street Directory marked in red
   - (showing position of house and direction lights sighted)
   - naked eye and also viewed through binoculars
7. **Where was object first observed, e.g. overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.**
   - Moved from the West, became stationary, moved off again to the West
   - seen from angles of about 20 degrees
8. **What first attracted observer's attention, e.g. light or noise.**
   - Red and Green, and intermingling flashing lights
9. **Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.**
   - intensity of a star. Could not see through light to ascertain shape
10. **If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.**
    - One object sighted at 2000 hrs. Two objects sighted at 2200 hrs
    - One was due West the other was off to the West South West
11. **What was the colour of the light or object.**
    - Red, green, white and rainbow coloured
    - could not be ascertained
12. **What was its apparent shape.**
    - could not be ascertained
13. **Was any detail of structure observable.** No
14. **Was any method of propulsion obvious.** No
15. **Was there any sound.** No
16. **Height, or angle of elevation.**
    - about 20 deg angle from standing position
17. **Speed, or angular velocity.** No idea
18. **State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 16 and 17.**
   - From his own judgement

---

Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object it will usually be better to :endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
Report on aerial object observed (cont.)

19. Direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
   Moved off to the West from house. (See item 6)

20. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all.
   Stationary then disappeared in straight line.

21. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?
   No.

22. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.
   Appeared to land or move due west in straight line.

23. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.
   Witnesses only: Shipman's wife, his neighbours who are Judith and Dennis Cave.

24. Weather conditions experienced at time (s) or observation (s).
   Slight Fog in the atmosphere.

25. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.
   See attached report paras 11 and 12. (6/3/4/Air (10))

26. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

27. Any additional information.
   See attached report. (6/3/4/Air (10))

Questions 25, 26 and 27 to be answered by interrogator.
APPENDIX 'B' TO OUR
6/3/4/Air (10) 21 APR 67

Su That House
MARKED IN RED

Direction Object Viewed
From House
MARKED IN RED
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REPORT OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT BY TWO POLICE OBSERVERS
AT 221030Z IN VICINITY OF KIRRA BEACH COOLANGATTA PD SIGHTING
REPORTS AS FOLLOW: COMM BRILLIANT WHITE LIGHT COMM SIZE OF TWO
SHELLING PIECE COMM TRAVELLING IN NORTHERLY COMM NORTH WESTERLY DIRECTION
PD INVESTIGATION FOLLOWING.

DAF1
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer. Wt & Mts. LAWRENCE
2. Address of observer Comet Rd, KURRAJONG, NSW
   Postal Address: Box 61, KENSINGTON, NSW. PHONE Richmond 5218
3. Occupation of observer. Retired Accountant
4. Date and time of observation. 20 JUL 66 1835hrs
5. Duration of observation. 5 - 7 minutes
6. Observers location at time of sighting. Comet Rd, KURRAJONG
   (1200' AMSL; 800' below mountain ridge, 3nm east of mountain ridge)
7. Weather conditions at time of observation. Fine; Vis 15nm, W/V Calm,
   + Sc 4000 🟢 Sc 25000; QNH 1017 - Richmond weather 1900 hrs
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation. No aids used
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   Overhead, about 75 degrees above the horizon due west
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    Lights
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?...
    Group of lights in crescent shape
12. If there was more than one object:–
    (a) how many were there? 4 - 8 lights
    (b) in what formation were they? Crescent shaped line
3. What was the colour of the light or object? Orange, changing to blue
4. What was its apparent shape? Crescent/elliptical shaped
5. Was any detail of structure observable? None apparent
17. Was there any sound? No.
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation). 3000'.
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity). No estimate.
20. Was the object stationary? No.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? Dye west.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? Remained in a straight line.
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? Slight trail similar to that of a comet.
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) Over the horizon.
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No.
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? Yes.
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) Witnessed Haley's comet as a child.
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. None.
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? No.
30. Name and address of organisation N/A.
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. None.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

Sydney Observatory observed, reported nil.

35. A meteorological balloon was released from... Released by Sydney Airport or Katoomba Town near this... and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were confirmed. Sydney Observatory reported no comets but no comets (const, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was...

39. The object reported could have been...

40. The cause (or-likely-cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signatures and dates]

RESTRICTED
SUBJECT: Reports of Two separate sightings of mysterious happenings over the Kangarooby Range, Goolagong.

I have to report that it has been reported to me at this office, on Two separate occasions, by reputable citizens of this district, of the sightings by them of mysterious happenings, in the vicinity of the Kangarooby Range, Goolagong on the same day as it was first announced that an orbiting satellite had landed in Western Australia. The Two persons mentioned refrained from reporting the incidents as it was considered that it had no connection with the lost satellite, but upon hearing news broadcasts and from the press on Friday 10th instant, that Authorities believe it may have landed somewhere between Forbes and Gosford, possibly in the Canowindra district, and as these ranges are about 15 miles south-west of Canowindra, the strange sightings were then reported should this information assist you in your investigations.

I am refraining from mentioning the names and addresses of the reporting persons at this stage, but would supply them if required by your organisation.

The first sighting, reported to me on Friday 10th instant, was by a middle aged married woman, who stated that about 2.30 to 3am on the morning of the day in question, she had been fully awake for about 30 minutes and sitting up in her bed in a sleep-out on the western side of her residence, she looked out of the open louvered window and saw a large circular yellowish coloured bright light, on the eastern slope of a heavily timbered mountain range on their property. The light appeared to be about one foot in diameter, and was about two miles distant from their home. She continuously watched this light for about 10 seconds, then went outside the house and could see nothing. It was a moonlight night and she kept constant watch for about 30 minutes, but there was no light visible or any movement at all. There were no persons in the vicinity at the time, the area is far too rugged for any form of "spotlight" shooting, and impossible for any vehicle to be anywhere in the vicinity.

The second sighting, reported to me on Saturday 11th instant, was by a middle aged married man, who stated that about 7am on the same day as the first sighting, he was working a property, when he became aware of an extremely long white-grey coloured vapour trail, in the form of a spiral or knotted pattern, generally in a south-west position from his particular location. He estimated it to be about 8 to 10 miles away, commencing 5,000 to 6,000 feet up and continued down until it disappeared behind the Kangarooby Ranges. It descended in the form of a slight arc in a cloudless blue sky, there were no other trails of any description visible, no sound was heard. The trail appeared to him to be about 18 inches wide and remained visible for a period of 5 minutes.

At 7.30am on the same morning, this person heard a news broadcast stating it was believed that the satellite had descended in Western Australia, but recently noticed in the press that it is likely and could have fallen within this area.

From a comparison of these Two reports, the distance between the two sightings would be about 5 to 8 miles apart.

R.F. Lupton.
Senior Constable No.7317.
20 March 67.

Dear Professor Hynek,

Thank you for your recent letter. I enclose a preliminary report on a recent sighting. I interviewed Mr. Hanhood, who was most helpful and whose sincerity was, I feel, beyond any doubt whatsoever. The fact that Mr. Hanhood did not report the incident himself, the matter leaked to the local press via a friend. Reports from other witnesses whom I have not yet contacted, who claim to be able to corroborate the sighting, should be forthcoming soon. I would appreciate further copies of USAF Form F-TD 164 (Oct 1962).

Sincerely,

[signature]

P.S. The enclosed xerox of a letter received by Mr. Hanhood might interest you.
This questionnaire has been prepared so that you can give the U.S. Air Force as much information as possible concerning the unidentified aerial phenomenon that you have observed. Please try to answer as many questions as you possibly can. The information that you give will be used for research purposes. Your name will not be used in connection with any statements, conclusions, or publications without your permission. We request this personal information so that if it is deemed necessary, we may contact you for further details.

1. When did you see the object?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Time of day: 10:10 AM ± 10 min

(Circle One): A.M. or P.M.

3. Time Zone:

(Circle One): a. Eastern
b. Central
c. Mountain
d. Pacific
e. Other

4. Where were you when you saw the object?

[C]orr Phillips

Nearest Postal Address: [C]urrumbin

City or Town: [C]urrumbin

State or County: [S]ydney [N.S.W.]

AUS [T]RAILI

5. How long was object in sight? (Total Duration)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Minutes</th>
<th>Seconds</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Certain
b. Fairly certain
c. Not very sure
d. Just a guess

5.1 How was time in sight determined? (Circle One):

[ ] Phone watch
[ ] Clock
[ ] Observed
[ ] Other

5.2 Was object in sight continuously? [ ] Yes [ ] No

6. What was the condition of the sky?

(DAY) a. Bright
b. Cloudy

(NIGHT) a. Bright
b. Cloudy

7. IF you saw the object during DAYLIGHT, where was the SUN located as you looked at the object?

(Circle One): a. In front of you
b. In back of you
c. To your right
d. To your left
e. Overhead
f. Don’t remember
8. IF you saw the object at NIGHT, what did you notice concerning the STARS and MOON?

**8.1 STARS (Circle One):**
- a. None
- b. A few
- c. Many
- d. Don't remember

**8.2 MOON (Circle One):**
- a. Bright moonlight
- b. Dull moonlight
- c. No moonlight – pitch dark
- d. Don't remember

---

9. What were the weather conditions at the time you saw the object?

**CLOUDS (Circle One):**
- a. Clear sky
- b. Hazy
- c. Scattered clouds
- d. Thick or heavy clouds

**WEATHER (Circle One):**
- a. Dry
- b. Fog, mist, or light rain
- c. Moderate or heavy rain
- d. Snow
- e. Don't remember

---

10. The object appeared: (Circle One)
- a. Solid
- b. Transparent
- c. Vapor
- d. As a light
- e. Don't remember

---

11. If it appeared as a light, was it brighter than the brightest stars? (Circle One):
- a. Brighter
- b. Dimmer
- c. About the same
- d. Don't know

11.1 Compare brightness to some common object:

---

12. The edges of the object were:

(Circle One):  
- a. Fuzzy or blurred
- b. Like a bright star
- c. Sharply outlined
- d. Don't remember

---

13. Did the object:

(Circle One for each question)
- a. Appear to stand still at any time? Yes No Don't know
- b. Suddenly speed up and rush away at any time? Yes No Don't know
- c. Break up into parts or explode? Yes No Don't know
- d. Give off smoke? Yes No Don't know
- e. Change brightness? Yes No Don't know
- f. Change shape? Yes No Don't know
- g. Flash or flicker? Yes No Don't know
- h. Disappear and reappear? Yes No Don't know

---

**Observations:**
- Brightness:
- Oval (circle)
14. Did the object disappear while you were watching it? If so, how?

   Yes over railway embankment after 5 min. 
   Then rose up again after 1-2 min. & rose up - invis
   for 5 minutes.

15. Did the object move behind something at any time, particularly a cloud?

   (Circle One): Yes  No  Don't Know.
   IF you answered YES, then tell what
   it moved behind: railway embankment - over power
   line which it crossed closely at right angle.

16. Did the object move in front of something at any time, particularly a cloud?

   (Circle One): Yes  No  Don't Know.
   IF you answered YES, then tell what
   in front of: ________________________________

17. Tell in a few words the following things about the object:

   a. Sound ________________________________
      hum - whirring noise - like spinning top
   b. Color ________________________________
      dark gray - black

18. We wish to know the angular size. Hold a match stick at arm's length in line with a known object and note how
   much of the object is covered by the head of the match. If you had performed this experiment at the time of the
   sighting, how much of the object would have been covered by the match head.

   Many degrees more.

19. Draw a picture that will show the shape of the object or objects. Label and include in your sketch any details
   of the object that you saw such as wings, protrusions, etc., and especially exhaust trails or vapor trails.
   Place an arrow beside the drawing to show the direction the object was moving.
20. Do you think you can estimate the speed of the object?  
(Circle One) Yes  No  
IF you answered YES, then what speed would you estimate?  
More than 30 m.p.h., but would depend on whether object was close or large and distant.  

21. Do you think you can estimate how far away from you the object was?  
(Circle One) Yes  No  
IF you answered YES, then how far away would you say it was?  

22. Where were you located when you saw the object?  
(Circle One):  
a. Inside a building  
b. In a car  
c. Outdoors  
d. In an airplane (type)  
e. At sea  
f. Other  

23. Were you (Circle One):  
a. In the business section of a city?  
b. In the residential section of a city?  
c. In open countryside?  
d. Near an airfield?  
e. Flying over a city?  
f. Flying over open country?  
g. Other  

24. IF you were MOVING IN AN AUTOMOBILE or other vehicle at the time, then complete the following questions:  
24.1 What direction were you moving?  
(Circle One)  
a. North  
b. Northeast  
c. East  
d. Southeast  
e. South  
f. Southwest  
g. West  
h. Northwest  
24.2 How fast were you moving?  
_________ miles per hour.  
24.3 Did you stop at any time while you were looking at the object?  
(Circle One) Yes  No  

25. Did you observe the object through any of the following?  
(Circle One)  
a. Eyeglasses Yes  No  
b. Sunglasses Yes  No  
c. Windshield Yes  No  
d. Window glass Yes  No  
e. Binoculars Yes  No  
f. Telescope Yes  No  
g. Theodolite Yes  No  
h. Other  

26. In order that you can give as clear a picture as possible of what you saw, describe in your own words a common object or objects which, when placed up in the sky, would give the same appearance as the object which you saw.  

Disc - 2 plates, edges together, no projections, colours, etc.
27. In the following sketch, imagine that you are at the point shown. Place an "A" on the curved line to show how high the object was above the horizon (skyline) when you first saw it. Place a "B" on the same curved line to show how high the object was above the horizon (skyline) when you last saw it. Place an "A" on the compass where you first saw the object. Place a "B" on the compass where you last saw the object.

28. Draw a picture that will show the motion that the object or objects made. Place an "A" at the beginning of the path, a "B" at the end of the path, and show any changes in direction during the course.

29. IF there was MORE THAN ONE object, then how many were there? 

Draw a picture of how they were arranged, and put an arrow to show the direction that they were traveling.
30. Have you ever seen this, or a similar object before. If so give date or dates and location.

No.

31. Was anyone else with you at the time you saw the object? (Circle One) Yes No

31.1 IF you answered YES, did they see the object too? (Circle One) Yes No

31.2 Please list their names and addresses:

- Ms. Hanhood (during last few minutes of sighting).
- Mr. J. Coleman, 7 Margaret St, Kings Grove, Sydney.
- Almost whole sighting.
- Ms. Clavis, Montal Ave, Riverwood (later part of sighting).
- Mr. J. Gill, 20 Tennyson Rd, Gladesville.

32. Please give the following information about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>Last Name</th>
<th>First Name</th>
<th>Middle Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ms. D. Hanhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
<th>Street</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 Wairoa St.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Canterbury</td>
<td>Sydney</td>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>AUSTRALIA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TELEPHONE NUMBER</th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>783041</td>
<td></td>
<td>F.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Indicate any additional information about yourself, including any special experience, which might be pertinent.

33. When and to whom did you report that you had seen the object?

Was not reported directly.

Day  Month  Year

Last written by: (Signature)
Mr. Mankwood has had no previous interest in UFOs. He appears to be extremely level-headed and down-to-earth.

Weather Bureau 3 lb balloon released (20pm 1½ft at Harcourt Airfield 3 ft diameter, black) at 8:00 AM. It was observed by cloud at 9000 ft at 8:45 AM. No further balloons released till 2:00 pm. Previous night radiosonde (6 ft dia white) released but had large trailing package.

Wind at 1000 ft at 10:00 AM SSW, 2 knots.

Williams Town bore in 180 miles NNE and it is unlikely that any balloon released by them would be sighted in Canterbury.

It is highly improbable that any balloon could (1) change its aspect from circular to oval or elliptical (2) travel at a low altitude and suddenly change again.
3. It is virtually certain that no balloons were in the vicinity of Canterbury at the time of the reported sighting.

Plan of area:

- Park
- Swimming pool
- transformer for overhead wires
- high tension wires
- road
- embankment
- trees
- limits of initial path
- object sighted from here
- two observers saw window from this point
- Ms. Harwood, Mr. Coleman
cloud ceiling at 9:30 AM: —

3/8 at 1200 ft
1/8 at 3500 ft.

at Noon: —
4/8 at 1500 ft
2/8 at 3500 ft.

Since the Mamhood stressed the sharp outline of the object, it was obviously below 1200 ft. This provides a maximum height for the object. However, since the object subtended a fairly large angle ("small car" or about 100 ft) it is not likely that it would have been at any great altitude, or its size would be very considerable. Further, at greater altitudes would suggest that it should have been seen by a larger number of witnesses.

Radar (Maccott) - 6 miles distant: no written records kept and so were unable to assist.
8 March 1967

At approximately 10.10 A.M. Mrs. D. Manhood went outside to fetch her small daughter from the vicinity of the bowling green adjoining their residence as it was raining. At this time Mrs. Manhood observed the described object which came from the left and appeared to pass over the bowling green. There were no significant markings and the object appeared to change gradually from circular to elliptical. It was dark grey - black in colour. It was thought to be the size of a small car at eye-top height. If the estimate of size and distance was correct then its speed was less than 30 m.p.h. Mrs. Manhood's initial supposition was that it may have been preparing to land on the bowling green. It emitted a noise similar to that given off by a child's humming top. At the time when Mrs. Manhood left the house to enter the verandah, her sister, Mrs. Coleman was telephoning Mrs. Manhood's mother. She joined Mrs. Manhood to tell her that the telephone had gone dead. However
It could perhaps have been due to a technical fault. The P.M.O were working nearby at the time. After approximately 5 minutes, the object, travelling on a level to straight course, passed just over the railway embankment, just above the power lines (it appeared). Three witnesses saw the object pass over the embankment: Mr. Hancock, Mr. Coleman and Mr. Davis.

After about 1.5 minutes, the object again appeared over the embankment and climbed at an angle of about 70° to the horizontal at a fairly good speed. It was observed by the above persons plus Mr. Hancock at this stage. It appeared to become smaller and smaller as it climbed towards a break in the clouds and was finally lost to view after approximately nine minutes.
U.S. AIR FORCE TECHNICAL INFORMATION

This questionnaire has been prepared so that you can give the U.S. Air Force as much information as possible concerning the unidentified aerial phenomenon that you have observed. Please try to answer as many questions as you possibly can. The information that you give will be used for research purposes. Your name will not be used in connection with any statements, conclusions, or publications without your permission. We request this personal information so that if it is deemed necessary, we may contact you for further details.

1. When did you see the object?
   - Day
   - Month
   - Year

2. Time of day:
   - Hour
   - Minutes

3. Time Zone:
   (Circle One):
   a. Eastern
   b. Central
   c. Mountain
   d. Pacific
   e. Other

4. Where were you when you saw the object?
   - Nearest Postal Address
   - City or Town
   - State or County

5. How long was object in sight? (Total Duration)
   - Hours
   - Minutes
   - Seconds
   a. Certain
   b. Fairly certain
   c. Not very sure
   d. Just a guess

5.1 How was time in sight determined?
   - Certain
   - Fairly certain
   - Not very sure
   - Just a guess

5.2 Was object in sight continuously?
   - Yes
   - No
   - IT REAPPEARED

6. What was the condition of the sky?
   - DAY
     a. Bright
     b. Cloudy
   - NIGHT
     a. Bright
     b. Cloudy

7. IF you saw the object during DAYLIGHT, where was the SUN located as you looked at the object?
   (Circle One):
   a. In front of you
   b. In back of you
   c. To your right
   d. To your left
   e. Overhead
   f. Don't remember
8. IF you saw the object at NIGHT, what did you notice concerning the STARS and MOON?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STARS (Circle One):</th>
<th>MOON (Circle One):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. None</td>
<td>a. Bright moonlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. A few</td>
<td>b. Dull moonlight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Many</td>
<td>c. No moonlight – pitch dark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Don’t remember</td>
<td>d. Don’t remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. What were the weather conditions at the time you saw the object?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLOUDS (Circle One):</th>
<th>WEATHER (Circle One):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Clear sky</td>
<td>a. Dry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Hazy</td>
<td>b. Fog, mist, or light rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Scattered clouds</td>
<td>c. Moderate or heavy rain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Thick or heavy clouds</td>
<td>d. Snow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>e. Don’t remember</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. The size of the object (Circle One):
| a. Small             | b. As a light          |
| c. Transparent       | d. Don’t remember      |
| c. Vapor             |                         |

11. If it appeared as a light, was it brighter than the brightest stars? (Circle One):
| a. Brighter          | c. About the same      |
| b. Dimmer            | d. Don’t know          |

11.1 Compare brightness to some common object:

2. The edges of the object were:

(Circle One): a. Fuzzy or blurred
| b. Like a bright star |
| c. Sharply outlined   |
| d. Don’t remember     |
| c. Other              |

3. Did the object:

(Circle One for each question)
| a. Appear to stand still at any time? Yes |
| b. Suddenly speed up and rush away at any time? Yes |
| c. Break up into parts or explode? Yes |
| d. Give off smoke? Yes |
| e. Change brightness? Yes |
| f. Change shape? Yes |
| g. Flash or flicker? Yes |
| h. Disappear and reappear? Yes |
14. Did the object disappear while you were watching it? If so, how?

It *descended behind a line near power lines, it rose approx. 2 miles after then ascended*.

15. Did the object move behind something at any time, particularly a cloud?

(Circle One):  
- Yes  
- No  
- Don't Know.

If you answered YES, then tell what it moved behind: ___________________________

16. Did the object move in front of something at any time, particularly a cloud?

(Circle One):  
- Yes  
- No  
- Don't Know.

If you answered YES, then tell what it moved in front of: ___________________________

17. Tell in a few words the following things about the object:

a. Sound:  
- Similar to a child's spinning top (humming whirring)

b. Color:  
- Dark grey (or gunmetal)

18. We wish to know the angular size. Hold a match stick at arm's length in line with a known object and note how much of the object is covered by the head of the match. If you had performed this experiment at the time of the sighting, how much of the object would have been covered by the match head?

19. Draw a picture that will show the shape of the object or objects. Label and include in your sketch any details of the object that you saw such as wings, protrusions, etc., and especially exhaust trails or vapor trails. Place an arrow beside the drawing to show the direction the object was moving.

Approx. shape:
20. Do you think you can estimate the speed of the object?
   (Circle One)  Yes No
   IF you answered YES, then what speed would you estimate? 15 mph

21. Do you think you can estimate how far away from you the object was?
   (Circle One) Yes No
   IF you answered YES, then how far away would you say it was?

22. Where were you located when you saw the object?
   (Circle One):
   a. Inside a building
   b. In a car
   c. Outdoors
   d. In an airplane (type)
   e. At sea
   f. Other

23. Were you (Circle One)
   a. In the business section of a city?
   b. In the residential section of a city?
   c. In open countryside?
   d. Near an airfield?
   e. Flying over a city?
   f. Flying over open country?
   g. Other

24. IF you were MOVING IN AN AUTOMOBILE or other vehicle at the time, then complete the following questions:
   24.1 What direction were you moving? (Circle One)
      a. North c. East e. South g. West
      b. Northeast d. Southeast f. Southwest h. Northwest
   24.2 How fast were you moving? ___________ miles per hour.
   24.3 Did you stop at any time while you were looking at the object?
      (Circle One) Yes No

25. Did you observe the object through any of the following?
    a. Eyeglasses Yes No  e. Binoculars Yes No
    b. Sunglasses Yes No  f. Telescope Yes No
    c. Windshield Yes No  g. Theodolite Yes No
    d. Window glass Yes No  h. Other

26. In order that you can give as clear a picture as possible of what you saw, describe in your own words a common object or objects which, when placed up in the sky, would give the same appearance as the object which you saw.

