

UFOS ACTIVE IN INDIA

MORE PIECES OF THE PUZZLE

STRANGE MATERIAL

A recent letter from a member who had the opportunity to inspect some rather strange material in 1963, adds to the information APRO has on file concerning strange materials related to landed or crashed discs. To wit:

Said member (who will remain anonymous but whose information and name are on file at Headquarters) claims that he had the opportunity to handle and inspect some unusual material at Milhoff Steel Products of Bloomington, Minnesota in 1963. The material, he said, was being manufactured by the 3M Company (Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing) under a contract with the Honeywell Company. He also claimed that the material was being used on a classified project for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA).

This same member directs our attention to Page 9 of "The Roswell Incident-Update and Conclusion", a paper by author William B. Moore, delivered at the UFO Ohio Symposium in Cleveland, Ohio in June, 1981. This paper describes material whose physical characteristics closely resemble those of the following described material: (Available from APRO at \$3.50 postpaid).

Our informant said that at first glance, the material he examined appeared to be aluminum or lead foil. When handled, it felt like plastic. It would not tear, and when stretched very taught between two vises and struck with a two pound hammer, the hammer bounded back as though it had struck a trampoline.

The material could be crumpled into a ball, but if left alone, would return to its original state (flat, absolutely smooth) within 6 seconds.

At the end of the work day during which he examined this material, he folded it into a 1½ inch square and placed it under 20 tons pressure, and left it overnight. The next day, when taken out of the press, and allowed to lie at rest, it once again took its original form.

Although the material could be stretched, it returned to its original shape in seconds, yet it could be cut very easily with a razor blade. It was about 4 mil thick, but its weight was practically nothing.

Our informant, at the end of his description, points

(See Puzzle—Page Two)

Dr. Arun Vajpey has forwarded details of two UFO sightings which took place in India in the early part of 1982. His original information consisted of very small press notices, but after investigation, they yielded some interesting information. The end result demonstrates what can be learned if sufficient energy is applied to investigation.

FORMATION OF FOUR

The "Nagpur Times" of February 19, 1982, carried an account of a sighting at Kanker, located in the Bastar district of Madhya Pradesh state. Kanker is a town of about 15,000 population, mostly farmers and plantation workers, and Bastar is a barren region and one of the most underdeveloped parts of India.

Although there were many witnesses, Dr. Vajpey was able to contact Mr. Prithviraj Golcha, a senior lecturer at the Kanker high school. Mr. Golcha's report is as follows:

"On the evening of the 16th of February 1982, at 6:40 p.m., I was walking along a field just outside Kanker. Suddenly, I noticed four round-shaped objects in the sky; they were very "cloudy" at first (hazy? - AV) but gradually turned white. Two of them later turned orange; after about ten minutes three turned white again but one remained orange. For the most part, all four UFOs appeared to be stationary and 'hovering'; but at times they moved with a swaying motion. The entire phenomenon lasted for about 40 minutes and there was *no sound* of any sort throughout."

Dr. Vajpey comments: "There were many more observers, of course; but partly due to reluctance on the part of the locals to talk and partly because some of them, like truck drivers, were not traceable later, I was able to get only sketchy information. Some of the others seemed to think the objects were pancake-shaped rather than spherical and seemed to be revolving along their horizontal axes. Still others claim a display of colored lights from the UFOs. It should be noted that by 6:40 p.m. in the month of February in Bastar district, it is almost totally dark with a clear, cloudless sky. The air temperature is usually cool at night because of the altitude. There is no weather station in the vicinity of Kanker which would have sent up balloons or things of that nature. I don't think the locals ever heard of UFOs before, much less read about them. On balance, my impression is that their statements about this UFO encounter are very probably authentic with a very small margin being given for exaggeration and human error."

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN
 Copyright © 1982 by the
 AERIAL PHENOMENA
 RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, INC.
 3910 E. Kleindale Road
 Tucson, Arizona 85712

Phone: 602-323-1825 and 602-323-7363
 Coral E. Lorenzen, Editor
 Richard Heiden, Ass't Editor
 Brian James, Lance P. Johnson,
 Robert Gonzales, Artists

A.P.R.O. STAFF

International Director L.J. Lorenzen
 Secretary-Treasurer Coral E. Lorenzen
 Membership Secretary Madeleine H. Cooper

THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN is the official copyrighted publication of the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc., (A.P.R.O.), 3910 E. Kleindale Rd., Tucson, Arizona 85712, and is issued every month to members and subscribers. The Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc., a non-profit corporation established under the laws of the State of Arizona and a federally recognized scientific and educational tax-exempt organization is dedicated to the eventual solution of the phenomenon of unidentified flying objects. Inquiries pertaining to membership and subscription may be made to the above address.

A.P.R.O. MEMBERSHIP including BULLETIN:
 United States \$15.00/yr.
 Canada & Mexico \$16.00/yr.
 (Canadian Currency will be accepted)
 All other Countries \$18.00/yr.
 Air Mail Overseas \$21.00/yr.

SUBSCRIPTION to BULLETIN only; SAME AS ABOVE.
 Newswires, newspapers, radio and television stations may quote up to 250 words from this publication provided that the Aerial Phenomena Research Organization, Inc. (or A.P.R.O.), Tucson, Arizona, is given as the source. Written permission of the Editor must be obtained for quotes in excess of 250 words.

Published August, 1982
 * * * * *

India

(Continued from Page One)

BLUE OBJECT

Dr. Vajpey's second report involves a sighting at Aurangabad, a city of about 190,000 in the Maharashtra district. Vajpey comments that "It is probably just a coincidence that it is located at approximately the same latitude as Kanker, though 400 miles to the west of it."

In this case, the UFO was observed and recorded by the Chikaltana Meteorological Office, located at the Aurangabad Airport. The following is the statement of Mr. Subhash Babulal Choudhari, given to Dr. Vajpey:

"On the evening of 18th March 1982, I was at my station on duty at the Chikaltana Observatory (Lat. 19° 51' N, Long. 75° 24' E). The sky was clear and the wind velocity was 360/08 Kts. At about 1940 Hrs. IST, I saw a UFO in the eastern sky; it was cylindrical in shape and of a strange blue colour. It moved very fast from east to west and disappeared over the

western horizon in about 5-6 seconds. Its altitude was very low, probably not more than a few hundred feet (at least, it was the impression I got)."

The foregoing is the original account, and upon request, he submitted the following added details:

"The entire object was blue in colour; but there appeared to be a bluish light (NOT like a flame) at