   A small car, (Volkswagen) minus the bonnet (where the hard luggage goes)
27. In the following sketch, imagine that you are at the point shown. Place an “A” on the curved line to show how high the object was above the horizon (skyline) when you first saw it. Place a “B” on the same curved line to show how high the object was above the horizon (skyline) when you last saw it. Place an “A” on the compass when you first saw it. Place a “B” on the compass where you last saw the object.

28. Draw a picture that will show the motion that the object or objects made. Place an “A” at the beginning of the path, a “B” at the end of the path, and show any changes in direction during the course.

29. IF there was MORE THAN ONE object, then how many were there? **ONE**

   Draw a picture of how they were arranged, and put an arrow to show the direction that they were traveling.
31. Was anyone else with you at the time you saw the object? (Circle One)
   Yes  No
31.1 IF you answered YES, did they see the object too? (Circle One)
   Yes  No
31.2 Please list their names and addresses:
   - Mrs. Johnson
   - Mr.
   - Mr. S. Claus

32. Please give the following information about yourself:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CLARKMAN</th>
<th>JANIV</th>
<th>MAUREEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ADDRESS
- MARGARET
- 45678
- SYDNEY
- NSW
- AUS

TELEPHONE NUMBER - AGE 26 - SEX

Indicate any additional information about yourself, including any special experience, which might be pertinent.

33. When and to whom did you report that you had seen the object? Canterbury Police.
   - Day 5
   - Month 8
   - Year 67
35. Information which you feel pertinent and which is not adequately covered in the specific points of the questionnaire or a narrative explanation of your sighting.

THE OBJECT WAS NOT AT ALL BRIGHT OR SHINY.
AS FAR AS I CAN ASCERTAIN IT WAS METALLIC
IT WAS ON A DIRECTED COURSE, NOT DRIFTING AIMLESSLY.
THERE WERE NO MARKINGS ON ITS SURFACE.
IT WAS A DEFINITE OUTLINE, COULD NOT HAVE BEEN A CLOUD FORMATION OR AN ILLUSION.

FROM EXTERNAL CANBERRA
UNCLASSIFIED
FOR A
S. M. WILSON D.C.A MELBOURNE 363
HANNAH, MET. BUREAU - MELBOURNE
DEPT OF AIR CANBERRA 5428
FROM BENTLEY E A CANBERRA

"GHOST BALLOONS."

FURTHER LAUNCHING ON 27TH MARCH - NO. 91-77, CODE NO;
TRANSMITTING ON 15322 KC/S
BT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FROM</th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>ATTENTION</th>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intelligence - UFO sightings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two reports of UFO sightings are attached.

1. reading?
2. 

**SIGNATURE**

**PRINTED NAME**

**RANK AND APPOINTMENT**

**PHONE EXTN**

C.O.O. 9777
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Name of observer</strong></td>
<td>Capt. B. C. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Address of observer</strong></td>
<td>14, Ambassador Ave. Methuen, Mass.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupation of observer</strong></td>
<td>Major</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date and time of observation</strong></td>
<td>22.9.43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of observation</strong></td>
<td>1.3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Observers location at time of sighting</strong></td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weather conditions at time of observation</strong></td>
<td>Overcast Clouded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation</strong></td>
<td>Visual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Where was object first observed? (eg, over head, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon)</strong></td>
<td>53 KCC, Keithing 32/4/70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise)</strong></td>
<td>Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?</strong></td>
<td>A definite object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If there was more than one object:</strong></td>
<td>Only one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What was the colour of the light or object?</strong></td>
<td>Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>What was its apparent shape?</strong></td>
<td>Like a bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Was any detail of structure observable?</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESTRICTED**
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious?  
17. Was there any sound?  
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation)  
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity)  
20. Was the object stationary?  
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?  
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?  
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen?  
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)  
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence)  
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?  
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s).  
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.  
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena?  
30. Name and address of organization.  
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
### PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from:

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

39. The object reported could have been...

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

---

**Signature:**

**(Unit)**

**(Name)**

**(Date)**

**(Rank)**
# Intelligence - Report of Aerial Object Observed

## Operational Command ASI 3/4/5

### Part 1 - Report by Observer

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of observer: MRS. J. MURPHY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of observer: 78. SHAKESPEARE ST.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHONE: 9 7 - 2345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of observer: Housewife</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and time of observation: Thursday, 16th Mar. 1947, 1900 - 2000 K</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of observation: 21/2 HOURS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observers location at time of sighting: WALLING, MANCHESTER, MOBY ST.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TELEPHONE: SHAKESPEARE ST.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PHONE: 9 7 - 2345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One cloud in vicinity of object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Whence was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon.): **Motion from Rear Cloud/Formation as Seen.**

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise): **Light, Shimmering from Rear Cloud.**

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? **White.**

12. If there was more than one object:
   (a) how many were there?: **One.**
   (b) in what formation were they?: **Train.**

13. What was the colour of the light or object?: **White.**

14. What was its apparent shape?: **Round.**

15. Was any detail of structure observable?: **No.**

---

Signed: [Signature]

Date: 24/3/67

Certified: [Signature]

Date: 3/4/68
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious?</td>
<td>NOT OBSERVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was there any sound?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was its height? (or angle of elevation)</td>
<td>UNAERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was its speed? (or angular velocity)</td>
<td>UNAERIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was the object stationary?</td>
<td>REMAINED UNAERIAL CLOUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?</td>
<td>VERTICAL ANGLE, APPROX 30°/SLIGHTLY EAST OF VICTORIA'S CENTRE = REMAINED UNAERIAL SAME DIRECTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?</td>
<td>UNAERIAL TO MOVE IN AND OUT BEHIND THE CLOUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where did object disappear? (e.g., in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)</td>
<td>NORTH SEEAM, REDRAWING BEHIND CLOUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence)</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If so, give brief details of incident(s). READER...WOUNDED...AT..</td>
<td>DISCLOSE DETAILS BUT ADVISED AUSTRALIAN SECURITY RE SIGHTING (REVEALED)...SHOULD HAVE BEEN MUSCLE BIOLOGICAL SATELLITE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena?</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name and address of organisation</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional information which relates to the sighting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reader</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beijing</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>AE</td>
<td>10:29 AM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESTRICTED
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:
   
   **Aircraft type:** C-130H
   **Heading:** N 30° E
   **Height:** 10,000 ft
   **Speed:** 500 K

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:
   
   **Aircraft type:** Cessna
   **Heading:** W 45° N
   **Height:** 8,000 ft
   **Speed:** 300 K

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from N at 2 and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellies, rockets, research balloons)

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been...MACH...C.I.F...AFFINITY...RUNNING...FARES...CPS...CONTINUOUS...CREATION...

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

---

(Results) (Unit) (Name) (Date) (Rank)
Subject: UFO REPORT

Brisbane Weather Report From
MET Section Brisbane Airport.

160900 Z
w/v 150/10 Vis 22NM Fine
1/8 Cu 2500 1/8 5000 1/8 11,000
Temp 23/16

160930 Z
w/v 160/8 Vis 22NM Fine
3/8 Sc 5000 2/8 11,000
Temp 23/16

161000 Z
w/v 170/7 Vis 22NM Fine
1/8 5000 2/8 Ac 11,000
Temp 22/16
Subject: UFO REPORT

CIVIL AIRCRAFT IN VICINITY OF REPORTED UFO

TVP VISCount 5Y/BN
POSITION 29 OME 1002
ARR BN 1010

RHF B727 BN/SY
VIA 138 DIVERSION ATD BN 0847

TVG VISCount BN/SY
VIA 138 DIVERSION ATD BN 0851

TAF DC4
VIA 138 DIVERSION ATD BN 1016
Subject: UFO REPORT

1/ After further telephone conversation with Mrs. Murphy at 190600, the following details given.

2/ Object appeared to be north of observer, approximately in line with SHERBURY BRIDGE.

3/ Mrs. Murphy is not sure if she was wearing glasses. If wearing glasses all objects would appear larger than normal.

4/ Observer was not sure of amount of cloud in vicinity of object but particularly noticed the large white cloud behind which the object appeared and disappeared. Also she noticed on opposite side of the sky a large bright star, which she believed to be the "evening star".
RESTRICTED A704 UFO INTELL REPORT PD FURTHER MY

A703 OF 7 APR PD AMPLIFYING REPORT RECEIVED FROM TWO STOCKMEN

AT RUTLAND PLAINS STATION 139NM NE OF NORMANTON PD AT 2145

HOURS LOCAL 4 APR SIGHTED THREE OBJECTS RED IN COLOUR BEARING

55° DEG THEN OVERHEAD TO 77° DEG SPACED 8-10 MILES APART AND

EXTREMELY HIGH ALTITUDE PD FIRST OBJECT EXPLODED AND BROKE INTO

FOUR PIECES WITH BRIGHT YELLOWISH/WHITE TAILS 57-58 FEET LONG

PD AFTER TWO MINUTES REMAINING THREE OBJECTS EXPLODED WITH

LOUD REPORTS AT 30 SECS INTERVALS FOLLOWED BY FINAL LOUD

EXPLOSION 2 MINUTES LATER PD CHECKS WITH DCA AT ASMA ABLR ATCS

ATTL ATNM CONFIRM NIL OVERFLYING ACFT OR FLYING ACTIVITY AT

TIME OF SIGHTING PD OTHER REPORT RECE

GED FROM OBSERVER AT MOUNT

ISA INDICATE EXPLODING METEORITE SHOWER OVER CAPE YORK PEN-

INSULA PROBABLE CAUSE
LOUD REPORTS AT 30 SECS INTERVALS FOLLOWED BY FINAL LOUD EXPLOSION 2 MINUTES LATER PD CHECKS WITH DCA AT ASMA ABLR ATC3 ATTL ATNM CONFIRM NIL OVERFLYING ACFT OR FLYING ACTIVITY AT TIME OF SIGHTING PD OTHER REPORT RECEIVED FROM OBSERVER AT MOUNT ISA INDICATE EXPLORING METEORITE SHOWER OVER CAPE YORK PEN- INSULA PROBABLE CAUSE
SIGHTINGS OF UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Forwarded herewith are reports on UFO sightings investigated by this Headquarters. The sightings were made by:

Julie Ann SPAIN
Douglas George ELLIOTT
Mrs R.A. REES
Maureen Jean PEERS.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

Name of Observer: Spain, Johnveyor ........................ Age. 29y.

Address of Observer: 307 Central Rd, Warrnambool, Vic.

Occupation of Observer: 

Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time) 4.00a.m. Wednesday, 20th February, 1957

Duration of Observation(s): 10 minutes

Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)

Box Hill, Point High, Nelson Rd, No. 111.

Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s) ........................... Clear ....

Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)

Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.

Above horizon, northly direction.

What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.

Light (recorded).

Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.

Object is. A. Light, trailing, etc. (recorded).

If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation.

What was the colour of the light or object. Orange.

What was its apparent shape

Was any detail of structure observable

Was any method of propulsion obvious

Was there any sound

Height, or angle of elevation

Speed, or angular velocity

Was the object stationary

What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass

Angle. Bearing from North to West North West

... 1/2.
Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?  

1. Was there any unusual phenomena previously.  
2. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.  
3. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.  
4. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.  
5. If so, give details of incident(s).  
6. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19.  
7. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?  

8. Name and address of organisation.  
9. Any additional information.  

8. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.  
9. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.  
10. Comments.  

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

Name of Observer: GEORGE ELLIOTT Age 27
Address of Observer: 96 GLASS ST., ESSENDON, VIC
Occupation of Observer: DIRECTOR

Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
FRIDAY 17TH MARCH 1967 APPROX 9 P.M.

Duration of Observation(s): APPROX. 15 MINUTES

Address of Observer (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
92 GLEN IRIS RD.
GLEN IRIS, VIC

Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)
CLEAR, OVERHEAD, LIGHT CLOUD TO NORTH

Aids to Observation(s) (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
NONE

Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
COMING THROUGH SOUTHERN CROSS

What first attracted observer’s attention, eg light or noise.
MOVEMENT OF LIGHT

Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
LIGHT

If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
ONE

What was the colour of the light or object.
GREENISH WHITE

What was its apparent shape.
SIMILAR TO STAR

Was any detail of structure observable.
NO

Was any method of propulsion obvious.
NO

Was there any sound.
NO

Height, or angle of elevation.

Speed, or angular velocity.
SIMILAR TO SATELLITES OBSERVED

Was the object stationary?
NO

What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
THROUGH SOUTHERN CROSS, FROM SOUTHERN DIRECTION AND THEN VEERED NORTH EAST
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon?

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information. Also observed at the same time by Mr. Len Gencell, Mrs. A. Elliott, Mrs. D.C. Elliott, and Miss. Jan Elliott.

   Signature of Observer: D. S. Elliott

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments. (Handwritten notes)

   Signature of Interrogator: [Signature]

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 4 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
ABSERVED FROM "X"
TO SOUTH IN LINE
WITH ARROW.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer. MRS. R. A. REES. .......... Age. 50.
2. Address of Observer. 11. BERRIMA AVE. EAST. MALVERN VICT.
3. Occupation of Observer. HOME DUTIES .......... 
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   16th, 17th, 20th MARCH. 1947. APPROX. 8:30 P.M.
5. Duration of Observation(s) .......... ½ HOUR APPRX.
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own
   position by map reference if possible, or by known
   landmarks)
   EAST. MALVERN. SECTION. I1. X, ON. MAP. ENCLOSED. N.EAR. DANDELONG R.D. S.W.
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s). CLEAR. FINE
   AND. MILD., NO. CLOUD., MOON. LIGHT
8. Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the
   observation)
   NONE. BUT. TWO. EYES
9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from
   behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   MOVING. FROM. WEST. TO. EAST. MIDWAY. IN. SKY
   BETWEEN. HORIZON. AND. OVER. HEAD
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    A. MOVING. STARLIKE. OBJECT. PASSING. ANOTHER
    STAR. NO. SOUND
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    A. LIGHT. ... A. BRIGHT. ... STAR
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and
    what was their formation.
    ONE. ONLY
13. What was the colour of the light or object. WHITE
14. What was its apparent shape. STARLIKE
15. Was any detail of structure observable. NO
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious. NO
17. Was there any sound. NO
18. Height, or angle of elevation. MIDWAY. BETWEEN. HORIZON
   AND. OVER. HEAD
19. Speed, or angular velocity. MOVING. RAPIDLY
20. Was the object stationary. NO
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks
    or points of the compass.
    FLIGHT. FROM. WEST. TO. EAST. WHEN. LAST. SEEN
    IT WAS HIGH AND IN DIRECTION OF. MT. DANDELONG
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?
   STRAIGHT PATH

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?
   NO

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon?
   HIGH, UNTIL OUT OF SIGHT

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence?
   NO

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?
   Yes

27. If so, give details of incident(s)
   SPATNIK 10 YEARS AGO

28. IT IS UNUSUAL TO SEE A RAPIDLY MOVING STAR AND THE MOVEMENT WAS SIMILAR TO SATELLITE SEEN 10 YEARS AGO

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?
   No

30. Name and Address of organisation
   

31. Any additional information
   THE WONDERFUL ACHIEVEMENTS IN SPACE EXPLORATION IN THE PAST FEW YEARS MAKE ANY UNUSUAL SIGHT VITAL TO AUSTRALIA FOR SCIENCE AND SECURITY
   Signature of Observer

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting
   N.I.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area
   MONAABN AIRPORT, MONASH UNIVERSITY

34. Comments
   

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer. MADGE N. DOERS..............................Age. 28
2. Address of Observer. 51 RALEIGH ST. FOREST HILL
3. Occupation of Observer. HOUSEWIFE
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time) TUESDAY 21ST MARCH AT 2.40 P.M.
5. Duration of Observation(s). 45 SECONDS
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting. (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
   BACKYARD. OFF 51 RALEIGH ST. FOREST HILL
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s). CLEAR SKY BRIGHT SUNSHINE
8. Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   NAKED EYES
9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   OVERHEAD
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    BRIGHT LIGHT
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    OBJECT APPEARED DEFINITE BUT LOWER SECTION WAS LIKE A BRIGHT LIGHT
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation.
    ONLY 1 OBJECT
13. What was the colour of the light or object. GREY
14. What was its apparent shape. ROUND, LIKE A FULL MOON
15. Was any detail of structure observable. NO
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious. NO
17. Was there any sound. NO
18. Height, or angle of elevation. ABOUT THE HEIGHT OF A PLANE
19. Speed, or angular velocity. MUCH FASTER THAN AIRLINER
20. Was the object stationary. NO
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    OBJECT TRAVELLING NORTH BY DUE SOUTH

.../2
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? 
REMAINED ON A STRAIGHT PATH.
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen... 
24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon. 
OVER THE HORIZON.
25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. 
NO:
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously... NEVER.
27. If so, give details of incident(s)....
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19. 
NO EXPERIENCE.
29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? 
NO.
30. Name and address of organisation.
31. Any additional information. PLEASE FIND ENCLOSED SKETCH.

Signature of Observer: [Signature]

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. 
[Location]
33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. 
[Location]
34. Comments. [Handwritten comments]

Signature of Interrogator: [Signature]

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note... Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
Plane passed over approx 10 mins. Beforehand travelling west to east.

**This Section**
Dull grey in color

**This lower section**
Appeared like a bright light.
INVESTIGATION INTO UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Forwarded herewith are reports of Unidentified Flying Objects submitted by No 2 Stores Depot and by Headquarters East Sale.

2. The report from 2STODEP concerns sightings made by Kenneth Albert MARTIN and Stephen BURNS.

3. No 2 Stores Depot has the following comment to make:

   "Investigations with Department of Civil Aviation officers at MASCOT aerodrome show that at 0126 hours on the 16th March a civilian DC-4 aircraft landed at MASCOT. This aircraft approached from the Glenfield Beacon and it is estimated that the aircraft would have overpassed very close to Mr MARTIN's residence between a height of 1500 and 2000 feet. Department of Civil Aviation officers have also advised that it is quite possible that the pilot of this aircraft tested the aircraft landing lights at about the point that the UFO was sighted and this could account for the brilliant white light observed by Mr MARTIN."

4. The report from Headquarters East Sale concerns sightings made by:
   - Mrs J.A. FERGUSON
   - Mrs C.B. LAWLER
   - Mrs M. HOWARD
   - Mr R.T. BUTLER.

5. This Headquarters has nothing further to add to these reports.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of Observer: KENNETH ALBERT MARTIN Age: 32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of Observer: 28, Kathleen Pde, Picnic Point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer: PROCTOR WORKER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time): 015 16/3/67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s): 30 minutes altogether</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting: (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): Cloudy, obscure object - complete cloud cover</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation) NIL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise. Brilliant red flash - red light flashed through aides before beginning to move a very brilliant white light, the beams came on for 5 or 10 sec. Then saw the red lights again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object. No actual shape at first but when closer appeared a small grey color.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation. One object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object: Red.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape: Couldn't discern any shape.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Was there any sound: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation: 15° - 20°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity: Moved E to NE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Was the object stationary: No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass: 30° - 5E Easterly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Object about 15-20 elevation

Observe from second window over next door
House at about 40-45 elevation

Factor of first observation window

General direction of track
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Evidence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously, about 8 weeks ago.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 15 and 16.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information. Was witnessed on 1st sighting 8 weeks ago - this time uncertain. He was unable to give exact position of event. Very puzzled by the whole business. Shaped it was not like any known aircraft he has ever seen or heard.

Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments. The witness seemed reliable and very sure of what he saw and heard. It was not an aircraft tacking edgily it would send to be very low. Because height estimation, so relatively hard to assess. Witness believed, the witness was not aware that aircraft normally have flashing red light at the rear.

Signature of Interrogator.

Note: If one cannot confirm inbound traffic landed at 6.38. Dominant red light, night.

Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine from the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.

Refer Diagram.
Repeated first sighting to Air Force at Bankstown Aerodrome. Have number for him to call - when he called he was asked to send in a diagram.
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Name of Observer: <strong>STEPHEN BURNS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of Observer: 26, KATHLEEN PDE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer: SCHOOLBOY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time): <strong>EARLY AM, HRS 16/3/67</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s): About 1½ mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observer Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by reference if possible, or by known landmarks): Lookin' in a westerly direction from above address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): CLEAR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc: OVER HORIZON — WEST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise: His uncle woke him up to confirm his sighting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object: 2 LIGHTS (RED)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object: <strong>RED</strong> (centre light)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape: <strong>NOT SURE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable: <strong>NO</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Was any method of propulsion obvious: JET ENGINE NOISE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Was there any sound: SOUNDED LIKE JET</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation: APPROX 20°</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity: STATIONERY THEN MOVED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Was the object stationary?: INITIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass: SOUTH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? 

NO

Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? 

NO

Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon? 

BEHIND EDGE OF WINDOW

Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. 


Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? 

NO

If so, give details of incident(s). 


State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 17 and 18. 

NIL

Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? 

NO

Name and Address of organisation. 


Any additional information. 

Write here

jet noise was low pitched, faintly normal associated with a

jet engine, rather eerie or strange.

Signature of Observer. 


Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. 

BANKSTOWN

Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. 

NIL OBSERVED

Comments. 

The had been asked by his uncle to observe the object and substantiate the story to a larger degree.

Signature of Interrogator. 

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Notes. Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
INVESTIGATION OFFICER'S REPORT

AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED AND UNIDENTIFIED SOUND
IN THE CARRAJUNG AREA 19TH MARCH 1967 - 21ST MARCH 1967

Introduction

1. This report deals with the attached statements by Mrs Ferguson, Mrs Howard, Mrs Lawler and Mr Butler.

Unidentified Sound

2. Investigation reveals that the noise heard by all observers was from a direction coinciding approximately with HAZELWOOD Power Station. The engineer at HAZELWOOD reported that on the three nights that the sound was heard a steam line had been blown at the power station. This steam release was of 30 minutes duration, repeated at 30 minute intervals. Meteorological records at RAAF Base EAST SALE show that on the three nights in question an inversion was present at the 5000 ft level. This would give a sound reflecting surface 3000 ft above the observers at CARRAJUNG.

Aerial Object Observed

3. The aerial object was sighted by two of the observers, Mrs Ferguson and Mrs Howard. It appeared as a "bright star" on an approximate bearing of 290° from Mrs Ferguson and 300° from Mrs Howard. They both state that there was only one object in that part of the sky. Reference to the Air Almanac and Volume 2 of AP 3270 shows that, at the time of observation, the planet Venus was on a bearing of 293° and at an altitude of about 9°. Although neither observer could give an approximate angle of elevation, both stated that the object was "just above the horizon".

4. Venus would have passed below the horizon at approximately 1940. This agrees completely with the information given by Mrs Ferguson. Mrs Howard, from her position, would have lost sight of it earlier as it descended below a hill between her and the horizon.

Conclusions

5. The following conclusions are drawn:

(a) The noise heard by the four observers was made by HAZELWOOD Power Station and was reflected by an inversion 3000 ft above CARRAJUNG.

(b) The object seen by Mrs Ferguson and Mrs Howard was the planet Venus as it descended from an altitude of about 9° to the horizon.

(J.V. ROSSITER)
Flight Lieutenant
Investigating Officer

28 Mar 67
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

2. Address of Observer. CARRAJUNG via THIRALGAN.
4. Date, Time and Duration of Observations. At 1930 on Sunday 19th March I heard a loud noise coming from a north-westerly direction. It was similar to a car travelling past the house. The noise recurred on Monday at 0415 and 2200, and Tuesday at 0600, 1730, 1850 and 2010. In each case, it appeared to last for about 20 minutes. On Monday night at 1850 I saw a star in the west which appeared to be moving. I watched it for about five minutes. At 1930 it was still visible and almost out of sight and would have been completely gone by 1945.

6. Weather conditions at time of observation. Clear night. Wind was calm, except on Sunday night, when a southerly wind was blowing.

7. Weather conditions at time of observation. Clear night. Wind was calm, except on Sunday night, when a southerly wind was blowing.

8. Aids to observation. None

9. Where was the object first observed. Above the horizon, slightly north of west (290° T. Investigating Officer)


11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object. As a light.

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there. Only one.

13. What was the colour of the light. Similar to a large star.

14. What was its apparent shape. Similar to a star.

15. Was any detail of structure observable. No.


17. Was there any sound. Yes.

18. Height, or angle of elevation. Not known.


20. Was the object stationary. It first appeared to be stationary but then moved.

21. What was the direction of flight. Downwards, slightly towards north.

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all. Straight path.

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No.
24. Where did object disappear. Over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs or other supporting evidence. No.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. No.

27. If so, give details. Not applicable.

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. Not applicable.

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena. No.

30. Name and address of organization. Not applicable.

31. Any additional information. None.

Signature of Observer. A. August
REPORT OF UNIDENTIFIED SOUND


2. Address of Observer. CARRJUNG TOWER.


4. Date, time and duration. On Tuesday 21st March 1967, from 1930 - 1930.


7. Description of the Sound. The noise was similar to a wind blowing up or loud car noise.

8. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. No.

9. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena. No.

10. Any additional information. None.

11. If there was more than one object, how many were there. One.

12. What was the colour of the light. Black.

13. What was its apparent shape. Similar to a star.


15. Was any method of propulsion obvious. No.

16. Has there any sound. Yes the sound seemed to disappear about the same time as the light.

17. Height, or angle of elevation. Not known.

18. Speed or angular velocity. Not known.

19. Was the object stationary. No.

20. What was the direction of Flight. Southeast.

21. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or maneuver at all. Straight path.

22. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No.

23. Have the object disappear. Shadow trees on a hill.

24. Evidence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. No.

25. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. No.

Signature of Observer...k. Black
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer. Mrs Howard. Age 40.

2. Address of Observer. Post Office CARRAJUNG.


4. Date and time of observation. Tuesday 21st March 1967, 1900.


7. Aids to observation. None.

8. Where was object first observed. Slightly above the horizon.

9. What first attracted observers attention. We were discussing the noise and noticed what appeared to be a bright star.

10. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object. As a light.

11. If there was more than one object, how many were there. One.

12. What was the colour of the light. Similar to a star.

13. What was its apparent shape. Similar to a star.


15. Was any method of propulsion obvious. No.

16. Was there any sound. Yes, the sound seemed to disappear about the same time as the light.

17. Height, or angle of elevation. Not known.

18. Speed or angular velocity. Not known.

19. Was the object stationary. No.

20. What was the direction of flight. Downwards.

21. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all. Straight path.

22. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No.


24. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. No.

25. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. No.
27. If so give details. Not applicable.
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. Not applicable.
29. Are you a member of any organization interest in aerial phenomena. No.
30. Name and address of organization. Not applicable.
31. Any additional information. The object appeared in a north-westerly direction (300 T Investigator)

Signature of Observer.
REPORT OF UNIDENTIFIED SOUND

1. Name of Observer. Mr R.T. Butler. Age 48
2. Address of Observer. CARRAJUNG SOUTH
4. Date, time and duration of observation. On Monday 20th March 1967 from 2300 until 2359, on Tuesday 21st March from 0600 - 0700, 1800 - 1930 and 1945 - 2030.
7. Description of sound. On each occasion I heard a loud noise from a direction slightly north of west. (275 T Investigating Officer).
8. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. No.
9. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena. No.
10. Any additional information. None.

Signature of Observer...
RESTRICTED A703 UFO INTELL REPORT PD THREE PERSONS AT KARUMBA NEAR NORMANTON REPORT UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL OBJECT SIGHTED ON 4 APR AT 2225 HRS LOCAL TIME PD NIGHT CLEAR WITH NIL CLOUD PD OBJECT APPEARED AS SIX LIGHTS IN ONE UNIT OR FORMATION WITH RED LIGHT IN FRONT FLANKED EITHER SIDE BY TWO BLUE LIGHTS WITH FIFTH BLUE LIGHT AT REAR WITHOUT GLOW OR RADIATION PD DIRECTION WAS SW TO NE ALTITUDE APPROXIMATELY 18000 FEET AND VISIBLE FOR ONE MINUTE APPROX PD OBJECT AT 45 DEG ABOVE HORIZON WHEN SIGHTED MAINTAINED FORMATION AND WAS REPORTED FROM NORMANTON 30 MINUTES LATER PD REPORT PHONED BY MR D PAINTER DCA COMMUNICATION OFFICER AT NM PD REPORT SUGGESTS OVERFLYING AIRCRAFT DAR NOUMEA OR LR/BAK TRACK BUT CONFIRMATION NOT AVAILABLE TO DATE
DE RAYQST 002 21/22472
ZNY RRRRR
R 212300Z
FM HQESL

TO RAYQ/HQSUPCOM
RAYWPP/DEPAIR

RESTRICTED A92 UFO PD UFO SIGHTING AT CARRAJUNG ON NIGHT OF 20MAR67 HAS BEEN REPORTED PD INITIAL REPORT IS
(A) ROUND RED OBJECT IN SKY (B) RED GLOW (C)
LOUD CONTINUOUS AND UNFAMILIAR NOISE PD INVESTIGATING OFFICER APPOINTED

DAF

RECOD. 22MAR67
C.A.S.
REPORTS ON AERIAL OBJECTS OBSERVED

1. Forwarded herewith are certified copies of Reports received at this Headquarters on the sighting of Aerial Objects in Western Australia by the undermentioned persons:

   (a) Mr. George GRANT

   (b) Mr Robert JOBSON

   (G.A. MARTIN)

   Flight Lieutenant

   For Officer Commanding
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

GEORGE GRANT

1. Name of Observer.............. Age 20
2. Address of Observer.............. RIVERBROOK PASTORAL COMPANY, WEST GINGIN
3. Occupation of Observer.............. FARMHAND
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time) 13 FEBRUARY 0115 LMT (Sunday night)
5. Duration of observation(s) "A few seconds"
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
   40 Miles North of Perth on Wanneroo Road "along last row of new pine"
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s).............. Fine and Clear night
8. Aids to Observation(s) (Describe any equipment used in the observation) None
9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   "to the west in line with last row of new pines on Wanneroo Rd" 40 miles north of Perth
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg, light or noise
    Big flash in sky like lightning
11. Did the object appear as a light or as a definite object
    Definite object
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation
    Long red stem about 6ft
13. What was the colour of the light or object
    Long red stem about 6ft with bright luminous green bottom
14. What was its apparent shape
    Stem shaps with round head like metal on end of a piece of ribbon
15. Was any detail of structure observable
    Yes
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious
    No
17. Was there any sound
    No
18. Height, or angle of elevation
    Apparently 45° elevation
19. Speed, or angular velocity
    Not able to determine
20. Was the object stationary
    No
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass
    To West of observer. 45° angle of elevation, inapprox. line with mouth of Moore River
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?  

--- An apparent straight path ---

23. Was there any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?  

---

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon disappeared from view behind pines on ocean side of Wanneroo Road.  

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or any other supporting evidence.  

--- No ---

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.  

--- No ---

27. If so, give details of incidents(s).  

---

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.  

--- None ---

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?  

--- No ---

30. Name and Address of Organisation.  

---

31. Any additional information.  

--- Details given via PMG lines ---

Signature of observer.  

---

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.  

---

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.  

--- PERTH-PEARCE ---

34. Comments.  

--- (1) Observation made on evening biosatellite was expected re-entry.  

--- (2) Observer was driving vehicle at time. ---

Signature of Interrogator.  

---

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note:- Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
1. Further to information from Mr George GRANT at 1000 hours on 22 Feb 67, this Headquarters was again contacted by GRANT at 1500 hours stating that he had found an object in a paddock that was not in the paddock over one week.

2. The object is similar to an aircraft H.F. Aerial. Copper cable 8" in thickness, approximately 45 feet in length covered by a plastic insulating material. At irregular intervals around the insulating material are white identification and/or circuit labels, 2" long. One end of the cable was attached to a spring loaded metal cylindrical assembly of 18" length, approximately 1" thickness bearing the brand name "DAYTON AIRCRAFT PRODUCTS FLORIDA" and other data thought to be component numbers etc. inscribed in the metal.

3. A further search of the surrounding terrain has not revealed further objects or parts.

4. This information together with the material has been handed over to Mr MILLS of Department of Supply PERTH who was nominated by NASA as the W.A. Handling Authority for Operation Lost-Ball.

5. Information as to aircraft aerial or part has been passed to DCA PERTH.
**REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED**

1. **Name of Observer**: ROBERT JOBSON  
   **Age**: 39

2. **Address of Observer**: 23 MUIR STREET NORTH INNALOO

3. **Occupation of Observer**: BUILDING CONTRACTOR

4. **Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)**: 12 FEB 67 EARLY EVENING

5. **Duration of observation(s)**: APPROX 5 MINUTES

6. **Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)**: APPROX 20 MILES SOUTH WEST DAMPIER

7. **Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)**: FINE, CLEAR NIGHT, MOON OVERHEAD AT TIME

8. **Aids to Observation(s)**: (Describe any equipment used in the observation.)  
   OTHER WITNESSES OCCUPYING VEHICLE AT TIME OF SIGHTING

9. **Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.**: ON HORIZON

10. **What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise**: BRIGHT ORANGE LIGHT

11. **Did the object appear as a light or as a definite object.**  
    **AS PER ANSWER NO 10**

12. **If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.**  
    **ONE ONLY**

13. **What was the colour of the light or object**: BRIGHT ORANGE

14. **What was its apparent shape**: ROUND

15. **Was any detail of structure observable.**  
    **NO**

16. **Was any method of propulsion obvious**:  
    **NO**

17. **Was there any sound**:  
    **NO**

18. **Height, or angle of elevation**: ON HORIZON TO S.W.

19. **Speed, or angular velocity**: NO, ANGULAR MOVEMENT

20. **Was the object stationary.**  
    **NO - "ROBED UP & DOWN ONCE OR TWICE AND DISAPPEARED"**

21. **What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass**:  
    IF ANY, SW. - S
Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

BOBBED UP & DOWN ONCE OR TWICE THEN DISAPPEARED

Was there any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?

ANSWERS NOS 10 & 13

Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon
YES - BELOW HORIZON

Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or any other supporting evidence?

NO

Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?

NO

If so, give details of incidents(s)

State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19

Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

NO

Name and Address of Organisation

Any additional information

MOON OVERHEAD, OTHERWISE QUITE A DARK NIGHT

Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting

Location of any meteorological stations in the general area

ROBOURNE, (?) MARDLE

Comments. SPECIFIC TIME OF OBSERVATION NOT GIVEN BUT CLAIM IT WAS QUITE DARK WITH MOON OVERHEAD, SUNSET DAPTILITY 1850 LAT.

END OF CIVIL TWILIGHT 1913 LMT

Signature of Interrogator

Details taken by PMG Lines through Sister, Mrs. J. CLAYTON. Phone 656196

Signature of Observer

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
UNCLAS AI10 UFO PD REPORT RECEIVED ASSISTANT DISTRICT COMMISSIONER
FINSCHAFEN CLN TWO ROCKET LIKE OBJECTS WITH VAPOUR TRAILS PLUNGED INTO SEA THREE MILES EAST GINGALA POINT 170450Z PD ONE APPEARED TO EXPLODE AFTER ENTERING WATER CMM NO REACTION FROM OTHER PD SEEN BY MORE THAN ONE RELIABLE WITNESS PD DCA REPORTS NO KNOWN AIRCRAFT IN AREA AT TIME
UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Forwarded herewith for your information and action, as necessary, is a copy of a Police report provided to our West Australian Regional Office.

We apologise for the delay in this report being made available to you but most of the delay was outside our control.

This report was processed prior to the adoption of the procedures arising from your correspondence 354/1/30 (121) dated 3rd March, 1967, and we quite confidently anticipate that these procedures will obviate delays in future reports.

(W. J. MOLLOY)  
for Director-General of Civil Aviation.
Search for American Biosatellite, believed to have come down from space and landed in an area of 300 miles north-east of Perth, vide report in "West Australian" newspaper dated 17th February, 1967.

I have to report that Mr. Ernest Joseph Hastie of 38 Winton Street, Carey Park, reported at this station today having read the account of the above biosatellite in the newspaper today, and recalled that on Tuesday evening, the 14th February, he was fishing at Myalup Beach north of Bunbury, and between 7 p.m. and 7.30 p.m. he noticed an orange coloured light a little larger than a bright star, travelling in a westerly direction, and it disappeared over the horizon and apparently fell into the sea.

Mr. Hastie said that he watched the light for a space of three or four minutes and at the time thought it may be a satellite, but was puzzled as it was travelling so low. He said the light appeared to disappear below the horizon for a second or so, then rose again a few feet before disappearing altogether. He said that the appearance of the light rising may have been caused by the action of the waves, although at the time the sea was extremely calm.

Mr. Hastie said the object he saw definitely fell into the sea, and when he read the account of the biosatellite in the paper today he thought the object he saw may have been the biosatellite that is being searched for on land.

Perhaps this information could be passed on to the appropriate parties concerned through the Department of Supply, Department of Army, Swan Barracks, Perth.

Bunbury Station,
17th February, 1967.

Sgd: A.G. GEE
Serge 2/c 1981.
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RESTRICTED

INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL

OBJECT OBSERVED

(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

Mr John ALDERSON

Not known

1. Name of observer

2. Address of observer. Mail Service Box 51, FERNVALE, QLD.

3. Occupation of observer. Not known

4. Date and time of observation. 2240 K 19 FEB 67

5. Duration of observation. Seconds only.

6. Observers location at time of sighting. Proceeding along the Ipswich Road near the GAILES Weighbridge - in the direction of IPSWICH.

7. Weather conditions at time of observation. Nil cloud Visibility 25 miles

(from BRISBANE, Met. EAGLE FARM).

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation. Visual observation

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon.

To the north of Ipswich Road

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).

Fiery light

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?

Fiery light

12. If there was more that one object - No

(a) how many were there?

(b) in what formation were they?

13. What was the colour of the light or object? Reddish/ Fiery

14. What was its apparent shape? Fiery

15. Was any detail of structure observable? No
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17. Was there any sound? No.
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) Descending apparently vertically.
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) Rapid.
20. Was the object stationary? No.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? Descending vertically in area of GOODNA Mental Hospital.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? No.
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? No.
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) Appeared to disintegrate just above the ground.
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No.
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No.
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s). N/A.
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. N/A.
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? Not known.
30. Name and address of organisation. N/A.
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. At an adjacent service station two other people advised witnessing the fiery object. The details herein were advised to the IPSWICH police, thence to the Orderly Officer RAAF Base AMBERLEY who, on request, the IPSWICH police to have the GOODNA Police investigate the sighting. Inquiries by the Goodna police could not produce any evidence to support the sighting.
PART 2  UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:--

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nil Military aircraft in area</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Viscount TVI LONGREACH - BRISBANE ATA 191247z</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Viscount RMD, BRISBANE - DARWIN ATD 191235z or 286M</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakota ABQ, BRISBANE - SYDNEY, 000 ft</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

- Major stars: CAPELLA 5 degree above horizon bearing 300 (T)
- ALEXANDAR 19 degree above horizon bearing 300 (T)
- No planets evident at this time.

34. A meteorological balloon was released from EAGLE FARM Airport at 2100 hours.

35. W/V generally from the South East at 1100 and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were:

- No meteorite showers expected before April.

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satelites, rockets, research balloons):

- Nil

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

- No conclusive evidence

39. The object reported could have been:

- Not known

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

Base Squadron RAAF Base AMBERLEY

(Base) (Unit)

19 Feb 67 (Date)

Flight Lieutenant (Rank)

REstricted
INTTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL
OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/4/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: Laurence Joseph Woodhouse
   AGE: Adult
2. Address of observer: 201 Wauchope Road, Port Macquarie
   PHONE: None
3. Occupation of observer: Fisherman
4. Date and time of observation: 20th February 1967, Between Midnight and 1am
5. Duration of observation: Approximately 15 seconds
6. Observers location at time of sighting: Fishing on Oyster Bay (Port Macquarie area)
7. Weather conditions at time of observation: Clear Night with small amount of cloud but none in quadrant of sighting
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: Visual only
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon)
   NW from observer 45 degrees above horizon descending almost vertically but in slight arc from NE direction
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise)
    Bright light
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    Light
12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there? One only
    (b) in what formation were they? A bright light, slightly
13. What was the colour of the light or object?
14. What was its apparent shape?
15. Was any detail of structure observable?
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16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? No

17. Was there any sound? No

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) 45 degrees above Horizon. (See "3")

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) Rapid then decreasing

20. Was the object stationary? No - descending almost vertically

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? Descending almost vertically but in slight arc from N. E. Seen in NW direction from observer

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? Descending in slight arc

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? No. Object appeared to be a bright light without tail or debris.

24. Where did object disappear? (e.g., in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) Disappeared behind trees - NW from observer

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) Observer states that numerous meteorites had been sighted while fishing immediately prior to reported sighting. This sighting however, was not "similar" to previously observed meteor flights.

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. No special experience but an "outdoors" type conscious of things about him.

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? No

30. Name and address of organisation

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. The observer states that the sighting was descending rapidly but at a point approximately 15 degrees above the horizon it appeared to be arrested in flight as would occur with the deployment of a parachute. Even then to estimate the distance from the point of observation the observer confidently stated "Up to 50 miles". He further added that his estimation of altitude put the object "somewhere about 30,000 feet". He also stated that the intensity of the light did not diminish as expected with a meteorite...
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:
   None - Operations checked at WILLIAMTOWN and RICHMOND
   Aircraft type
   Heading
   Height
   Speed

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:
   None
   Aircraft type
   Heading
   Height
   Speed

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:
   Not applicable - object reported as descending.

35. A meteorological balloon was released from WILLIAMTOWN at 1100Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time. (Note: Wind direction supports possibility but type of sighting does not.)

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were not significant meteorite activity noticed. (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons), N9.

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was... ...

39. The object reported could have been a larger than normal meteorite ...

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

HQ WILLIAMTOWN (Unit) J RODDY (Name)
21st February 1967 (Date) Flight Lieutenant (Rank)
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INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/3/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer. 2nd Officer, O.F. AGS
2. Address of observer. Caltex, Manchester - Newcastle, Sydney
3. Occupation of observer. Ships Officer
4. Date and time of observation. Feb 21 1815 Z
5. Duration of observation. 10 - 11 mins
6. Observers location at time of sighting. 15 miles N.E. of Macquarie Light
7. Weather conditions at time of observation. 2/3 cloud
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation. Naked eye first - then binoculars showed it as a silvery colour
9. Where was object first observed? (e.g., overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon). Sydney, direction of not quite ahead. Posnott(g)
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (e.g., light or noise). Light very bright
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
12. If there was more than one object:
   (a) how many were there? One
   (b) in what formation were they? Silvery
13. What was the colour of the light or object? Silvery
14. What was its apparent shape? N.I.
15. Was any detail of structure observable?
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious?... N. L.
17. Was there any sound?... N. L.
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) from O. H. to H. Z.
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) from O. H. to H. Z., 10-11 H.U. (M. S.)
20. Was the object stationary?... N. O.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?
   From S.E. to E. N. E. HORIZON
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?... STRAIGHT
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen?... N. L.
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)
   BELOW HORIZON
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photog- graphs, or other supporting evidence)
   N. O.
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?... N. O.
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s)

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.
   TRAINED SHIPS OFFICER - STATED HE HAD NEVER SEEN ANY STAR OR PLANET AS BRIGHT AS THIS SIGHTING.
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena?
   N. O.
30. Name and address of organisation

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
   OBJECT WAS MUCH BRIGHTER THAN VENUS OR...
   MAN NAME SATELLITE - BEING OFFICER OF THE WATCH
   SENTANT SIGHTS HAVE OFTEN BEEN TAKEN OF PLANETS ETC.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

| N/A |

35. A meteorological balloon was released from Sydney at 1700Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

| N/A |

37. Any other relevant remarks (e.g., about satellites, rockets, research balloons)

| N/A |

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

| N/A |

39. The object reported could have been a balloon hit by the sun's rays, before sunrise (observers' suggestion). Time factor (10-11-11 MWD) rather doubtful.

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>H8 OP COM (Unit)</th>
<th>(Name)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27 Feb 67 (Date)</td>
<td>FL Lt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer ...................................................... Age ... 20 ...
2. Address of observer .................................................... Phone .... 6544 63175 ...
3. Occupation of observer ..................................................
4. Date and time of observation ..........................................
   15 FEB 67 ... EITHER 1:56 P.M. OR 2:04 P.M ...
5. Duration of observation ..............................................
   10-15 SECONDS
6. Observers location at time of sighting ................................
   30 MILES NORTH OF TOWNSVILLE ON INGHAM ROAD ...
7. Weather conditions at time of observation ..........................
   FINE SCATTERED CLOUD
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation .............
   NIL
9. Where was object first observed? (eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon) ...
   SW TO BE APPROXIMATELY OVERHEAD
10. What first attracted observers attention (eg light or noise) .........
   SMALL DARK OBJECT
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? ..............
   DEFINITE OBJECT
12. If there was more than one object:-
   (a) how many were there? ............................................. N/A
   (b) in what formation were they? .................................. N/A
13. What was the colour of the light or object? .......................
   DARK
14. What was its apparent shape ......................................
   APPROX DESCRIPTION ROUGHLY TRIANGULAR
15. Was any detail of structure observable? ..........................
   NO
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16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? ................................. NO
17. Was there any sound? .......................................................... NO
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) ....................... APPROX. 20,000 - 30,000 FT
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) ......................... APPROX. FASTER THAN AVERAGE JET AIRCRAFT
20. Was the object stationary? ................................................... NO
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? SW TO NE
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? STRAIGHT PATH DESCENDING
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? ..................... NO
24. Where did object disappear? (eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) BEHIND A CLOUD APPROX BACK OF OVERHEAD
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) NO
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? NO
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) ................................. B/A
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. CONSIDERABLE EXPERIENCE AS AIRCRAFT PASSENGER
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? NO
30. Name and address of organization ........................................ NO
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting ........ NO
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RAAF C130H WJ NUG</td>
<td>TL-WJ</td>
<td>300K</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAAF C130H WJ NUG</td>
<td>FL215</td>
<td>450K</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAAF C130H WJ NUG</td>
<td>ASC</td>
<td>000ft</td>
<td>000ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PAN AMERICAN CLIPPER JEE</td>
<td>FL 310</td>
<td>000ft</td>
<td>000ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAN AMERICAN CLIPPER JEE</td>
<td>HOLEA-DAR</td>
<td>450K</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

- [comet, meteorite shower, etc]

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were:

- [comet, meteorite shower, etc]

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets research balloons)

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

39. The object reported could have been:

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

HOTUL Unit
16 FEB 67 Date
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UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Forwarded are reports, investigated by this Headquarters, of aerial sightings by the undermentioned civilian observers. This Headquarters has nothing further to add to paragraph 34 of the questionnaire.

John Howard THOMPSON  Newtown Geelong Vic
Ivan F. BARTLETT  Blackburn Vic
Kenneth F. BRETT  St Kilda Vic
F.W. DINGER & family  Brighton Vic

(L.E. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl
X - my location
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer... John Howard THOMSON... Age... 22...
2. Address of Observer... S. Potter, St. Newtown, Geelong...
3. Occupation of Observer... Survey Drafter...
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   6/3/39... approx. 9:4.40 a.m.
5. Duration of Observation... approx. 30 minutes.
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own
   position by map reference
   if possible, or by known
   landmarks)
   See attached sheet...
7. Weather Conditions at time(f) of observation...
   *Note*: (96?) Fine, Clear. Night...
8. Aids to Observation(s) (Describe any equipment used in the
   observation)
   None...
9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from
   behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   At an elevation of about 15°
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    Light...
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Light...
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and
    what was their formation...
13. What was the colour of the light or object... Red or discharge.
14. What was its apparent shape... Circles...
15. Was any detail of structure observable... No...
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious... No...
17. Was there any sound... Could not hear anything above the wind?
18. Height, or angle of elevation... 65°
19. Speed, or angular velocity... Could not estimate...
20. Was the object stationary... No...
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks
    or points of the compass...
    From West to East...

.../2.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments.

Signature of Observer:

Signature of Interrogator:

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: Joan P. Banks & Nancy Banks

2. Address of Observer: 93 Blackburn Rd, Blackburn

3. Occupation of Observer: Stores Manager

4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   
   19/11/61 7:00 PM (approx.)

5. Duration of Observation(s)

6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)

7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s)
   
   Clear Sky

8. Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)

9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.

   Facing West 60° approx.

10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.

   Light: Intrigued by my first assumption of a star as heavy.

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.

   as a Star

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.

   One

13. What was the colour of the light or object.

   White

14. What was its apparent shape.

15. Was any detail of structure observable.

   No

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious.

   No

17. Was there any sound.

   No

18. Height, or angle of elevation.

   See Q.9

19. Speed, or angular velocity.

   180° in approx. 90 mins.

20. Was the object stationary?

   No

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.

   West to East. Course of flight directly overhead.../2.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?  
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? No.  
24. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.  

Faded out at about 150°.  

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.  

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. Yes.  
27. If so, give details of incident(s).  

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 17 and 18.  

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? No.  

30. Name and Address of organisation.  

31. Any additional information.  

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.  

NIL.  

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.  

NIL.  

34. Comments.  

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: Kenneth Frederick Britt
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   4.1.67...at exactly 9.20 pm...Jan. 6...1.67...at 9.30 pm...
5. Duration of Observation(s): 4 minutes
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): Very
   Clear...No cloud...unobstructed view...Sky
8. Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   A pair of binoculars...3 x 20
9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   In the North...West...appeared from our near a group of trees
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    A very bright light
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Appeared as a bright light
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
    Only one was seen
13. What was the colour of the light or object.
    White
14. What was its apparent shape.
    Undetermined...just a light
15. Was any detail of structure observable.
    No
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious.
    No
17. Was there any sound.
    No
18. Height, or angle of elevation
    45° to horizon
19. Speed, or angular velocity
    Fast..estimate
20. Was the object stationary.
    No
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    At first came from North West...heading East...then changed course again to North.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or
manoeuvred at all? No...
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No...
24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.
25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. No...
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. Yes ...
27. If so, give details of incident(s) A red light in the sky.
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.
29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? No...
30. Name and Address of organisation. ...
31. Any additional information. I have seen many aerial phenomena. The light was too bright to be a typical object, and it changed. I have seen it twice.
32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. NIL...
33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. Enniskillen...
34. Comments. At no time did the object achieve or alter any unusual object, object to be reported. No...

Signature of Observer, Kenneth Brett...
Signature of Interrogator, [signature]

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: 

2. Address of Observer: 

3. Occupation of Observer: 

4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time): Feb. 12, 1965, 4:30 P.M. 

5. Duration of Observation(s): 

6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference or, if possible, by known landmarks): 

7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): 

8. Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation): 

9. Where was object first observed, eg. overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.: 

10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg. light or noise: 

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object: 

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation: 

13. What was the colour of the light or object: 

14. What was its apparent shape: 

15. Was any detail of structure observable: 

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious: 

17. Was there any sound: 

18. Height, or angle of elevation: 

19. Speed, or angular velocity: 

20. Was the object stationary: 

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass: 

SST, 5.30, to N.W. (Note: Some on commercial airline with 106.)
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or
manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen.

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over
the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments,
photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably
certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial
phenomena?

30. Name and address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of
sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height
and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better
to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the
object, the angle through which it moved and the time
taken to do this.
MEMORANDUM

RAAF FORM A273 MAR 63

FROM

HQ OPERATIONAL COMMAND

TO

DEPT OF AIR

ATTENTION

SIGN LRN BAXTER

SUBJECT

INTELLIGENCE - UFO SIGHTINGS.

1. Two reports of UFO sightings received from our Public Relations Office are enclosed.

2. The first report of Mr P.W. Agnew is passed without comment except that the requests from the mentioned colour films were unsuccessful.

3. Concerning Mr Lord’s photographs:
   (a) He has approached the press with a view to selling them but was turned down.
   (b) He has not come forward with any information himself. Information submitted by two of his friends.
   (c) Originally only one photo was forwarded; then three weeks later the next, were suddenly found by him!
   (d) The negatives have still not been forwarded although he did promise to do so.
   (e) It is the opinion of the PRPhotographer that these photos are bogus.

SIGNED

PRINTED NAME

AGREEN

RANK AND APPOINTMENT

FLT Lt CINTELLO

PHONE EXTN

390

RESTRICTED
UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Enclosed is a self-explanatory report by Mr P.W. Hynes of Wentworth Falls relative to a UFO sighting. When submitting the report to this office, Mr Hynes gave into custody a roll of unexposed colour film. The report was retained pending receipt of the processed films which were thought to have been lost. However, Mr Hynes has advised that the films were returned to him and are now in his possession.

2. The enclosed photographs were forwarded to this office as substantiating evidence of a UFO encounter by Mr Jack Lord, proprietor of Jack's Camera Store, 304 Liverpool Road, Ashfield, (Tel No 716394). Mr Lord said that he experienced the phenomenon at approx 2100 hours on 19 Nov 1966 near Rockwood Cemetery. Mr Lord approached this office immediately prior to Christmas. He undertook to furnish this office with the negatives from which these prints were made, but these have not been forthcoming.

3. Forwarded for your action.

[Handwritten notes:]
- Mr Lord declined to fill in UFO report.
- More photos were sent in by friends of his.
- Enclosed, no further action.

(J.P.K. WILES)  
Squadron Leader  
Public Relations Officer
REPORT ON ILLUMINATED FLYING OBJECT SEEN AT ABOVE ADDRESS
AT 3.5 am to 3.15 am ON ABOVE DATE.

Awoke just after 3am, while sleeping on enclosed verandah which faces North. Suddenly a star disappeared. I moved my head and it came into view again only to move behind window sill. Put on glasses for better view outside window. There was no noise and object travelled from North to South. Went to front of house and focussed 225mm lens on camera loaded with 50 A.S.A. Perutz colour film. I secured three open shutter shots, keeping a proper star on the view finder for comparison and letting the object travel across it.

The object was blue coloured, but through the lens changed to silver and then intense white. There was a pulsating movement of the colour. The object seemed to be a long way off and travelled in a straight but faltering and zig-zagging manner. That is, like a seismograph needle. It seemed to be vibrating intensely and yawing like an aircraft going into strong wind. At one stage it stopped for about a second when it seemed to go behind a patch of cloud or emitted something around it so that it became indistinct but with a haze around it. My wife came out at this time and as I was explaining where it was it started to move off South again and she was able to spot it with unaided vision. A visitor also came out and was able to see it clearly without glasses. I watched it for 5 to 10 minutes before it angled down sharply towards the Southern horizon. It had the appearance of being circular although I could not get an absolute outline with the lens I had.

I have spent many nights on watch during the war, at sea, camped out, seen aircraft at night, but it did not resemble anything I have ever seen before. It was quite a distinctive and unusual occurrence.
DIRECTORATE OF AIR FORCE INTELLIGENCE

580/1/1(20)

24 FEB '67

Headquarters Support Command
RAAF
Victoria Barracks
MELBOURNE 301 VIC

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

The attached letter was received from the Department of Civil Aviation. It is forwarded to you for investigation in accordance with current policy.

(M.G.S. MARSHALL)
Wing Commander
for Director of Air Force Intelligence
RESTRICTED A787 UFO INTEL REPORT PD OBJECT SIGHTED BY
MR G J HOLT CNM 3 ST JOHN STREET BELGIAN GARDENS TOWNSVILLE AT 150356Z
OR 150004Z FEB WHILE PASSENGER IN CAR APPROX 30 NM NORTH OF TVL.
P D APPEARED AS SMALL DARK OBJECT ROUGHLY TRIANGULAR SHAPE MOVING FROM
SW TO NE DIRECTION CNM HEIGHT CALCULATED 20000 FT PD ON STRAIGHT
PATH DESCENDING PD ONLY ACFT REPORTED WAS PAN AM 747 JET EN ROUTE
NOUMEA - DAR OVER COOKTOWN FLIGHT LEVEL 318 AT APPROX TIME OF SIGHTING
LT

Awaiting full report
from TVL
MEMORANDUM FOR:

The Secretary,
Department of Air,
Canberra.

UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Attached is a copy of a letter dated 12th January, 1967 from Mrs. P. S. Casey, Oak Vale, Coolac, New South Wales. This letter is referred for any action you consider necessary.

2. We have no knowledge of any civil aircraft movements in the area at the relevant time.

3. I have advised Mrs. Casey that I have referred her letter to you.

[Signature]

for Director-General of Civil Aviation.
Oak Vale,
Coolag, N.S.W.
12th January, 1967.

Dear Sir,

I address this to you as I do not know the correct procedure — if any. I have been unable to identify a flying object! May I digress; some months ago a helicopter was stationed in this area, Cootamundra, doing some sort of survey; once or twice it returned whence it came late at night and I had no trouble in knowing by sight and hearing that it was indeed a helicopter.

We are situated as the crow flies about six miles below the Burrunjuck Dam and due east of us is a range of mountains called, I believe, Barren Jack; they rise from the river which is approximately one and a half miles from our house.

Last night, 11th inst. at about 10.30 p.m. I watched what I thought at first to be a helicopter coming between the hills directly towards me. It appeared to be a bright gold ball even with the binoculars, it was a steady golden glow without sound which passed between us and the hill (or mountain, it would be regarded as either) and then passed out of sight behind the mountain — or hill — to reappear and be lost to sight behind some high ground of ours.

If it was a helicopter why the steady light and why soundless? The night was still and the sky clear in that direction. It was not an aeroplane, I thought it moved more quickly than a helicopter. Why do the rounds of the mountains at that hour in a blaze of lights? I would love to know!

Yours in bewilderment,

(Mrs.) Pamela S. Casey
UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Forwarded herewith are reports on aerial sightings by the undermentioned, investigated by this Headquarters.

L. BOARDMAN
R. BELFORD
R. STREET

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer... (Mr) L. Boardman... Age... 53.
2. Address of Observer....26, Russell St., Camberwell, S.E., Vic.
3. Occupation of Observer... Engineer, Draftsman...
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)
   Saturday, 10.12.26...11.10 P.M. (A.P.M.).
5. Duration of Observation(s)... approx. 3 mins.
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)
   310333 on Aust. Army Survey Map of Melbourne...4 miles to 1 inch.
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s).
   No...cloud...no...wind...
8. Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   Nil.
9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   Bearing...75° to 80°...Altitude...approx. 50°.
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    Motion of what appeared to be a bright star.
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Point of light like star of magnitude 6.
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
    One.
13. What was the colour of the light or object...white.
14. What was its apparent shape...point of light.
15. Was any detail of structure observable...No.
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious...No.
17. Was there any sound...No.
18. Height, or angle of elevation...approx. 50°.
19. Speed, or angular velocity...about, or slightly more than that of
    usual or satellite.
20. Was the object stationary...No.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    Due South.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? Straight path.

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? No.

24. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon? Behind house.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. Nil.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 29.

General Engineering Experience.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? No.

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information. The object had all the appearance of a satellite, e.g. polar orbit, but of course satellites are not visible at midnight on a usually so bright night.

Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments. The object was seen for several minutes across the horizon from the southern end of the night.

Signature of Interrogator.

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.

References 31 and 34. The object is normal for a meteorological satellite. When the elevation is 20° or more, the Earth's horizon is visible, and the object can be seen to move across the sky.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Address of Observer. 8, Coler Street, Broadmeadows, Vic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Occupation of Observer. RAAF Officer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time) 2300 hrs Friday 13 June 67.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Duration of Observation(s). Approx. seven seconds.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks) Sydney Road, Fawkner, looking South.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s) Fine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Aids to Observation(s). (Describe any equipment used in the observation) No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc. Straight level flight path over Melbourne, at right angles to observer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>What first attracted observers' attention, eg light or noise. Light. The object was first seen by my wife, who pointed it out to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object. Bright object, about fifty feet in length.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation. Smaller objects, (3 or 4) were visible for no longer than one second, and appeared to come from larger object.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape. Blunt, rounded, bent, tapered tail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Was there any sound. No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Height, or angle of elevation. Approx. 1000 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Speed, or angular velocity. Approx. 500 kts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Was the object stationary. Yes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass. Flight from West to East, at right angles to Sydney Rd. Fawkner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? 

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? No.

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. No.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No.

27. If so, give details of incident(s). N/A

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to paras 18 and 19. Substantial experience gained as a result of my occupation.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? No.

30. Name and address of organisation. N/A

31. Any additional information. Estimated distance of object was one mile, and appeared to be on the runway heading of Exeter airport, heading away from airport. No navigation lights were visible after object disappeared. Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. Need to know.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. Need to know.

34. Comments. It is generally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this. Signature of Interrogator.
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: R. R. STREET  
   Age: 45

2. Address of Observer:  
   KINGS ST. YORK GLEN

3. Occupation of Observer: TRACTOR SALESPEW

4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time):  
   Dec 28th 8 P.M.

5. Duration of Observation(s): Approx. 5 MINUTES

6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks):  
   KING ST. YORK GLEN South West  
   OR MT. ST. LEONARD (OFFICE 12 MILES)

7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): TURB MAD

8. Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation)

9. Where was object first observed, eg. overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.  
   ABOUT 3° ABOVE HORIZON 3° LEFT OF JUST RISED FULL MOON (SEE SKETCH)

10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg. light or noise.  
    LIGHT & MOVEMENT

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.  
    LIGHT (SUCH AS MENTALITE PHENOMENON)

12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.  
    ONL ONL

13. What was the colour of the light or object.  
    ROUND

14. What was its apparent shape:  
    NO

15. Was any detail of structure observable:  
    NO

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious:  
    NO

17. Was there any sound:  
    NO

18. Height, or angle of elevation:  
    3° ABOVE HORIZON

19. Speed, or angular velocity:  
    15° IN 3 MINUTES

20. Was the object stationary:  
    NO

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.  
    FROM WEST TO EAST

.../2.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen?

24. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena?

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information.

Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments.

Signature of Interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.

(SEE SKETCH ON REVERSE SIDE)
The sun had just set and the moon was immediately. If dust had not reached it feels night. The object appeared to iron behind the moon. But it would be impossible to say this for certain. Before it made the final jump to the Earth I was certain it was a large rock-like swinging around the moon.
13 FEB 1967

UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

1. Forwarded herewith are UFO sighting reports received from Department of Civil Aviation, Melbourne.

2. This Headquarters has nothing further to add to report No 1. Report No 2 is considered possibly to be sightings of satellites and it has not been possible to contact Mr O'LOUGHLIN to verify this.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
**REPORT ON AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED.**

**B. G. O'LOUGHLIN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Name of Observer</th>
<th>B. G. O'LOUGHLIN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. Address of Observer</td>
<td>5 MADDEN ST., ALBERT PARK, MELBOURNE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation of Observer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Date and Time of Observation (Time given in 24 hour clock zonal time)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 30/12/66 2200HRS.</td>
<td>2. 31/12/66 2345 HRS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Period of Observation (a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Manner of Observation: (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks, and describe any equipment used in the observation).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RUIGAI, TANAGA</td>
<td>EQUIMENT MIL.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Where was object first observed, e.g. overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. TO THE NORTHWEST</td>
<td>2. OVERHEAD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What first attracted Observer's attention e.g. light or noise.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What was the colour of the light or object RED ORANGE BOTH OCCASIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. What was its apparent shape</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Was any detail of structure observable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Was any method of propulsion obvious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Was there any sound</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Height, or angle of elevation GREAT HEIGHT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Speed, or angular velocity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 16 and 17.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE GIVEN.**

Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do so.
Report on Aerial Object Observed (Contd).

19. Direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
   - 1. NORTHWEST TO SOUTHEAST.
   - 2. OVERSEAS TO SOUTHEAST.

20. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all.
   - 1. APPEARED TO ZIG-ZAG.
   - 2. STRAIGHT PATH.

21. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen.

22. Where did object disappear, e.g. in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

23. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence.

24. Weather conditions experienced at time (s) or observation (s).

25. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.
   - 1. CIVIL TRAFFIC SUSPENDED.

26. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.
   - 1. LAUNCESTON NEAREST.

27. Any additional information.
   - 1. OBSERVATIONS RECEIVED THROUGH THE STARS.
   - 2. REPORT DELAYED IN MAIL.

Questions 25, 26 and 27 to be answered by interrogator.
MEMORANDUM
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FOR USE WITHIN THE RAAF ONLY
WRITE OR PRINT CLEARLY

FROM
HQ OPERATIONAL COMMAND

TO
DEPARTMENT OF AIR

ATTENTION
SAN LIR

REFERENCE
DEP OF AIR
580.1

SUBJECT
INTELLIGENCE - UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL SIGHTINGS

Things uncorrelated UFO reports are forwarded for your attention.

1st. Minter & Bridellea reading.
2nd. Jellihoe
3rd. ?? Practice w/Frank McMillan
4th. Acknowledged.

ATTENTION
OUII ALE
DAT

SIGNATURE
PRINTED NAME
RANK AND APPOINTMENT
PHONE EXTN

Al Green
Lt Lt
C RO
3100

RESTRICTED

C.O.O. 9777
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer: LYNETTE VEALE
   Age: 18 yrs
2. Address of Observer: 40 Censor St, Springfield, N.Z.
3. Occupation of Observer: Insurance clerk (New Zealand)
4. Date and Time of Observation: 15-1-67, 11.20 p.m.
   (Time to be given in local time)
5. Duration of Observation(s): 10 minutes
6. Observer's Location at Time of Sighting:
   at home
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): Sky clear
8. Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation)
   Nil
9. Where was object first observed, eg overhead, coming from behind a hill, etc.
   Coming from behind a house
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    Light
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Light
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there and what was their formation.
    One only
13. What was the colour of the light or object?
    Red
14. What was its apparent shape?
    Round
15. Was any detail of structure observable?
    No
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious?
    No
17. Was there any sound?
    No
18. Height, or angle of elevation.
    About 7 feet, horizontal
19. Speed, or angular velocity.
    Still then moved slowly
20. Was the object stationary?
    Initially
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    Proceeding west
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all? 

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? 

24. Where did object disappear, eg mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon? 

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. 

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? 

27. If so, give details of incident(s). 

28. State any experiences which enable observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to para 18 and 19. 

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? 

30. Name and address of organisation. 

31. Any additional information. Did it behave like an aircraft would be expected to? 

Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting. 

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area. 

34. Comments. 

Signature of Interrogator. 

QUESTIONS 32, 33 and 34 to be answered by interrogator. 

note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved and the time taken to do this.
Dear Sir,

My husband and I travelled to Sydney last Friday, the 13th instant, via the Hume Highway, and somewhere between 10.30 p.m. and 11 p.m. about 20 miles this side of Camden, I drew my husband's attention to what appeared to be two red lights in the sky ahead of us.

We at first thought it a plane, though my husband commented that a plane did not have two red lights as we could see ahead of us. It appeared stationary, or possibly moving very slowly - we appeared to approach it, rather than it us. We were on a flat stretch of road, wooded in parts and cleared in others. The traffic was fairly light though I do recall cars behind us.

We watched for possibly two minutes from the time I first saw the lights and my husband said "that appears to be only about 500 feet up", though I don't know myself how he placed such a height.

We slowed the car, watching the whole while, and stopped when the lights were just about directly over us. My husband got out of the car (at the same time a car drove past us) and after a moment or two said he could not see anything. When I went to speak he quietened me for a moment and then said he thought he could hear a very faint sound possibly like a jet in the distance, though he wasn't certain and with the car passing us, could have imagined it.

We continued to look about for a minute or two and then drove on. I kept my eyes to the sky for a while but we didn't see anything further.

We did wonder about it, and in fact laughingly said we had sighted a "U.F.O." and considered reporting it at the Police Station when we arrived at Camden. We didn't bother however as we felt we would be laughed out, and didn't think anymore about it until next morning when we told my sister.
we had seen a "something". Not until we saw the report later that morning in the Telegraph did we wonder if indeed we should have reported to someone. We felt we had seen the same object as reported by the two policemen at or near Newcastle, though certainly we had not seen any light shining towards the ground.

However, the similarity between the description of lights and the object either stationary or only just moving, and the fact that my husband had said it appeared about 500 ft. up, did make us feel we should report it.

We came back to Wagga and on Monday afternoon (after telling my employer - a Solicitor - about "it" and on his recommendation) I called at the Wagga Police Station and spoke to a local Sergeant.

Without actually saying anything to me, he gave me the impression that I was a "Nut" and in fact didn't even ask me any questions - just listened while I tried (without encouragement) to explain what we had seen, without appearing to be imagining things. He did take my name and address and said if anything further came up, he would make a report to the Camden Police Station. This I felt was most odd, and possibly said just to "get rid of" me so I left feeling rather stupid. I decided at that time not to do anything further as I'd again probably be treated as silly, but on mentioning it to another chap in our firm who had read a further article on the Newcastle sighting in one of the Sunday papers, he told me that that sighting was in your hands, and suggested I write.

Whether you too will think me odd I don't know, but at least I feel we did see something unusual and that I should report to someone.

Yours faithfully,

[Signature]
(Judith Rootes)
RESTRICTED

INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL

OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer
   Judith Rootes & Husband

2. Address of observer
   231 Kincaid Street WAGGA WAGGA

3. Occupation of observer
   Employed by solicitor.

4. Date and time of observation
   13 JAN 67 Between 10:30 & 11 PM

5. Duration of observation
   Approximately two minutes.

6. Observers location at time of sighting
   On Hume Highway about 20 miles south of CAMDEN.

7. Weather conditions at time of observation
   Not stated.

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation
   No aids or equipment mentioned in observer's letter.

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   Ahead of observer's car.

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    Two red lights.

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    Only described as two red lights.

12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there? n/a
    (b) in what formation were they? n/a

13. What was the colour of the light or object?
    Red.

14. What was its apparent shape?
    Apparently no shape discerned.

15. Was any detail of structure observable?
    Apparently not.

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious?
    Mr Rootes thinks he may have heard faint sound possibly like jet.
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17. Was there any sound? .............................................................. See para 16.
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) ......................... Approx. 500' AGL
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) .......................... Stationary or moving very slowly.
20. Was the object stationary? .................................................... See 19.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? 
   See 19.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? 
   No manoeuvres described by observers.
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? .................... Apparently not.
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) 
   Not stated.
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) 
   No.
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? N/K.......
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) ................................... N/A
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. 
   N/K..................................................
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? 
   N/K..................................................
30. Name and address of organisation ........................................... N/A
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. 
   Observer states that Telegraph reported similar sighting 
   by two policemen in the NEWCASTLE area.
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

Aircraft type: Convair Constellation (NASA 431)
Heading: 57° - Can - 57° T ex 57° 1919 K Rebrad 57° 2258 K
Height: 15,000 ft - 20,000 ft - 30,000 ft
Speed: approx 220 K - 230 K

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

Aircraft Type: Boeing 727
Heading: 57° - M - T 2231 K
Height: Climbing to 31,000 ft - 30,000 ft - 30,000 ft
Speed: approx 500 K - 600 K

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in the portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

37. Any other relevant remarks (e.g., about satellites, rockets, research balloons)

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signatures and dates]

RESTRICTED
PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: Mr. Hopkins

2. Address of observer: NAUHARINGA STATION
Charleville (S.E. of Charleville), Phone 6089

3. Occupation of observer: Not known

4. Date and time of observation: 17.06.67, Jan 67

5. Duration of observation: 1 minute

6. Observer's location at time of sighting: NAUHARINGA STATION

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: Not known

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: Hand held compass

9. Where was object first observed? (eg. overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon), descending vertically (bearing 688.6 Enrique)

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise), flash in sky, object descending vertically at very high speed then puff of smoke

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? Puff of smoke - remained for one minute

12. If there was more than one object:
   (a) How many were there?  
   (b) In what formation were they?

13. What was the colour of the light or object? Not known

14. What was its apparent shape?  

15. Was any detail of structure observable?  
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16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? ....... Net stated

17. Was there any sound? ....... After puff of smoke - 16:21

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation). .......... 46000 ft

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) .......... Very rapid

20. Was the object stationary? ....... No

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? ....... 088° M from AUSTIN AIR Station

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? ....... Rapid, vertical fall

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? .......... Red, sighted

24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) ....... Apparently mid-air

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) ....... Not Known

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? ....... N/A

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) .......... N/A

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. ....... Not known

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? ....... Not known

30. Name and address of organisation .......... N/A

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting:

Mr. Hopkins, niece, neighbour at CLIFTON - 10/11 East if AUSTIN. Also heard explosion believing it to be an earth tremor.

Civil aircraft CLIFTON HILLS to CAMERVALE at 4500 ft

48 miles from CV - 2 sets sighted puff of smoke - tale.

Pilot Clifton who described puff as above 5000 feet and to the south of the aircraft.
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>0,000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pilot: Baker Co.</td>
<td>085°</td>
<td>0,000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

35. A meteorological balloon was released from CHARLESTON at 0700 Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time. Normal operation to 30,000 ft.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that only bright star - CONOR'S BERING 145° but very difficult to see with by daylight.

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons)

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

39. The object reported could have been a meteor - or meteorite if it struck the ground - or a missile particle.

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

Base: Bostwick (Unit)   17 Jan 47 (Date)   L. A. Hudson (Name)  (Rank)
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL
OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer. Basil ALPHAN
   AGE. Adult.
2. Address of observer. 11 Kulaba Street NARRIBRI, NSW
   PHONE.
3. Occupation of observer. NOT KNOWN.
4. Date and time of observation. 21/01/61.
5. Duration of observation. 90 seconds.
6. Observers location at time of sighting. Residence above.
7. Weather conditions at time of observation. Cloudless but hazy.
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation.
   Presumably a magnetic compass.
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   30° above horizon, bearing 230° from NARRIBRI, passing between two stars.
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    Flash from corner of eye.
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    As a light varying in intensity, appearing to flash away.
    8 - 10 seconds.
12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there? N/A.
    (b) in what formation were they? N/A.
13. What was the colour of the light or object? White.
14. What was its apparent shape? Similar to a star.
15. Was any detail of structure observable? No.
17. Was there any sound? ........ No.
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) 30° approximately.
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) Approximately 5°-6°/min.
20. Was the object stationary? ........ No.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?
   No reference, but appeared to move SE-NW i.e., 90° to line of sight.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?
   Remained on straight path.
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? ........ No.
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)
   Disappeared in haze.
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence)
   No.
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? See below. p. 27
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s). Although not unusual, observer saw two shooting stars the previous evening plus a similar flash described above, which was taken to be vertically descending "shooting star".
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 16 and 19.
   Not stated, but observer appears to have given sighting considerable thought.
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? ........ Not stated.
30. Name and address of organisation ........ N/A.
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.
   Opinion of observer that the flashing could have been a Net balloon.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None reported</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None scheduled</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time: The two signs mentioned were probably SOMALHAUT and ANKAA. May be significant that MARS, SATURN, JUPITER, MARS, SATURN, MARS.

35. A meteorological balloon was released from WILLIAMSTOWN, but not at 1100...2 AM could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were by Sydney Observatory MIL...Confirmed/(comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons)...

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was...

39. The object reported could have been a tumbling satellite, the flashes occurring each time a face passed through sun's rays. (A suggestion by Prof. BIRD, Dept of Aeronautics, Sydney University).

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

Headquarters, RAAF Base... (Unit) ......... (R.V. ORGUN)... (Name)
WILLIAMSTOWN
26. Jan. 67 ......... (Date) ......... Sergeant, Leader... (Rank)
To Whom it May Concern,

U. F. O. sighting.

I was watching a flood light a quarter mile NW as a result my eyes were not as accustomed to darkness as much as what I would have liked for the following observations. Witnesses called subsequently from lighted rooms were affected similarly.

A flash was observed from the side of the eye, the last seen obtained. Subsequent flashes were verified by direct sight.

Time: 09:15 on 6 June 67.

Direction: 230 magnetic from residence
Height: Almost 30° above horizon.

Location: In the direction indicated there were two bright stars; the distance apart of the long axis of the southern cross and of less magnitude one close to the horizon than the other. The flashes observed by me were slightly northeast of a line joining the two.

Visibility: A moderate display of stars lacking sparkles. Hazy. At midnight a foggy cloud formation appeared.

Description of height: 30 meters vertically from spot & to 10 meters distant at 600 feet.

Duration of flashes: Eye blinks time may less than 1/2 second.

Remarks of flashes: Brief sudden, puffs of light, from bright to flashes made first for 20 to the diameter of either of the stars mentioned.
composing with the star maps of about 2 degrees off the star, 15 to 20 of the star, at 3 to 10 seconds.

Time between flashes. Not counted, recollected at 8
by my wife, my daughter of 13, at 8.

Time lapse between first and last flash sighted.
A basket was falling with sound, this was
1 to 2 minutes at 90 seconds.

Observing. The first flash was the brightest, the last flashes were not seen by me—
the atmosphere offered hay, it first as a background on which light could be seen more
formally subsequently as an observing medium.

I could detect no movement in position in relation to the 13 stars. The
final observation of my daughter of 13 was
3° apparent south.

Report 1st note 7:25 pm 1/1/67
2nd note 12:30 am 1/1/67 Attached to
current midriff 13/1/67.

Next morning I asked the 13 year old daughter
where I considered a less reliable witness what
she saw, she said a light. I said what was
it like, plant the answer took my breath for
clarity.

The plant has foraged to be thrust by
momentarily, then straightened the foraging.

The point of contact represented the flash point.

The shifted shies, the long way emanating from the
plant. Thus in observing, the long ways were
reverted the long ways downward. Date flashes
looked for point identity and were assumed
by reflection.
Identification

Necro 2.20: Phenomena reflection and repetition, and late movement ruled the out.

High altitude plane: Lack of movement between early flashes ruled this out.

Observation balloon fitted with blinder light.

Highly possible.

As some Public body may be interested in the movements of such a piece of equipment, this report is forwarded to be used or not desired as observed. Acknowledgement is not desired.

[Handwritten signature]

[Handwritten notes]

E

East

S

South

NW

North West
ROYAL AUSTRALIAN AIR FORCE

TELEPHONE: 69 0550

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "AIRCOMMAND, MELBOURNE"

IN REPLY QUOTE 5/6/Air(25)

Secretary
Department of Air
Russell Offices
CANBERRA ACT

31 JAN 1967

UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

Your 580/1/1 Pt6(36) 6 Dec 1966

1. The reports mentioned in your letter quoted above were referred to Queensland Squadron ATC for comments.

2. The reply by the Investigating Officer in question indicates that in each of the cases, he was unable to make an assessment of the sightings other than to describe them as astronomical phenomenon. The Investigating Officer contacted both Department of Civil Aviation and the Commonwealth Meteorological Bureau to ascertain the likelihood that the sightings could be related to either aircraft or meteorological balloons. In each case the Departments could not suggest any possible explanation.

3. It is regretted that the findings of the two investigations should be so inconclusive but the Investigating Officer is completely at a loss to determine the nature of the flying objects sights. This Headquarters has nothing to add to this report.

(L.B. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding
1. After discussing the incident with the two observers, I believe the report submitted in good faith. The observers impressed me as being 'normal' people and no indications of any religious, mental, or other instability was apparent.

2. As far as can be ascertained, no military aircraft or activity could have resulted in this report.

3. The only aircraft known to be anywhere near the vicinity were five individual light aircraft operating on "local" flights from the Royal Newcastle Aero Club airfield at Rutherford. No further details of the positions of these aircraft at the time of the sighting can be obtained.

4. I enquired at the Maitland Technical College and the Maitland YMCA as to the possibility of a youth rocket club or similar activity but no such club is known to exist in the area.

5. Having suspected a malfunction of the Maitland NDB of being the cause of the noise reported in conjunction with the UFO I enquired as to the reported serviceability of this aid. DCA advise the aid was fully serviceable at the time of the report and is currently serviceable.

6. I am unable to offer any further evidence to suggest a likely cause of either the noise or UFO.

/J.L. ELLIS
Flight Lieutenant
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer. W. A. Robinson (Mother) ............ Age 24.
   Mrs C. McCarthy (Daughter) ........................................

2. Address of observer 21, Bulleen Avenue, Down. Down ..........
   New South Wales ....................................................... Phone

3. Occupation of observer Housewife ..............................

4. Date and time of observation 21 Jan 67, between 10:15 - 10:30 hours.

5. Duration of observation approximately one minute........

6. Observers location at time of sighting Driving along the road
   between Furri Kurri and Maitland (McCarthy, Driving). Sighting was
   made in the vicinity of Maitland NDB

7. Weather conditions at time of observation Very hot and cloudless
   (confirmed by investigating officer)

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation
   Object seen with naked eye and strange noise heard

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon).
   Right hand side of car (through front windscreen). Object passed in front of car and climbed rapidly away to observers left (Rutherford)

10. What first attracted the observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    A very loud hum intermingled with indiscernible voices seemed
    to fill the car (no radio fitted)

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object? Observers
    say it was a definite object, however when pressed for detail
    both were a little confused as to closeness, size, etc

12. If there was more than one object:–
    (a) how many were there? N/A
    (b) in what formation were they? N/A

13. What was the colour of the light or object? Bright silver

14. What was its apparent shape? Disk shaped

15. Was any detail of structure observable? No. Object moved too rapidly
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16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? No
17. Was there any sound? No. For question 10.
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation)? Confused. Answer, but apparently approximately 50°, initially then climbed very rapidly.
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity)? "Very high". Confused, but both observers agree it was very fast indeed.
20. Was the object stationary? No.
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? Approximately from Kurri NDB site to Rutherford.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? Dipped slightly as it creased from right to left then curved upward into a steep climb.
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? No.
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) In mid-air, appeared to climb and both observers watched until out of sight.
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No.
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? No.
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) N/A.
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. In relation to Mirage aircraft observed in area.
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? No.
30. Name and address of organisation N/A.
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. The sound commenced about ½ mile before Kurri NDB and built up to a maximum after ½ mile. This is about the spot where the sighting was made. The sound then continued to decrease over the next four tenths mile driven by the observers.
The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

**NIL**

- Aircraft type:..............................
- Heading:..........................T........T
- Height:.........................,000 ft...........,000 ft
- Speed:.............................K........K

The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

**See Investigating officers report**

- Aircraft type:..............................
- Heading:..........................T........T
- Height:.........................,000 ft...........,000 ft
- Speed:.............................K........K

Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

**NIL**

A meteorological balloon was released from......**NIL**

at............Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

**NIL**............(comet, meteorite shower, etc).

Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons)

**See Investigating officers report**

There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

**N.I.A**

The object reported could have been......**N.I.A**

The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

No 76 Squadron......(Unit)............J. L. Ellis......(Name)

26th January 1967......(Date)............Flight Lieutenant......(Rank)
1. Report of telephone conversation, with Mr. Gavan BROMILLOW of the Maitland Mercury advised this day that the possible solution to this UFO report was given by two women at Maitland.

2. They stated to BROMILLOW that on the Saturday morning in question they observed from the building in which they were working a "willy-willy" lifting a considerable amount of papers and dust at a rubbish tip area. This "willy-willy" was of high intensity. They stated that they saw it lift, what appeared to be a reasonably large sheet of plastic and hold it suspended some feet off the ground until the plastic was suddenly sucked up into the air at a great height at a very fast rate. The direction of the plastic was towards the Kurri Kurri area from Maitland. It is BROMILLOW's theory that this sheet of plastic was the same silvery object that the ladies saw which is the subject of this report.
SIGHTING UN-IDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECT

Your 580/1/1(35) 6 December 66

Forwarded is a report by Flt Lt J. McQUEEN who carried out an investigation into the sighting of a UFO at Won Wron by Mrs Beryl JEFFS. This Headquarters has nothing to add to the report.

(L.E. BROWN)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl
1. This report deals with attached statements by Mrs. Beryl Jeffs.

2. During the interview the witness gave the impression of being unsure of her facts; a little eccentric and had a mania that she was not a liar.

3. The witness knew personally Mr. and Mrs. W. Stratford whose "sighting" is the subject of a previous investigation and may have been influenced by listening to them. She had also read of newspaper reports of flying saucers.

4. The witness was convinced that she had seen a "flying saucer" or "Russian spaceship" and had awakened her husband. He told her it was only the moon and they had both gone to bed. Her husband has recently had a breakdown.

5. Due to the uncertainty of the date and time, no definite information can be obtained on planet movements, however, I feel certain some natural phenomena such as the moon distorted perhaps by cloud was observed.

6. No definite explanation can be given for her previous sighting two years ago.

(Signed)

(Lt J. McQueen)
REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

1. Name of Observer. Mrs. Deryl JERMS
   AGE. 49
2. Address of Observer. Wen Wren Via TRAMALGON
3. Occupation of Observer. Housewife
4. Date and time of Observation. Approximately two months ago early hours of morning.
5. Aids to Observation. Observer's house.
7. Where was the object first observed. Over trees east of the house.
9. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object. Definite object.
10. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation. Not applicable.
11. What was the colour of the light. Yellow light.
12. What was its apparent shape. Elliptical.
13. Was any detail of structure observable. No.
15. Was there any sound. No.
16. Height, or angle of elevation. Approximate Tree Top Level
17. Speed, or angular velocity. Nil.
18. Was the object stationary. Stationary.
19. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass. Not applicable.
20. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or maneuvre at all. No.
21. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No.
23. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. Nil.
24. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. Yes.
25. If so, give detailed of incidents. Approximately two years ago an object was seen by a yellow light and heard by a "beep beep" noise which appeared from the west and descended in approximately the same spot as the first object. This also occurred in the early hours of the morning and was observed for about three minutes.
26. State any experience which enable observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 16 and 19. None.
27. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena. No.
30. Name and Address of Organization. Not applicable.
31. Any additional information. None.

[Signature of Observer]

18 Jan 67
**MEMORANDUM**
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**FROM**

HQ OPERATIONAL COMMAND

**TO**

DEPARTMENT OF AIR SENIOR BAXTER

**ATTENTION**

**SUBJECT**

INTELLIGENCE - UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL SIGHTING

| 1. Further to our above referenced correspondence concerning an unidentified aerial sighting from the merchant vessel "Lake Boga," enclosed are additional reports from the master, two officers and a seaman who were aboard at the time of the sighting. |
| 2. The intelligence officer No 10 Son was unable to obtain additional information as the "Lake Boga" failed to berth at Townsville. |
| 3. This headquarters has not replied to Master C.L. O'Toole's letter. |

**REFERENCES**

OUR

5/15/1 AIR (92)

04720 105 JAN 67

**DATE**

25 JAN 67

**PRINTED NAME**

T. J. LEACH

**RANK AND APPOINTMENT**

SON/LAR C SEC 0

**PHONE EXTN**

336

**SIGNATURE**

[Signature]

**C.O. 9777**

RESTRIC TED
The Commanding Officer,
Operational Command,
The Royal Australian Air Force,
FENTH, NEW SOUTH WALES.

Dear Sir,

Re: SIGHTING - UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS - 30.12.66.

Please find enclosed reports for your consideration and necessary action, of a sighting of unidentified flying objects, sighted at 0455 Eastern Australian Time on the 30th December 1966, while the vessel was west of Piron Island in position Lat. 14°08'S Long. 144°02'E and steering a true Course of 117°.

I was not on the bridge at the time and did not see the phenomenon, however the Torres Straits Pilot Captain Carter, the Chief Officer Mr. Bayly, and the look-out man G. Thomson A.B. are not the imaginative types and I strongly recommend that their reports be fully investigated.

There is one point that I would like to bring to your attention, which is not included in the reports of Captain Carter and Mr. Bayly; is that Captain Carter observed on the vessel's Radar Set evidence of another radar set being used within the range of the ship's set. This is not unusual on the Australian coast, and the vessel is usually sighted within the next two hours. On this occasion no other vessel was sighted.

The ship's Radar Set is a Kelvin Hughes Marine Radar Set, type 14, and operates on a wave length of 12 cm.

I would be obliged if you would let me know if this sighting is classified or not, as I would like to pass this information on to the Lines News Sheet "ALL HANDS" as an item of interest.

Yours faithfully,

(C.L.O'TOOLE.)
MASTER.
REPORT OF SIGHTING OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS AT 0455 x 30.12.66.

By Mr. A.G. BAYLY Chief Officer.

At 0455 on Friday 30th. December 1966, in position 14° 08' S 144° 29' E on a course 117° (True), Speed 11 Knots. The lookout reported lights in the sky, about 2 points abaft the starboard beam.

I went to the starboard wing of the bridge, with Captain R.T. Carter, Torres Straits Pilot, and observed three horizontal rows of lights, 2 points abaft the beam, which were moving in the same direction as the ship, and parallel to the horizon, and at an angle to it of 15 degrees.

There were about four groups of lights, each in a vee formation, each group consisted of three blobs of light with a thin pencil line of light trailing astern from each light.

The other groups were in the same formation as the leading group and in line astern. Each group just keeping clear of the pencil line of lights of the group ahead.

The weather was fine and clear with broken low level, fine weather Cumulus cloud, which obscured part of the formation at times but never completely.

The formation was finally obscured by cloud when four points on the starboard bow. I had these lights in sight for something like 20 seconds from two points abaft the starboard beam (227°(T)) to four points on the starboard bow (16°(true)).

The colour of this formation of lights, when I first observed them (approx. true bearing 227°) was white, but viewed through glasses, between true bearings of 174° and 162° appeared to be a dull blue gray with a suspension of indigo. I have estimated that it took the formation twenty (20) seconds to alter the bearing 67°.

My impressions of the formation is set out below.

[Signature]

Lt.Cdr. R.A.N.V.R.

(ANDREW G. BAYLY.)

CHIEF OFFICER.
REPORT OF SIGHTING OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS AT 0455 K. 30.12.66
BY. CAPTAIN R.T. CARTER, QUEENSLAND COASTAL AND TORRES STRAITS PILOT

At 0455 E.A.S.T. in position Lat. 14°08' S Long. 144°29'E, off Pipon Island and on a true course of 117°, the bridge look-out reported to the O.O.W. of an unusual phenomena appearing from the sw quadrant, I the went out to the starboard wing of the bridge and saw what appeared to be brilliant white circular lights massed in a uniform formation moving from west to east at a tremendous speed.

Angle from my sighting would be approximately 45° and this entire mass appeared to travel parallel to the observers horizon until obscured by cloud and completely disappeared.

The time factor for my sighting would be approximately 15 seconds, however I was the last of 3 to see these objects.

The formation was "V" shaped and there could have been 3 to 5 shapes in each. Making four in line ahead like thus:

```
  o-- o-- o-- o--
  o-- o-- o-- o--
  o-- o-- o-- o--
  o-- o-- o-- o--
```

Each object trailed an exhaust like flame and every U.F.O. behind the leading formation seemed to take station clear of this "exhaust".

(R.T. CARTER.)
QUEENSLAND COASTAL AND TORRES STRAITS PILOT.
REPORT OF SIGHTING OF UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS AT 0455k 30.12.66
Sighted by G. THOMSON Able Seaman Bridge Lookout 0400-0500.

At about 0450 I saw what I thought was a rocket rising above the horizon about 6 points abaft the starboard beam. I watched for about a minute and saw that the lights were forming into lines.

I reported the sighting to the Chief Officer, who came out to the wing of the bridge, with the Pilot, by this time, the front lights were made up of groups of smaller lights, with several single lights trailing astern. There were several groups of lights abreast of the front light.

Set out below is how the lights looked to me:

First sight:

4 Points abaft the beam:

Abeam:

2 Points on the Bow:

(G. THOMSON)
ABLE SEAMAN
RESTRICTED A92 INTELLIGENCE REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT

OBSERVED PD SIGHTED BY MR AND MRS ROOTES 231 KINCAID STREET WAGGA
WAGGA CMH TWO RED STATIONARY LIGHTS APPROXIMATELY 500 FEET AGL
CMH AREA HUME HIGHWAY 20 SOUTH FROM CAMDEN CMH BETWEEN 2000
PM AND 1100 13JAN67 PD NO KNOWN CAUSE PD FOR HQOPCOM CMH REPORT
IN ACCORDANCE OPERATIONAL COMMAND ASI 3/A/5 FOLLOW.
MEMORANDUM

For use within the RAAF only
Write or print clearly

OUR FILE
5/15/1/AIR (90)

DATE
20 Jan 67

REFERENCES

FROM
HQ OPERATIONAL COMMAND

TO
DEPARTMENT OF AIR

ATTENTION
Sgn Ldr Baxter

SUBJECT
INTELLIGENCE-UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL SIGHTING

A report concerning a UFO reported from the Armidale area is enclosed.

Corks

Ned Balloon?

SIGNATURE

PRINTED NAME
A Green

RANK AND APPOINTMENT
Flt Lt Cintell 0

PHONE EXTN
390

C.O.O. 5777
RESTRICTED
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT ENCOUNTER
(Operational Command ASI 3/4/5)

PART I - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: SGT. K. R. HODGES

2. Address of observer: C/O. ARMIDALE POLICE
   STATION
   PHONE ARMIDALE 2444

3. Occupation of observer: POLICE SERGEANT

4. Date and time of observation: 14. JAN 67 1210

5. Duration of observation: ABOUT 3 MINS

6. Observers location at time of sighting: A.T. ARMIDALE POLICE STATION

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: N.I.C. (CLOUD GOOD, VISIBILITY)

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: NIL

9. Where was object first observed? (eg. overhead, coming over behind a hill, over the horizon).
   NORTH... EAST... OF... POLICE STATION... ABOUT... 3 MILES

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg. light or noise).

   MRS. SPENCER... DUMPRES... ST... ARMIDALE... (PHONENO.3020)
   CALLED POLICE TO REPORT WHAT SHE THOUGHT WAS AIRCRAFT IN TROUBLE... HEARD ENGINE NOISE... SGT. HODGES WENT OUTSIDE TO CHECK AND SIGHTED OBJECT BUT COULD HEAR NO NOISE

11. Did object appear as a light or a definite object? DEFINITE

   OBJECT - APPEARED TO HAVE TWO WINGS LIKE BI-PLANE BUT NO FUSELAGE - A SQUARE LARGE BOX KITE SHAPE
   ABOUT... SIZE... OF... CESSNA... AIRCRAFT AND IT APPEARED TO BE TOWING A ROUND OR CIRCULAR OBJECT

12. If there was more than one object:
   (a) how many were there? N/A
   (b) in what formation were they? N/A

13. What was the colour of the light or object? WHITE

14. What was its apparent shape? SQUARE LIKE LARGE BOX KITE

15. Was any detail of structure observable? NO

16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? NO
17. Was there any sound? [N.O.]

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) ELEVATION -600 FEET.

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) SLOWER THAN A CESSNA LIGHT AIRCRAFT.

20. Was the object stationary? [N.O.]

1. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?

F.R M. FROM EAST TO WEST...

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?

OBJECT REVOLVED RAPIDLY BUT MOVED ON A STRAIGHT AND LEVEL PATH.

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? [N.O.]

24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) SET RHODES RETURNED TO PHONE (MRS SPENCER STILL ON LINE) AFTER OBSERVING OBJECT FOR ABOUT 3 MINS. HE RETURNED TO LOOK AT OBJECT ABOUT 2 MINS LATER BUT IT HAD DISAPPEARED.

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) [N.O.]

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? [N.O.]

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) [N.O.]

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain. In the case of McGowan, the experience given to SGT RHODES SAID THAT HE FREQUENTLY OBSERVES CESSNA LIGHT AIRCRAFT PASSING OVER ARIMDALE AND WHICH OPERATE FROM ARIMDALE AERODROME.

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? [N.O.]

30. Name and address of organisation [N.O.]

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.

SGT RHODES THOUGHT OBJECT WOULD HAVE BEEN AT A LOWER ALTITUDE THAN THE VISCOUNT AIRLINER, EN. ROUTE, BRISBANE TO SYDNEY, WHICH PASSED OVER ARIMDALE AT 1216 AT 22000 FT. T.W.I.B. THE HEARING PERSONS REPORTED HOLOG. SIGHTING. THE OBJECT - MRS CLARK WHO LIVES 12 MILES OUTSIDE ARIMDALE AT ROLLER TRACK PHONE NO. 5453. TIME OF SIGHTING 1135 ON JUNE 17 - MRS SPENCER WHO REPORTED HER SIGHTING TO SGT. RHODES. MRS. CLARK S SIGHTING WAS OF A SILVER OBJECT WHICH APPEARED TO EXPLODE. SHE WAS REPORTED TO D.C.A. AUTHORITIES BY A MR HYATT PHONE ARIMDALE 3079. MRS CLARK STATED OBJECT WAS TRAVELLING IN EASTLY DIRECTION. MRS CLARK HAS NOT BEEN PERSONALLY INTERVIEWED.
PART 2 - UNIT EVALUATION

32. The following CIVIL aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

Aircraft type: 1. VISCONT SYD-BRS 2. VISCONT BRISBANE-SYD

Heading: N
Height: 22,000 ft
Speed: 02.14Z

33. The following MILITARY aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

Aircraft Type: NIL
Heading: T
Height: 0,000 ft
Speed: K

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

SEE PARA 39

35. A meteorological balloon was released from ...

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that serial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons): NIL

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was ...

39. The object reported could have been: THE DESCRIPTION BEST FITS A RADIOSONDE BALLOON. OR A RAWIN BALLOON. AND THE NOT PEOPLE SAY MORE IS TOO FAR AWAY.

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signatures and dates]
MEMORANDUM

FROM
HQ OPERATIONAL COMMAND

TO
DEPARTMENT OF AIR

ATTENTION
Sqn Ldr BAXTER

SUBJECT
INTELLIGENCE - UNIDENTIFIED AERIAL SIGHTING

1. A Report concerning an Unidentified Aerial Sighting from the Merchant Vessel LAKE BOGA is enclosed.

2. The Intelligence Officer No 10 Sqn Jurramville will be visiting the Vessel when it berths at Jurramville sometime this week. Any further reports will be forwarded to you.

Aircraft overflying to New Caledonia?

Cc

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIGNATURE</th>
<th>PRINTED NAME</th>
<th>RANK AND APPOINTMENT</th>
<th>PHONE EXTN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GREEN</td>
<td>A GREEN</td>
<td>F/C T CINELLO</td>
<td>390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RESTRICTED
UFO REPORT PD AT 031048Z CIVILIAN LOCATED EAST
MELBOURNE REPORTED A WHITE LIGHT HIGH UP MOVING AT A MODERATE
SPEED FROM NORTH TO SOUTHEAST WITHOUT CHANGING COURSE FOR
ABOUT FIVE MINUTES PD SIGHTING CORROBORATED BY OTHERS NEARBY PD

ON CHECKING ESSENDON TOWER CONTROLLERS REPORT A SATELLITE SIGHTING
IN SAME POSITION AND TIME PREVIOUS EVENING PD REPORT FOLLOWS
MEMORANDUM
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FROM
HQ OPERATIONAL COMMAND

TO
DEPARTMENT OF AIR

ATTENTION
Sgt. L. BAXTER

SUBJECT
INTELLIGENCE - UNIDENTIFIED FLYING OBJECTS

DATE
06 JAN 66

REMARKS
Two completed reports concerning unidentified aerial sightings in the Sydney and Dalywater areas are enclosed.

SIGNATURE
A. GREEN

PRINTED NAME
A GREEN

RANK AND APPOINTMENT
FLT/LT CINELLO

PHONE EXTN
390

REMARKS

1st memorandum
2nd memorandum

Restricted

G.A.S.

RECD.
10 JAN 1967
Tuesday, the 22nd. of November, 1966, at 0943 whilst doing my Balloon Flight I suddenly picked up an U.F.O. My balloon at 25,000 feet was close to the sun and impossible to follow any further.

This object (see sketch) appeared where I left the balloon azimuth 260°, elevation 59.2°. I followed the object for approx. 2 (two) minutes then lost it. I immediately took another reading azimuth 320°, elevation 27.9°. It seemed to be travelling at a tremendous speed. I guessed the height between 40-50000 feet, due to the object being slightly blurred by haze.

The dentist from the Mobile Clinic who was standing next to me looked in the indicated direction but could not see anything.

My first thoughts were this must be an aircraft, but the speed was too fast for an aircraft at this altitude. If an aircraft had been lower we would have heard the engines or jets, which neither of us did. On checking with Darwin Operation (D.C.A) I was informed there was no aircraft in the area therefore I am reporting this as an U.F.O.

Signed H. MUNSTERMAENN
MET. O.I.C., DAILY WATERS

COPY FOR INFORMATION

REGIONAL DIRECTOR
BUREAU OF METEOROLOGY
DARWIN NT
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/5)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: HARRY MUNSTERMANN
   AGE: 32

2. Address of observer: C/O MET OFFICE
   DAILY. WATERS N.T. PHONE: 3

3. Occupation of observer: WEATHER OBSERVER

4. Date and time of observation: 22-11-66 0013Z

5. Duration of observation: TWO MINUTES

6. Observers location at time of sighting: THEODOLITE
   FOLLOWING A MET BALLOON

7. Weather conditions at time of observation: FINE 21/24000 FT
   W'8 20 MILES, SURFACE WIND NNW 6 KNOTS

8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation:
   THEODOLITE

9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon):
   COMING FROM NEAR THE SUN

10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise):
    PICKED UP BY THEODOLITE

11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    DEFINITE OBJECT

12. If there was more than one object:
    (a) how many were there? N/A
    (b) in what formation were they? N/A

13. What was the colour of the light or object? METALLIC GREY

14. What was its apparent shape? OBLONG

15. Was any detail of structure observable? NO

RESTRICTED
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? ................. **NO**
17. Was there any sound? .................................. **NO**
18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) ....... 59.2° to 279° in two min.
19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) .......... **DON'T KNOW**
20. Was the object stationary? ............................ **NO**
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? ........................
   **FROM NORTH TO SOUTH**
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? ................................. **STRAIGHT PATH**
23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? .......................... **NO**
24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) .......................... **LOST IN MID-AIR DUE TO SPEED**
25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) .... **NO**
26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? .......................... **NO**
27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) ............... **N/A**
28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. ........................
   **SEE MY LETTER DATED 26-11-66**
29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? .......................... **NO**
30. Name and address of organisation ........................ **N/A**
31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. ........................
   **SEE MY LETTER DATED 26-11-66**
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

- Aircraft type: N/A
- Heading: N/A
- Height: 0,000 ft, 0,000 ft, 0,000 ft
- Speed: N/A

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

- Aircraft type: N/A
- Heading: N/A
- Height: 0,000 ft, 0,000 ft, 0,000 ft
- Speed: N/A

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

- NOT AVAILABLE

35. A meteorological balloon was released from the station at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

- NOT AVAILABLE (comet, meteorite shower, etc).

37. Any other relevant remarks (e.g., satellites, rockets, research balloons):

- NOT AVAILABLE

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was

- IDENTIFIED / IDENTIFIED

39. The object reported could have been

- NOT AVAILABLE

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

[Signatures and dates]
### RESTRICTED

#### INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL OBJECT OBSERVED

(Operational Command ASI 3/4/5)

#### PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Name of observer: MR. R. TAMBLING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AGE: 40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Address of observer: 8. BANDALONG AVENUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WEST PYMBLE, NSW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PHONE: 495316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Occupation of observer: Sales Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Date and time of observation: 5/16/77, 18 DEC 66, 1950, 1955, 2000, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Duration of observations: 15 - 20 mins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Observers location at time of sighting: At above address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Weather conditions at time of observation: Fine &amp; clear - Some haze over SYDNEY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation: Naked eye &amp; binoculars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon): 40° above Western Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise): Light</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?: Light only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>If there was more than one object: -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) how many were there? One only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) in what formation were they?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>What was the colour of the light or object?: Colour of stars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>What was its apparent shape?: No shape</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Was any detail of structure observable?: No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**RESTRICTED**
16. Was any method of propulsion obvious? No

17. Was there any sound? No

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation) As for a satellite

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity) As for a satellite

20. Was the object stationary? No

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass? Travelled from West to South East

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all? Straight path

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen? N.R.

24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon) Fm high over SYDNEY

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence) No

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? Yes

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s) Several satelites
- meteor sightings reported in fact

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19. Interested in satellites etc for some time

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena? No

30. Name and address of organization ____________________________

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting. The direction of travel (ie West to SE) seemed to Mr Tumbleton odd for a satellite

RESTRICTED
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

- Aircraft type: N/A
- Heading: T
- Height: 0,000 ft
- Speed: K

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

- Aircraft type: None
- Heading: S.E.
- Height: 0,000 ft
- Speed: Various

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

- Not known

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were:

- (comet, meteorite shower, etc)

37. Any other relevant remarks (eg about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

- The Astronomical Society reports that two satellites, both from the same orbit, passed over at about three times.

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

- It seems most likely that the object(s) was one of these satellites

39. The object reported could have been:

- 

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

---

**No. 1 CARU** (Unit)  
22 DEC 66 (Date)  
D. H. Scott (Name)  
274F (Rank)
INTELLIGENCE - REPORT OF AERIAL
OBJECT OBSERVED
(Operational Command ASI 3/A/9)

PART 1 - REPORT BY OBSERVER

1. Name of observer: ANDREW GOODENOUGH, BAYLY, AGE: 49
2. Address of observer: 34, MOORE ST., ROSEVILLE
   ____________________________ PHONEx 409338
3. Occupation of observer: MARINER [CHIEF OFFICER - LT. CDR. RANA]
4. Date and time of observation: 29/11/55 2.30 (30 DEC 66 0435)
5. Duration of observation: FROM 40 TO 60 SECONDS
6. Observers location at time of sighting: AT SEA ON THE
   LAKE BOGA IN POSN. 1408 S., 14129 E.
7. Weather conditions at time of observation: FINE AND CLEAR BUT
   CLOUD OCCASIONALLY OBSCURED OBJECTS BUT NEVER
   COMpletely
8. Describe any aids or equipment used in the observation:
   BINOCULARS - BUT ONLY FOR THE LATTER 5-10 SECS
9. Where was object first observed? (eg, overhead, coming from be-
   hind a hill, over the horizon).
   RISING ABOVE HORIZON
10. What first attracted observer's attention? (eg, light or noise).
    LIGHT (SEE 11)
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object?
    FIRST INDICATION WAS THAT OF A ROCKET
    GOING UP.
12. If there was more than one object:-
    (a) how many were there? SEVERAL GROUPS (4 OR 5)
    (b) in what formation were they? V-4 IN LINE ASTRERN
13. What was the colour of the light or object? WHITE
14. What was its apparent shape? EACH OBJECT CIRCULAR
15. Was any detail of structure observable? NO
15. Was any method of propulsion obvious?  

17. Was there any sound?  

18. What was its height? (or angle of elevation).  

19. What was its speed? (or angular velocity).  

20. Was the object stationary?  

21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass?  

22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate, or manoeuvre at all?  

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour, or light seen?  

24. Where did object disappear? (eg, in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon)  

25. Do you know of any physical evidence? (such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence)  

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously?  

27. If so, give brief details of incident(s)  

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 18 and 19.  

29. Are you a member of any organization interested in aerial phenomena?  

30. Name and address of organisation  

31. Any additional information which relates to the sighting.  

½ HOUR PRIOR TO SIGHTING, THE SHIP'S RADAR GAVE INDICATION OF INTERFERENCE, NORMALLY ASSOCIATED WITH RADAR TRANSMISSIONS OF OTHER SHIPS. NO OTHER SHIP KNOWN IN AREA.
32. The following military aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

33. The following civil aircraft were in the vicinity of the reported UFO position at the time:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aircraft type</th>
<th>Heading</th>
<th>Height</th>
<th>Speed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>T</td>
<td>000 ft</td>
<td>K</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

34. Calculations show that the following planets or major stars were in that portion of the sky at the time:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. A meteorological balloon was released from at Z and could have been in the reported UFO position at the time.

36. The State Observatory in the nearest capital city affirms that aerial phenomena in that portion of the sky at the time were

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. Any other relevant remarks (e.g., about satellites, rockets, research balloons):

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

38. There is conclusive evidence that the object reported was:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

39. The object reported could have been:

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40. The cause (or likely cause) of the sighting cannot be determined.

*Signature*

Hqtrs RAAF Base TOWNSVILLE
3rd January 1967

*Signature*

J.E. INGHAM
Flying Officer

*Signature*

J.E. INGHAM
Flying Officer
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**INFO**

"Investigation to Hw of Com Atten... so intel"
A letter from Mr. R. Jamieson which was inadvertently omitted from our 5/5/1/AIR(74) is enclosed.
The Officer Commanding,
Headquarters Operational Command,
R.A.A.F.
PENRITH, N.S.W.

Your reference: 5/15/1/Air (66)
Subject: Unidentified Flying Objects.

Dear Sir,

Many thanks for your letter dated 2/11/66 to which the above reference applies.

Since last writing to you I have been fortunate enough to see many more UFOs. In fact I have set up a small band of 'sky-watchers' whose reports come to me for confirmation and checking from a number of places in the Metropolitan area. Some of these people are now technical types, fortunately.

These UFOs interest me greatly and I have recently been commissioned by Horwitz Publications Inc., Pty., Ltd., to write a book on the subject.

My question now is, may I quote from the information supplied to me on 2/11/66, in my book? Also, is there an official view held by the Department of Air or the R.A.A.F. on the subject of UFOs? I understand that Mr. B.G. ROBERTS' published statement on the matter is not actually classed as the official attitude. Is this so?

Following your request for news of any further sightings, I am at the moment compiling a list of sightings seen since my last submissions. These will be forwarded to D.A.F.I. via No.1 Control & Reporting Unit, Brookvale. I hope they may be of some use.

I wish to express my thanks to you for your interest to date.

Yours faithfully,

Richard Tambling.

SUMMARY OF AN ADDRESS
GIVEN BY MR. B.G. ROBERTS
ORD DEP. AIR. TO THE
BALLARAT ASTRONOMICAL
SOCIETY IN FEBRUARY 1965.
REPORT ON UFO SIGHTINGS

1. Attached herewith is a report on an un-identified flying sighting. The report consists of -
   (a) Pro-forma
   (b) Sketch
   (c) Map.

2. It is considered that this sighting was of a commercial DC-4 aircraft en route Adelaide-Melbourne which landed at Essendon at 2102 hours local. This sighting does not pose a threat to the security of Australia.

(V.E. CANNON)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Encl (3)
1. Name of Observer: F.C. LEVANIEFELD (family) ... Age: 43
2. Address of Observer: "REDBANK" WILLABR VIC
3. Occupation of Observer: ... 
4. Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time): 
   Off 8.25 P.M. on the 22nd November '44
5. Duration of Observation(s): 6 minutes
6. Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks):
   We are about 10 miles west of WILLABR and 7 miles north-east of Glen Thompson
7. Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s): ... 
   Calm, Fine, Bright with small scattered cloud sometimes
8. Aids to Observation(s) (Describe any equipment used in the observation):
   No Aids - self with spotting scope and two binoculars
   Also observed with naked eye (all observers good eye sight)
9. Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.
   Now in the north
10. What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.
    Bright reddish flashing light
11. Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.
    Light
12. If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.
    No
13. What was the colour of the light or object.
    Reddish
14. What was its apparent shape.
    Not Noted
15. Was any detail of structure observable.
    No
16. Was any method of propulsion observable.
    No
17. Was there any sound.
    No
18. Height, or angle of elevation.
    Grow horizon
19. Speed, or angular velocity.
    Moving Rapidly
20. Was the object stationary.
    No
21. What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.
    See map enclosed

The size of the flashing light which was approximated to the size of the largest star (when first seen...
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen. No.

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind a hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. None.

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously. No.

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 12 and 14.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena. No.

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information. It appeared to be a long, needle-like type of object, very fast. Could you let us know if this object can be identified.

Signature of Observer.

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments. As observed, it was a flying saucer and passed over in a straight line.

Signature of Interrogator.

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
WORLD AERONAUTICAL CHART
RAAF 1:1,000,000

ELEVATIONS IN FEET

Lambert Conformal Conic Projection
Standard Parallels 36° 40' and 39° 20'

Users of this chart are requested to note any errors herein and forward it to Aeronautical Information Section, Headquarters Support Command, RAAF, Victoria Barracks, St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Australia.

This is a large format document which will not be legible if scanned. If you wish to obtain a copy of the document please send your request to ref @naa.gov.au.
DALGETY AND NEW ZEALAND LOAN LIMITED
1 MALOP STREET, GEELONG

Consult us for all requirements in connection with

WOOL : STOCK : PROPERTY : INSURANCE : TRAVEL
MERCHANDISE : SEEDS

WATCH CHANNEL BT6 ON FRIDAY NIGHT AT 8.55 P.M.
FOR OUR STOCK REPORT
REPORT ON AERIAL OBJECT

1. Attached is a report of a sighting of an aerial object. It is considered that the object sighted was in the nature of ball lightning or a plasma and is directly attributable to the severe electrical storm which was raging at the time.

2. This sighting poses no threat to the security of Australia.

Encl

[Signature]

(V.B. CANNON)
Wing Commander
For Air Officer Commanding

Assessment

Phenomenon caused by electrical discharge during severe electrical storm
| 1. | Name of Observer:  | PENNER JOHN SPRING Age: 50. |
| 2. | Address of Observer:  | 83 Sackville St, Kew, E4 Office 90 MIN 6 | Management Hill, to P/L |
| 3. | Occupation of Observer:  | REAL ESTATE, BRANT. 26 Queen St, Kew 60603 11H 806427 |
| 4. | Date and Time of Observation (Time to be given in local time)  | Sunday, 27th Nov 1966, 02:15 AM |
| 5. | Duration of Observation(s):  | 3-4 MINUTES |
| 6. | Observers Location at Time of Sighting (Give details of own position by map reference if possible, or by known landmarks)  | EILDON WEIR, VICTORIA. EILDON BOAT CLUB HARBOUR (BROOKLAND WEST) |
| 7. | Weather Conditions at time(s) of observation(s):  | VERY, HEAVY ELECTRICAL, STORM & RAIN |
| 8. | Aids to Observation(s): (Describe any equipment used in the observation)  | PURELY VISUAL |
| 9. | Where was object first observed, eg, overhead, coming from behind a hill, over the horizon, etc.  | COMING FROM BEHIND MOUNTAIN |
| 10. | What first attracted observer's attention, eg light or noise.  | WAS ON BOARD, MY. CRUISER, CHECKING IF RAIN WAS COMING IN TO BOAT WHEN I SAW OBJECT IN SKY |
| 11. | Did object appear as a light or as a definite object.  | OBJECT APPEARED AS A LIGHT WITH BLACK BUBBS, MASS, ON TOP |
| 12. | If there was more than one object, how many were there, and what was their formation.  | ONLY ONE OBJECT |
| 13. | What was the colour of the light or object.  | ORANGE-YELLO |
| 14. | What was its apparent shape.  | ROUND |
| 15. | Was any detail of structure observable.  | NO |
| 16. | Was any method of propulsion obvious.  | NO |
| 17. | Was there any sound.  | COULD NOT HEAR SOUND DUE TO THUNDER STORM |
| 18. | Height, or angle of elevation.  | AS PER MAP ATTACHED |
| 19. | Speed, or angular velocity.  | |
| 20. | Was the object stationary?  | NO MOVING, SLOWLY |
| 21. | What was the direction of flight with reference to landmarks or points of the compass.  | OBJECT WAS TRAVELLING IN NORTHWEST DIRECTION FROM BIG RIVER AREA TOWARDS RONNIE POON. SEE ATTACHED MAP. |

.../2.
22. Did the object remain on a straight path, deviate or manoeuvre at all?

23. Was any trail of exhaust, vapour or light seen? NO, light appeared to be under a black mass. With the object behind a mountain range I would consider a mutual light. 

24. Where did object disappear, eg in mid-air, behind hill, over the horizon.

25. Existence of any physical evidence such as fragments, photographs, or other supporting evidence. NO!

26. Have you observed any unusual phenomena previously? NO...

27. If so, give details of incident(s).

28. State any experience which enables observer to be reasonably certain about the answers given to 19 and 19.

29. Are you a member of any organisation interested in aerial phenomena? NO

30. Name and Address of organisation.

31. Any additional information. The object was travelling at a right angle to normal air route, and was at much lower altitude. At no time was aircraft in view from Boola Harbour. NO!

32. Location of any air traffic in the vicinity at the time of sighting.

33. Location of any meteorological stations in the general area.

34. Comments. 

Note: Since it is normally impossible to estimate the height and speed of a strange object, it will usually be better to endeavour to determine the angle of elevation of the object, the angle through which it moved, and the time taken to do this.
EILDON TOWNSHIP

The township of Eildon was built initially to house workers employed on the dam project. Planning was on similar lines to those used in the layout of housing for the Tennessee Valley Authority, U.S.A.

The township, with its present population of over 2,000, is on the right bank of the Goulburn River, on a slope surrounded by timbered hills. Its electrical power is taken from the local power station while its reticulated household water comes initially from the main storage system but first passes through treatment and settling tanks and is chlorinated.

Main attractions of the town are the lake wall and spillway, boat harbours, views from Mt. Pinninger and Easts Lookout.

Eildon is 87 miles from Melbourne via the Maroondah Highway to Taggerty, then Thornton and the Goulburn Valley Highway. Mileages from Eildon to some places of interest are Alexandra 16

- Buxton 23
- Jamieson 38
- Mansfield via Alexandra 59
- Mansfield via Jamieson 59
- Merton 36
- Mt. Buller 89
- Rubicon 15
- Snobs Creek Hatchery 7
- Taggerty 16
- Thornton 8

ALEXANDRA

Situated on the Goulburn River, Alexandra is a prosperous farming township with a population of 2,300. It was known in the hectic gold rush days as Red Gate Diggings.

MANSFIELD

The centre of a large grazing district Mansfield is also the gateway to a wealth of scenic attractions, including Mt. Buller. The present site of the town was from 1841 a vast sheep station, however, in 1851 the area was surveyed and three years later the first land sold. A monument in the main street honours policemen who were killed during a hunt for members of the notorious Kelly gang.

JAMIESON

Jamieson, an attractive old mining township at the confluence of the Goulburn and Jamieson Rivers, has a population of 139. In the gold rush days it had fourteen hotels and two breweries. Cobb & Co. Coaches in those distant times left Jamieson for Melbourne each morning. The fare there and back in five days being the equivalent of $5. Among the many beautiful trees growing in the streets is a huge Spanish chestnut planted in 1876.

FRASER NATIONAL PARK

Abutting the western side of Lake Eildon is Fraser National Park, which covers an area of 6,000 acres. Views from the high ridges within the Park are magnificent, looking across to the high peaks of the Victorian Alps or down wooded hillsides to the long still water reaches of the Lake. This Park was formerly two grazing properties, Bolte Bay, Coller Bay and Stone Bay where once contented cattle grazed are fast becoming tourist attractions.

Within the more inaccessible parts of the Park, kangaroos and other native fauna can be seen.

Shooting and domestic animals are totally prohibited in the park.

SNOBS CREEK FISH HATCHERY

A short distance off the Thornton to Eildon road, 7 miles from Thornton, is the fascinating fish hatchery which is open for inspection daily between 10 a.m. and 4 p.m. excepting Good Friday. Feeding time is 3.30 p.m. The stock fish eat nearly one ton of food each week during the summer months. When the fish are feeding it is often possible to see large numbers of trout leaping from the water. Australian Rainbow Trout originally came from California, U.S.A., to New Zealand whence trout eggs were introduced into Victoria in the 1880's. Eggs are now shipped back to America because ours are free of certain fish diseases found there. A short distance above the Hatchery one can find the Snobs Creek Falls.

Note:—

The track between Licola and Jamieson is only trafficable for four-wheel drive vehicles.
LAKE EILDON

The Goulburn, Victoria's largest river, rises on the northern slopes of Mt. Matlock near Woods Point in the Great Dividing Range. Fed by a mountainous catchment area of 1,500 square miles, and supplemented by the waters of the Delatite, Howqua, Jamieson and Big Rivers, the Goulburn winds its way northwards and flows into the Murray River which reaches the sea in South Australia.

The first person to consider using the water of the Goulburn River for irrigation was apparently a Mr. R. H. Thorne, a Parliamentary candidate some 110 years ago. He advocated using Waranga Swamp as a storage in 1856. In 1860 and again in 1880, consideration was given to developing a Waranga reservoir but it was not until 1902 that Waranga began to take shape.

At this stage a need was seen to dam the Goulburn nearer to its headwaters whereupon the Sugarloaf site, later to be known as Eildon, was chosen.

The original Eildon Reservoir was designed to hold 306,000 acre feet but by 1938 this proved to be inadequate to provide the needs of expanding irrigation projects in northern Victoria. Greater control and conservation near the headwaters of the primary waterway was demanded.

On June 15, 1951, work was commenced on the construction of the new Eildon Dam. A few statistics will indicate the result of the four years' effort that followed and which resulted in Lake Eildon as we know it today.

- Embankment: 260 ft. high, 3,225 ft. long, earth and rockfill, 13,300,000 cu. yds.
- Lake: Shoreline 320 miles, capacity 21 million acre feet, maximum depth 250 feet.
- Power output available: 136,000 kilowatts.
- Men employed: Over 1,600.
- Plant and construction equipment value: $7 million.
- Total cost: $52 million.

Lake Eildon can now be said to serve four main purposes — irrigation, power production, flood mitigation, and recreation. While the lake's three first-mentioned functions go along quietly, efficiently and in Victoria's interest, the fourth function, that of catering for the individual tastes in recreation are expanding. Fishing, swimming, water skiing, and boating are becoming increasingly popular.

Boating Control

Boating on the lake is controlled by the S.R. & W.S.C. which has erected speed limit signs at the entrances of various bays and estuaries. The following rules must be observed:
1. The spillway is prohibited for public use at all times.
2. The pondage lake is closed to boating and swimming and can be used only for bank fishing.
3. All boats must keep 100 yards from the temperature sounding buoy anchored midway between the point of Mt. Sugarloaf and Rennie Inlet.
4. All boats must keep 100 yards from the intake tower at the western end of the dam.
5. Lake Eildon foreshore generally — Except in proclaimed access lanes and areas excluded from public use, the waters of Lake Eildon for an off-shore distance of 200 ft. from the edge of the water at any particular time — Three miles an hour speed limit. Movement of boats parallel to the shore in the foreshore zone — Three miles an hour speed limit. Control is by the Motor Boat Police.

Constructed launching ramps for boats are available at Eildon Boat Harbour, Jerusalem Creek, Goughs Bay, Bonnie Doon, and at Coller Bay in the Fraser National Park. Launching of boats may also be carried out via sections of the many old roads which were flooded by the lake in the Mansfield and Jamieson areas.

SURROUNDING TOWNS AND POINTS OF INTEREST

MT. BULLER

Thirty miles east of Mansfield is the snow resort of Mt. Buller which rises 5,934 ft. above sea level. Beyond Mirimbah, 20 miles from Mansfield, a winding gravel road leads to the Alpine Village.

In winter the road is snow-ploughed as far as the parking area. The state of the surface varies with the weather and occasionally chains are required. A fee is charged for roadside parking on a daily and weekly basis. Four-wheel drive transport conveys skiers to the village.

Mt. Buller is usually covered by a good depth of snow from June to October. The terrain is varied and offers excellent slopes for all grades of skiers, with cleared runs of up to 1,300 vertical feet.

Five establishments provide public accommodation and a general store and Post Office stocks fresh food, grocery lines, ski equipment, liquid gas, and provides telephone and postal services.

BUXTON

This small township is very prettily situated on the Acheron River near its junction with the Steavenson River. A road from Buxton which becomes Keppels Lane, leads to the southern end of the Cathedral Range.

RUBICON

In the area about 4 miles south of Thornton is one of the oldest hydroelectric projects in Victoria. It consists of several small dams and the Rubicon power station. Nearby there are opportunities for fishing.
Many UFOs Are Identified as Plasmas

By Philip J. Klass

Washington—Hundreds of "unidentified flying objects" exhibit characteristics that clearly identify them as plasmas. In most cases they are plasmas of ionized air, sometimes containing charged dust particles. A few may be vortices of tiny charged ice particles.

Their erratic behavior is that of a mass of charged particles, attracted to other objects with unlike charge, repelled by those with the same polarity. These characteristics do not substantiate claims of "intelligent control."

But data sifted from the numerous UFO sightings could provide valuable insights into both atmospheric and plasma physics by showing that nature occasionally achieves what present-day theory finds impossible to explain fully.

The data could, for example, increase knowledge of the basic mechanisms involved in thunderstorms and tornado generation and propagation. It might even advance the understanding of plasma containment for fusion power use.

The lack of a full scientific theory to explain all aspects of the several forms of plasma observed in UFOs stems in part from the complex interactions that occur in plasma physics and atmospheric electrics, both involved in the phenomena. Few if any scientists working in either field have interested themselves in UFOs enough to analyze the hundreds of sightings in detail, so far as can be determined.

On Aug. 22, AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY (p. 48) advanced a theory that many low-altitude UFOs were a form of ball lightning (plasma), also called kugelblitz, that is generated by lightning or by corona discharge along high-voltage power lines under appropriate conditions. The idea was prompted by numerous UFO sightings observed on or near high-tension lines, especially at Exeter, N. H., last year, and the remarkable similarity of their characteristics to those reported for some kugelblitz sightings.

Since then, it has been learned that a mathematical model advanced by two Yeshiva University scientists to explain one form of ball lightning confirms the possibility that such objects could be generated by power line corona.

Subsequent analysis of many additional UFO reports provides added evidence in support of the initial theory and reveals that high-altitude UFOs also exhibit the plasma fingerprint. These could be created by electric discharge between clouds or between invisible layers of charged dust/ice particles.

Occasional daylight sightings of what have been reported as well-structured or silhouetted objects are explainable as plasmas that give the illusion of metal structure, possibly due to whirling charged dust or ice particles.

These conclusions stem from analysis of reports collected by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (Nicap), a private organization whose official view is that UFOs are "manifestations of extraterrestrial life." The 746 sightings selected by Nicap for the report, "The UFO Evidence," are called its "most reliable and significant."

If, as Nicap contends, the sightings in this report show strong evidence that UFOs are extraterrestrial in origin, they should provide the toughest possible hurdle for the alternative explanation that UFOs are merely one of several forms of plasma. For this reason the following analysis uses Nicap UFO sighting data exclusively. All observations and quotations cited below are from the Nicap report, unless otherwise indicated.

Aviation Week & Space Technology, October 3, 1966
It was photographed near Beaver, Pa. A man-made kugelblitz, or ball lightning, generated by the Atomic Energy Commission's Brookhaven National Laboratory, is shown above. Right, the laboratory used a radio frequency of about 75 mc. produced by an induction oven built by Radio Frequency Corp. Diameter of the luminous plasma is about 8 in. The experiments indicate that metastable forms of nitrogen and oxygen molecules are involved in the phenomena.

While Nicap sightings do not provide any significant evidence of extraterrestrial visitors, they do provide a wealth of observations on phenomena that scientists are struggling to understand in the fields of plasma and atmospheric physics.

Of more than a dozen specialists in these fields contacted by AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY, not one indicated prior interest in UFOs sufficient to justify a detailed study of reported sightings. Generally they dismissed the phenomena as “the work of crackpots,” as one phrased it. This could explain why the plasma fingerprint of UFOs was not spotted earlier by most scientists.

But the marked similarity had been noted by others. More than a year ago, the president of a small company in Medfield, Mass., that produces radio frequency induction furnaces observed that occasionally a spark discharge would form into a ball of ionized air. These exhibited extended lifetimes. The company, Radio Frequency Corp., uses a radio frequency exciter operating at 75 mc. that feeds an aluminum box measuring approximately 8 ft. cubed whose dimensions make it a tuned cavity at this frequency.

Fred Manwaring, RFC's president, says that using this tuned cavity “we can produce balls of ionized air that will last all day, if you want, so long as the RF power remains on.” Quite unknowingly the company had demonstrated elements of a theory advanced in 1955 by Rex Heflin, a former policeman, who said the object silhouetted against the sky was about 30 ft. across and nearly 700 ft from camera. USAF analysts said the object was 13 ft. across and only a few feet away. Original Polaroid print has been lost. For comparison, the lower photo shows an automobile about 200 ft. away.
Erratic Blip Shows Plasma Characteristics

On Mar. 10, 1954, at about 3 a.m. on a clear night, an Air Force control tower operator spotted a target on his radar that was "at least as big as any of our larger transport planes."

He followed it on his radar to within 5 mi. of the base and then to his surprise, it suddenly stopped. It remained fixed in the same position for about 30 min., according to a report of the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (see story).

An inbound Douglas C-124 Globemaster was vectored on an intercept heading toward the unidentified object. The crew was alerted to look for it. "Then, when it seemed that the two [blips] would collide, at about a 500-m. separation on the scope, the stationary object simply disappeared, vanished."

"During the encounter, the operator said: "How anything could vanish so suddenly from a radar screen without leaving a trace of what direction it went is really amazing."

The answer is that when the plasma's energy collapses rapidly it can easily disappear in the several seconds required for a 360-deg. azimuth sweep of the radar antenna. The cooled plasma becomes part of the surrounding air and no longer retains its plasma characteristics, although it has not physically departed.

Nican data shows that UFOs come in a remarkable variety of shapes, sizes, colors, motions and side effects. Even more remarkable is the evidence that UFOs can change size, color and shape while under human observation. These are not chameleonic-type changes that indicate the UFO is attempting to blend in with its background, but the reverse, as if it were seeking to attract attention.

These are precisely the changing characteristics that would be expected if the objects were plasma of ionized air that contains a variety of different elements and contaminants.

Perhaps the most remarkable of these characteristics is the observation that many UFOs can make abrupt right-angle turns, reverse directly or stop in an instant, even while traveling at very high speed. This is especially unusual for objects that occasionally are reported to be as large as a jetliner.

In this respect, UFOs appear to defy the fundamental Newtonian laws of inertia which have demonstrated their approximate validity throughout the solar system and the known universe. This apparent scientific inconsistency disappears if UFOs are plasmas, for the mass of the involved plasma is infinitesimal although the overall plasma size can appear quite large. For example, it requires only a fraction of a cubic centimeter of mercury in a fluorescent lamp to generate a plasma that fills the tube.

A commonplace example that shows the ability of charged particles to stop and change direction can be found in the picture tube of a television receiver. The electron beam stops and reverses direction more than 30,000 times per second.

On July 27, 1952, near Ann Arbor, Mich., at 10:40 a.m., 15 small UFOs were sighted. The observer reported that they "seemingly floated; one got the impression that they were of very light weight." In another sighting in the Antarctic, an observer reported seeing the UFO "abruptly dividing in two as if exploding," an easy trick for a plasma.

When UFOs take leave of their human observers, they often seem to depart at fantastic speed and sometimes vanish with the suddenness of an apparition (see box, above). One observer, reporting the departure of a UFO seen at Pompano Beach, Fla., on May 18, 1962, appropriately described its movement as being "like a flash of lightning."

Departure Description

On Jan. 8, 1959, at 5:15 p.m. near the Illinois-Wisconsin line, an observer described a UFO's departure by saying that it "seemed to go out of sight, disappear or disintegrate." Another observer on Nov. 14, 1956, near Mobile, Ala., reported that the UFO "disappeared rapidly to pinpoint and disappeared."

This will-o'-the-wisp quality of so many UFOs is again illustrated by an object sighted on Jan. 10, 1951, by a private flyer at 6,500 ft. The object appeared to glide to a landing on the outskirts of Vera, Tex., and the pilot was able to guide a police patrol car, by radio, to "within 100 yards of the landing spot."

"During this period the glow from the UFO which had been visible to [police officer] Rutledge on the ground, was diminishing to a dull red. About the time that [police officer] Some approached it unknowingly and blinked his lights, the glow from the UFO vanished completely."

The UFO itself disappeared as mysteriously as its glow, which would be logical if it were a plasma. When a plasma loses enough energy, due to a...
Variety of possible natural causes, to no longer be luminous, it looks no different than the surrounding air.

Where a UFO appears to zoom off at fantastic speed in a direction radial to the observer, it often is an optical illusion caused by the rapid collapse of the luminous core of the plasma. But actual high-speed movement also is possible, as evidenced by numerous ball lightning reports.

Nicap places great credence in the numerous radar sightings of UFOs by air defense and traffic control radars, as well as airborne radars. The reason, it explains, is that "in general, a blip on a radar always corresponds to a reflection off some solid (or liquid) surface. . . ." This simply is not true.

Radar Echo

Under most conditions, a plasma provides an excellent radar echo, usually far stronger and/or larger than an echo from a solid object, having the same dimensions. For example, the plasma wake produced by an ICBM during atmospheric entry provides a stronger radar signal than the vehicle itself.

On Mar. 29, 1957, a Pan American Airliner flying off the east coast of Florida at approximately 7:30 p.m. made a visual sighting which the crew described as a "very bright light" that "seemed to grow in intensity . . . then would subside."

The weather radar was turned on and showed a target in the same location as the visual sighting. The radar blip had an "apparent size in excess of normal aircraft," which would be expected for a plasma.

The UFO remained visible to the naked eye only for several minutes but continued to produce a radar echo for 20 min. This indicates a gradual loss of plasma energy, initially falling to where its luminosity was below the threshold of human vision but retaining sufficiently energetic particles to produce a radar echo for a much longer time.

DOD Network

The Defense Dept. maintains a very close watch on all objects in space, using high-power space-oriented Air Force radars and a Navy operated surveillance network that stretches across the entire width of the continental U.S. This network has been able to detect tiny metal strips a few inches long in orbit as well as small debris from rockets that have exploded in orbit.

If UFOs were extraterrestrial in origin, they should be detected at least occasionally by this extensive network. Yet so far Nicap data indicates, there is not a single reported sighting of UFOs outside the atmosphere but there are dozens within the atmosphere made by air defense and traffic control radars.

This is understandable only if UFOs are plasmas generated within the earth's atmosphere and not spacecraft having an extraterrestrial origin.

More than 100 UFO sightings have included some form of accompanying electromagnetic effect, such as interference with radios or television receivers or disruption of electric power.

Dr. Martin Uman of Westinghouse Research Laboratories, who advanced an explanation for some forms of ball lightning, earlier had suggested to AVIATION WEEK & SPACE TECHNOLOGY that if UFOs were plasma, and were in close proximity to a magnetic compass, they should cause its needle to spin madly. Nicap cites an incident where campers reported that their "compass needle waved wildly as the UFO passed overhead." This indicates the presence of a strong magnetic field.

The oscillating and gyrating charged particles even within a low-energy plasma such as the fluorescent lamp or commercial neon sign are well known as sources of radio interference. Another example is the plasma formed by a high-altitude nuclear blast. There are also numerous reports of radio interference effects from kugelblitz.

Some low-altitude UFO encounters are reported to have caused automobile engines to stall and/or headlamps to fail. This is explainable if the plasma envelopes the automobile battery or ignition, but it involves a density and intensity higher than some theories have suggested. A study of such reports could provide useful clues about the energy level present.

After-Effects Reported

Persons viewing UFOs at very close quarters sometimes report physiological effects or after-effects. Eyes that are bloodshot, swollen or otherwise irritated sometimes have been experienced.

An intense dosage of ultraviolet light could produce these symptoms and plasma often radiates in this part of the spectrum as well as the visible. Even the plasma within the household fluorescent lamp generates enough ultraviolet to irritate the eyes, but this is filtered out by the glass envelope.

Others have reported minor facial burns, a "prickling sensation like electric shock" and intense heat, or combinations of these. These would be expected only for certain forms of high-energy plasmas. The same effects are sometimes reported for ball lightning encounters.

One plasma specialist points out that a very-high-intensity plasma could generate X-rays. There is one report of a higher-than-normal radioactivity measurement on the ground where a UFO had "landed." The radioactivity quickly subsided as it would if produced by X-ray radiation.

An interesting polarization effect was
``The rings with glasses [on] faded to invisibility before the disk became too small to see," he noted.

Sequence of Events
Seeking a possible explanation for this effect, Aviation Week & Space Technology talked to Richard Adams, a polarization effects specialist with Polaord Corp., Cambridge, Mass. The nature of the object was not disclosed initially to Adams, only the sequence of events and observed effect.

After first ascertaining that the object was being viewed outdoors in daylight, illuminated by sky light which itself is polarized, Adams concluded that the dark rings were an interference pattern, a familiar optical effect. This indicated that the object was generating light that had a different polarization from sky light.

When Adams was asked what could cause the object’s light to have a different polarization, he replied: "A strong magnetic field, for example." Such a magnetic field would be present in at least some plasma.

Although UFOs are usually said to be noiseless, this is based on a comparison with the sound of aircraft and other known sources. The noise of a UFO can be described by a "humming" or "whirring" sound when hovering or moving slowly. This correlates closely with the sounds reported for ball lightning, when any sound is heard.

These same words could be used to describe the noise made by a neon sign or a fluorescent lamp.

Explosive Noise
During rapid acceleration or high-speed flight, UFOs occasionally produce "sharp explosive noise," Nicap says. Ball lightning can disappear by collapsing silently, or with a loud bang, according to many observers.

Analysis of hundreds of Nicap reports reveals that the two adjectives most frequently used to describe night sightings are "glowing" and "luminous." Other frequently used adjectives are "phosphorescent" and "fluorescent." It is impossible to find more precise adjectives to describe the appearance of a plasma.

Cigar-shaped glow, a man-made plasma generated by arc discharge in an air-filled tube, exhibits characteristics typical of unidentified flying objects. The display was generated at Morehead Planetarium of the University of North Carolina. The planetarium has generated "unidentified flying objects" in a variety of shapes and colors, and even formations. One of two electrodes used for excitation is at right.

One observer quoted in the recent book "Incident at Exeter" described the appearance of the UFO as "eerie, like a neon sign." Three UFOs seen near Dubuque, Iowa, on Mar. 4, 1960, were described as "glowing a neon-like blue-white."

The variety of colors and the ability to change color quickly, as reported for many UFOs in night sightings, dovetails perfectly with the characteristics of a plasma. The color ascribed by a plasma depends not only upon its constituent materials, which for air includes oxygen, nitrogen, carbon dioxide plus such gases as argon, helium and neon, but also on its internal energy level as well. As the internal energy changes the plasma color can change dramatically.

The nitrogen present in air will generate a bluish glow when energy is high, and the color will shift to red as energy is dissipated. At certain energy levels, where the atoms and molecules of many elements in the air are all excited, the variety of colors radiated will combine to give a predominantly white glow with periodic flashes of many individual colors.

The most frequently reported colors for both UFOs and ball lightning, are orange-red and white, with an astrono­
mical observation of blue and green. There are almost no reports of violet.

Because internal energy level can influence dynamic behavior of a plasma as well as its color, changes in motion should often be accompanied by changes in plasma color. In one group of UFO sightings, Nicap found that 28% of the observers reported a color change that "occurred during... and seemed to be associated with [UFO] acceleration."

In a group of nine sightings where the UFO changed color, the shift always was toward the red end of the spectrum, which would be expected for plasmas that were dissipating their internal energy.

Effect of Sunlight
Colors seldom are reported for daylight sightings. This is understandable if UFOs are plasmas. Their luminosity, which can seem quite bright at night, is easily washed out in bright sunlight. The adjectives most frequently used by observers to describe daylight encounters are "silver/metallic" and "white," in about equal proportions. Other adjectives include "reflective," "gray," and "silhouette."

Objects with a metallic or silhouette appearance might seem to defy explanation as plasmas but this is not the case; the human eye can be tricked easily when viewing the unfamiliar. On Mar. 18, 1950, a private pilot flying near Bradford, Ill., at 8:40 a.m. spotted what he described as a "metallic appearing disk... the UFO shone in the sunlight," or so it first seemed. But when the object flew below an over­cast, it "continued to glow, indicating that it was self-illuminated," the observer noted.

On Sept. 26, 1963, at Sunnyvale, Calif., a policeman saw an object the size of a basketball at a distance of
C-5A Air Data Computer Shown at Farnborough

Elliott-Automation's modular central air data computer that will be used on the USAF/Lockheed C-5A heavy logistics transport was displayed at the Farnborough Air Show. The company has received a contract from Lockheed to supply the device, which is composed of different combinations of a basic series of mechanically compatible modules for military and civil aircraft. It is also being used on the Hawker Siddeley HS 801, Avro 748, BAC 111, and the proposed Anglo-French Concorde.

approximately 8 ft. "The disk appeared grayish in color except when the small spot of light lighted up about every 3-4 sec. The color then changed to yellowish-white, some trace of orange ... this produced a pulsing effect every 3-4 sec."

What had begun as a "grayish" object now "gave an eerie lighted haze or mist illumination of the area just outside the disk circle itself as if it were glowing or surrounded by a gas or thin cloud, halo, etc."

The optical illusion that the objects are metallic or solid would be enhanced if some UFOs involve a "cold plasma" or charged dust particles, or ice particles at high altitude. These could be set to whirling by electrostatic and other natural forces and would then assume a body-of-revolution shape which would include spherical, ellipsoid (cigar-shaped) and circular.

At least two American scientists have suggested ball-lightning theories in which charged dust particles play a key role. This idea may have stemmed from the fact that some reports of ball lightning in years past noted that it was seen to emerge from a chimney or fire place, suggesting that carbon or dust particles had a role in its formation.

On Nov. 5, 1955, near Cleveland, Ohio, at approximately 6 p.m., a UFO was reported in which "an intensely white glow or beam or light shone steadily. ... The light rays were so bright we could see air dust in them." The UFO's color was described by one observer as "weathered aluminum," and by others as "pearly aluminum." Observers seldom use the term "aluminum" without adding a qualifying adjective.

A thunderstorm physics specialist at Arthur D. Little, Inc., Dr. Bernard Vonnegut, has demonstrated in the laboratory that tiny charged ice particles in the presence of a strong electric field will orient their surfaces parallel to one another. Such strong fields exist during thunderstorms but also are found in clear weather and at long distances from thunderstorms.

Depending upon the angle of incidence of sunlight striking these thousands of tiny mirror surfaces, it can be reflected without the means of reflection being apparent or visible to a human observer. This, Vonnegut says, can create strange optical effects and would explain a pilot's observation while flying above a thunderstorm of a bright band that suddenly moved across the anvil of the cloud.

If the angle of incidence of sunlight playing on a vortex of ice crystals aligned by electric fields were such that reflected light was directed away from an observer, it conceivably could pro-
duce a silhouette effect, although Von-negar did not speculate on this in his original scientific report.

But if the airborne vortex contains charged dust particles, similarly aligned by electric fields present in the atmosphere, a very pronounced silhouetted object could result. If electric discharge is taking place within the vortex between charged dust particles, as has been suggested by some ball lightning theories, it could easily create the illusion of a solid spacecraft with small lighted windows.

Flying Particles Observed

Flying vortices of charged dust and sand particles have been observed frequently in desert areas. They are commonly called "dust devils" or "dust devishes." One measured by Dr. G. D. Freir of the University of Minnesota in the Sahara showed an electric field intensity as high as 400 v. at an altitude of 300-600 ft. and a proximity no closer than 100 ft. The dust devil had a diameter estimated at 25 ft. In the presence of a strong atmospheric fields, small dust devils should be able to reach even higher altitude.

Those who hold that UFOs are extraterrestrial visitors contend that their behavior demonstrates "intelligent control." Some airborne UFOs, for example, seem to exhibit a curiosity about aircraft, while lower flying ones show a similar interest in automobiles or trains.

Often UFOs seem to be playing a game of tag with an airplane or automobile, and not infrequently will "buzz" them in what can only be described as a "hot-rodder's game of chicken."

"Intelligent Control"

There are reports of military jet fighter pilots who have attempted to close upon a UFO, only to have it suddenly zoom ahead when the aircraft comes near. Then the UFO sits and waits until the aircraft has nearly closed again. Then, the sequence is repeated. At other times the UFO darts at the aircraft on a collision course, often coming out of the clouds at nearly vertical angles of climb or descent. In some encounters, the UFO will circle an aircraft in flight as if inspecting it. This, it is claimed, demonstrates "intelligent control."

Such behavior merely demonstrates the well known physical law that two charged objects having opposite electric polarity will attract and two having identical polarities will repel. Aircraft fuselages usually carry a charge, sometimes a very high one, acquired from impact with charged vapor and dust particles in the air. Jet aircraft also acquire a charge from their turbine engines.

There is evidence that indicates that one type of kugelschitz generates its own "magnetic bottle" which sustains it, although not all forms achieve magnetic containment. One theory advanced to explain ball lightning suggests that its stability comes from a core of spiraling electrons surrounded by a crust of positive ions.

Under these and other conditions, a plasma should behave as previously described, being attracted to the aircraft when the two have opposite charges, repelled when they have the same. When attractive forces exist but are too low to enable the plasma to penetrate the aircraft windstream, it could be dragged along by electrostatic forces in the vicinity of the aircraft, easily giving the appearance of "flying formation."

When the plasma charge dissipates sufficiently it will depart or disappear. If aircraft and its plasma come near a stronger electric field, such as a cloud, the plasma may zoom off toward such a field.

A jet fighter attempting to close on a plasma having the opposite charge has a hopeless task, for so long as the plasma's charge persists it will avoid interception.

When the charge dissipates, the UFO will vanish in thin air, as frequently happens.

A typical encounter cited by Nicap occurred during World War 2 on Aug. 10, 1944, while a bomber was returning from a strike in Sumatra. The aircraft was flying at 14,000 ft., above "broken clouds with an overcast above us," when the crew spotted a "very bright
and intense red or orange" object pacing the aircraft off the starboard wing. Its distance was estimated at 1,500 ft and its diameter at 5-6 ft.

The airplane commander said it "seemed to have a halo effect...to throb or vibrate constantly." When he took evasive action, changing heading by as much as 90 deg. and altitude by 2,000 ft, the object followed doggedly for 8 min.

"When it left, it made an abrupt 90-deg. turn, up and accelerating rapidly; it disappeared in the overcast."

Another Report

One private flyer on Aug. 15, 1957, near Woodlawn Hills, Calif., observed a UFO "hovering between two drifting stratus clouds."

A book he purchased a year ago, written by two Nicap members, will cite evidence to show that UFOs have been scotching the earth for at least 200 years. It seems more than mere coincidence that a book entitled "Der Kugellitz," by Walther Brand, published in Germany in 1923, presents 600 accounts of ball lightning that date back to 1665, and a Russian report published in 1954 refers to a brief mention of ball lightning in 60 B.C. by the Roman poet Lucretius.

If extraterrestrial visitors have scotched the earth for at least 200 years, perhaps for close to 2,000, it is difficult to understand why they have not attempted to establish contact through formal channels. "After all, Columbus did not spend 200 years scotching the New World before landing to see if the Indians were friendly," is the way one skeptic puts it. "This indicates great scientific curiosity but no courage," he adds.

Nicap Explanation

Nicap officials have a ready explanation for this. Extraterrestrial visitors, they explain, may be fearful of creating widespread panic on earth if their existence and presence were known.

For this reason they prefer to observe in secrecy.

But this makes it even more difficult to explain the curious buzzing maneuvers and games of tag that UFOs seem to play with dozens of aircraft and cars, or the low-level visitations within sight of human observers—unless the UFOs are plasmas.

If secret observation is the intent, the very actions of UFOs have defeated this purpose. For example, a recent Gallup Poll indicates that at least half of the adult population in America is aware of UFOs and believes something is being seen.

Faced with this serious contradiction, Nicap officials have another ready explanation: It is not possible to use such "earth-logic" in trying to understand the actions of extraterrestrial visitors. This precludes any further effort aimed at rationalizing the contradiction.

There are almost as many theories available to explain ball lightning as there are scientists interested in the phenomena. Most scientists agree that no single theory yet advanced, their own included, can explain all reported kugellitz characteristics.

This leads many to conclude that there are at least two, perhaps more, different but related phenomena involved. The high-altitude UFO type plasmas may involve still other triggering and/or sustaining mechanisms. But all are believed to be sharing a common family tree.

The late French astronomer Camille Flammarion, in a book, "Thunder and Lightning" published more than 60 years ago, devoted an entire chapter to "Fireballs."

He called them "the most mysterious and certainly the least understood domain of thunder and lighting."

Matching Reports

Flammarion recounted stories of kugellitz seen 100-200 years ago whose reported characteristics closely match those of more recent surveys by competent American scientists. These include surveys by Warren D. Rayle of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Lewis Research Center, Dr. Edmond M. Dewan of Air Force Cambridge Research Laboratories and Dr. J. R. McNally of the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

At the turn of the century Flammarion wrote: "We must confess that if spherical lightning seems particularly capricious, it is because we are still ignorant of the laws which guide it. Our ignorance alone is the cause of the mystery.... We try to reproduce fireballs artificially [in laboratories] but the problem is complicated and its solution presents enormous difficulties."

These words are almost as valid today as when they were first written many decades ago. The boon, trans...
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10 a given contaminants or crsity. One could accept a few UFO plasmas, as encountered during or derstorms. Lightning may involve radioactivity, which can be found many miles from the site of the electric charge. Daily lightning, and derstorn phenomenon, can be explained by the presence of a magnetic field in the air. Corona discharge on the power line itself could provide added opportunities for the mechanism to be triggered, as the many sightings at Exeter demonstrated.

The Finkelstein-Ruben theory explains that a kugelblitz triggered by a small electric discharge under suitable conditions can have a lifetime of many minutes, perhaps even hours, without the need for generating a magnetic field to contain the plasma. Additional modifications of the basic theory have been suggested by recent experiments at Brookhaven National Laboratory using RF's Macrowave Oven. Dr. Finkelstein said recently. Based on experiments there conducted by Dr. James Powell, Finkelstein now believes that metastable forms of molecular nitrogen and oxygen, excited high-energy long-lived states, support the extended luminosity in ball lightning. The excitation of metastable atoms and molecules is a process also involved in laser action.

When the RF induction furnace is operated without benefit of a room-size cavity to help sustain the plasma, Powell reports he has achieved plasmas that can sustain themselves for up to 1 sec. after RF power is removed. This is not long compared with even natural ball lightning lifetimes, "but it is 100 times longer than such plasmas usually last," according to Powell.

Still longer lifetimes will be possible when the apparatus is modified to prevent vaporized metal electrode particles from entering the plasma. These collide with the metastable oxygen and nitrogen atoms/molecules and quickly rob them of their energy, causing collapse of the plasma.

Another theory involving a special type of plasma that could achieve stable containment for extended periods through a combination of magnetic, centrifugal and coulomb forces has been devised by Carsten Haaland of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Under Haaland's concept the plasma might take the geometrical form of a "trefoil knot," a three-dimensional atmospheric pressure, for example, among other factors.

Certain limitations of this theory disapprove if the corona discharge occurs in the presence of an alternating rather than direct current field, according to an extension suggested by Dr. Dewan. This would be true even at low frequencies such as the 60 cps, used for electric power transmission.

Added Opportunities

This describes precisely the situation that would be found in the vicinity of a high-tension power line, as theorized by Aviation Week & Space Technology. But the initial discharge need not await the appropriate inhomogeneity in the air. Corona discharge on the power line itself could provide added opportunities for the mechanism to be triggered, as the many sightings at Exeter demonstrated.

Air Contaminants' Role

There is cause to speculate that air contaminants also play a role in some UFO plasmas, as evidenced by the frequent encounters that often occur in a given geographic area within a matter of hours or days, after which few if any are sighted. One theory that has gained growing acceptance as an explanation for at least some types of kugelblitz is that advanced by Dr. David Finkelstein of City College of New York. It explains kugelblitz as a detached corona discharge, or a type of free-floating St. Elmo's fire, as Dr. Finkelstein sums it up.

It can be triggered by a dielectric inhomogeneity in air in the presence of a d.c. electric field such as those encountered during or following thunderstorms. This inhomogeneity concentrates electric lines of force until they cause a small localized corona discharge. Strong electric fields are often found many miles away from the thunderstorm itself.

This discharge causes an additional concentration of electric field lines which in turn causes the discharge, or plasma, to grow, and the process continues until a stable size is reached. This size could be influenced by local conditions, such as atmospheric pressure, for example, among other factors.

Certain limitations of this theory disappear if the corona discharge occurs in the presence of an alternating current field, according to an extension suggested by Dr. Dewan. This would be true even at low frequencies such as the 60 cps, used for electric power transmission.

Add Opportunity

This describes precisely the situation that would be found in the vicinity of a high-tension power line, as theorized by Aviation Week & Space Technology. But the initial discharge need not await the appropriate inhomogeneity in the air. Corona discharge on the power line itself could provide added opportunities for the mechanism to be triggered, as the many sightings at Exeter demonstrated.

The Finkelstein-Ruben theory explains that a kugelblitz triggered by a small electric discharge under suitable conditions can have a lifetime of many minutes, perhaps even hours, without the need for generating a magnetic field to contain the plasma. Additional modifications of the basic theory have been suggested by recent experiments at Brookhaven National Laboratory using RF's Macrowave Oven. Dr. Finkelstein said recently. Based on experiments there conducted by Dr. James Powell, Finkelstein now believes that metastable forms of molecular nitrogen and oxygen, excited high-energy long-lived states, support the extended luminosity in ball lightning. The excitation of metastable atoms and molecules is a process also involved in laser action.

When the RF induction furnace is operated without benefit of a room-size cavity to help sustain the plasma, Powell reports he has achieved plasmas that can sustain themselves for up to 1 sec. after RF power is removed. This is not long compared with even natural ball lightning lifetimes, "but it is 100 times longer than such plasmas usually last," according to Powell.

Still longer lifetimes will be possible when the apparatus is modified to prevent vaporized metal electrode particles from entering the plasma. These collide with the metastable oxygen and nitrogen atoms/molecules and quickly rob them of their energy, causing collapse of the plasma.

Another theory involving a special type of plasma that could achieve stable containment for extended periods through a combination of magnetic, centrifugal and coulomb forces has been devised by Carsten Haaland of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Under Haaland's concept the plasma might take the geometrical form of a "trefoil knot," a three-dimensional atmospheric pressure, for example, among other factors.

Certain limitations of this theory disappear if the corona discharge occurs in the presence of an alternating current field, according to an extension suggested by Dr. Dewan. This would be true even at low frequencies such as the 60 cps, used for electric power transmission.

Add Opportunity

This describes precisely the situation that would be found in the vicinity of a high-tension power line, as theorized by Aviation Week & Space Technology. But the initial discharge need not await the appropriate inhomogeneity in the air. Corona discharge on the power line itself could provide added opportunities for the mechanism to be triggered, as the many sightings at Exeter demonstrated.

The Finkelstein-Ruben theory explains that a kugelblitz triggered by a small electric discharge under suitable conditions can have a lifetime of many minutes, perhaps even hours, without the need for generating a magnetic field to contain the plasma. Additional modifications of the basic theory have been suggested by recent experiments at Brookhaven National Laboratory using RF's Macrowave Oven. Dr. Finkelstein said recently. Based on experiments there conducted by Dr. James Powell, Finkelstein now believes that metastable forms of molecular nitrogen and oxygen, excited high-energy long-lived states, support the extended luminosity in ball lightning. The excitation of metastable atoms and molecules is a process also involved in laser action.

When the RF induction furnace is operated without benefit of a room-size cavity to help sustain the plasma, Powell reports he has achieved plasmas that can sustain themselves for up to 1 sec. after RF power is removed. This is not long compared with even natural ball lightning lifetimes, "but it is 100 times longer than such plasmas usually last," according to Powell.

Still longer lifetimes will be possible when the apparatus is modified to prevent vaporized metal electrode particles from entering the plasma. These collide with the metastable oxygen and nitrogen atoms/molecules and quickly rob them of their energy, causing collapse of the plasma.

Another theory involving a special type of plasma that could achieve stable containment for extended periods through a combination of magnetic, centrifugal and coulomb forces has been devised by Carsten Haaland of Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Under Haaland's concept the plasma might take the geometrical form of a "trefoil knot," a three-dimensional atmospheric pressure, for example, among other factors.

Certain limitations of this theory disappear if the corona discharge occurs in the presence of an alternating current field, according to an extension suggested by Dr. Dewan. This would be true even at low frequencies such as the 60 cps, used for electric power transmission.
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"Preposterous Possibility"

"This possibility seems preposterous in many ways," Dewan wrote, "but since the mere existence of kugelblitz is almost 'preposterous', we are not at this time in a position to ignore any possibility." "Almost no inanimate natural phenomenon," Dr. Dewan wrote, exceeds the extent to which the kugelblitz mocks science by its complete lack of even a plausible hypothesis." Since that was written early in 1964, modest progress has been made in this field.

When scientists working in atmospheric and plasma physics recognize UFOs as an unusual plasma phenomena and begin to study some of the many reported observations, it may show that under freak conditions nature is accomplishing "the impossible." Invariably, demonstrations such as these later produce logical scientific explanations.

Observations Misinterpreted

Nicap itself does a moderately good job of weeding out the "crackpot reports," as evidenced by the fact that the fingerprints of plasma phenomena are clearly evident even though some observers misinterpret their observations as evidence of extraterrestrial visitors.

Even more valuable data could be obtained if UFO observations were collected by a scientific organization that had no preconceived ideas as to the nature of the objects. A new reporting form designed to elicit data having special value to scientists in plasma and atmospheric physics also would be helpful.
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Spectacular corona display along General Electric's experimental 500,000-v. transmission line near Pittsfield was produced by application of more than 120% of rated voltage. Corona also is induced by dirt, salt crystals or other foreign particles on the line or insulators. An extremely high voltage gradient can develop across these, exceeding breakdown voltage of air.

Plasma Theory May Explain Many UFOs

By Philip J. Klass

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

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

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

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

Most of the UFO sightings in the Exeter area occurred along or very near to high-tension power lines, according to the author. The same is true of two other sightings he investigated in western Pennsylvania and others reported at the time of the Northeast power blackout last November. Fuller speculates that the extra-terrestrial spacecraft may be attracted to the power lines as a source of energy for refueling their propulsion systems.

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

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

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

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

- Color: Ball lightning is multi-colored, but red is the most prevalent color reported, followed by intense bluish-white and green. A vast majority of the sightings reported from Exeter and the object was red, while the remainder were either bluish-white, green, or a combination of all of these.
- Shape: Ball lightning normally is either spherical or ellipsoidal with star-like configurations at the top or base, but the Exeter sightings were mostly round, oval-shaped or doughnut-shaped.
- Sound: Ball lightning is often so...
Ionized plasmas produced by electric discharge in laboratories of Illinois Institute of Technology's Research Institute several years ago show some of the characteristic shapes of UFO sightings. However, these pictures were made with extremely short film exposure times of 0.2-0.5 microsec, far briefer than the Lucci photo (below).

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

So long as a transmission line and its insulators are clean and suitably designed, corona does not normally occur. But if small particles of dust or salt crystals, for example, become affixed to the line or insulators they can trigger the corona, according to Darrell Shankle, manager of field research in Westinghouse Electric's electric utility operations. The reason is that an extremely high-voltage gradient develops across the dust or salt crystal which exceeds the breakdown voltage of air. Even flying insects that alight on the line can trigger a corona. For example, during the months of August and September a very high-voltage transmission line in West Virginia experiences frequent coronas caused by "flying spiders" that are carried by the winds and alight on the lines, according to Shankle.

Transmission lines near the ocean are also susceptible to corona because salt crystals deposit on the lines and insulators, according to A. F. Rohlf, manager of high voltage development for General Electric at Pittsfield, Mass. Exeter is located only 10 mi. from the ocean. The power lines of the Exeter and Hampton Electric Co., which were involved in the sightings, run right down to the ocean beach beyond Hampton. The company's chief engineer, Stanley Sawyer, says that corona occurs more frequently "when there is not much rain to clean off the lines."

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

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

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

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

Analyzing the returns, McNally concluded that ball lightning can originate randomly in space but is most often seen in proximity to wires or structures. It is usually airborne or partially airborne, moving randomly in space or along electric conductors. It often exhibits rolling, tumbling or spinning motions.

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

Many of the ball lightning sightings reported by persons surveyed by McNally occurred on or near power lines. Many different theories and mathematical models have been advanced by scientists here and abroad to explain the basic mechanism which generates ball lightning and the internal-external forces that enable it to survive for extended periods.

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

This theory suggests that ball lightning is a luminous, high-temperature region of air having high electrical conductivity that has been heated to the required temperature by a stroke of lightning under suitable conditions. When cloud-to-ground lightning currents are symmetrical through the ball, they can heat the atmospheric air to the ionization point, enabling ball lightning to then occur.
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Transmission Grating

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Another scientist working in the field, who declined to be quoted by name, was asked if he could positively exclude the possibility that power line corona could generate ball lightning. He re-
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WESCON 1966 starts tomorrow and 8 is the number of the week! We'll explain. This year's show is "8-great-shows-in-one" featuring 8 special product areas from communication and detection to computers and space control systems. (There are 5 other areas to see.) And we're happy to announce that our eighth puzzle booklet, Problematical Recreations, is available to all problem solvers during WESCON. Pick up your free copy at the Litton booth #1507. We'll be on the main floor of the Los Angeles Sports Arena displaying our latest advances and new products. Hope to see you the 23rd through the 26th!

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

LITTON INDUSTRIES
Beverly Hills, California
Increasing knowledge of plasmas, their generation and containment has been gained from recent AECL programs to develop fusion power. If the efforts of a few competent plasma scientists can be directed toward ball lightning and its possible relationship to electric corona, it may be possible to explain at least some, if not many, of the UFO sightings.

Wideband Video in Digital Form Transmitted Over Laser System

By Barry Miller

Los Angeles—Feasibility of transmitting wideband television in digital form over a laser communications system was demonstrated recently by Hughes Aircraft Co.

The Hughes system has transmitted digitized television data at a rate of 30 megabits/sec, roughly the equivalent of about 15 mc. of bandwidth.

The work with an ionized argon laser communications system is part of National Aeronautics and Space Administration's efforts to explore very high data rate laser systems for possible use in relaying information between spacecraft at interplanetary distances and earth (Air & Space Apr. 12, 1965, p. 34). Laser systems are attractive for this application because of the four or five orders of magnitude potential improvement in bandwidth resulting from the use of shorter wavelengths in the optical region rather than microwaves.

If power line corona and air contaminants do play a key role in generating ball lightning, it could explain the increasing frequency of UFO sightings in recent years. During this period there has been increasing pollution of the atmosphere and expanding numbers of power lines operating at ever higher voltages which increase the likelihood of corona.

Developed under contract to the space agency's Manned Spacecraft Center, it is now being field tested here in Los Angeles County. A similar system differing only in the type of laser and in the modulation scheme is being developed by International Telephone and Telegraph Corp.'s ITTFL-Aerospace for Marshall Space Flight Center. The two NASA centers intend to use their respective systems for further evaluation of laser communications technology.

Tests of the Hughes system are being conducted over a 42-mi. path from nearby Baldwin Hills to the company's facilities at Culver City. Television test patterns photographed on the TV monitor at the receiving link indicate a picture resolution in excess of 400 lines, thereby exceeding original NASA requirements. During tests on a clear evening late last month, resolution of the test pattern appeared to this reporter to be closer to 500 lines.

By feeding a ramp function through the communications link, Hughes engineers were able to show that they could obtain the eight shades of grey required by NASA for TV pictures. An alternate mode involving a rather complex switching process will yield a wider grey scale, they say.

In tests over the Baldwin Hills-Culver City path, the system has demonstrated a 50-db. system margin.

Besides transmitting a single 5-mc. TV channel, the system simultaneously can send a 4-ke. voice and a 1-ke. telemetry channel by multiplexing. Voice quality during TV transmission is good.

An unusual form of optical pulse code modulation, called pulse code modulation/polarized light (PCM/PL), is employed in the Hughes system and will be one of two techniques explored in the ITT effort. In this modulation scheme, a digital "one" is transmitted as right circular polarization and a "zero" is sent as left circular polarization. The modulator itself is a series of, in this case, 10 potassium dihydrogen phosphate (KDP) crystals.

Visible light emerging from the 2-w. argon laser is directed through the 20-in. row of crystals at a 45-deg. angle. Transistor-supplied voltage across the bank of crystals is varied as a function of the impressed information, retarding one component of the light beam with respect to the quadrature component.

The large number of crystals is needed to permit operation with the relatively low voltages supplied by transistorized circuits.

The light beam is then transmitted as polarized modulation, rather than as an amplitude-modulated signal after it has been put through an analyzer. Earlier
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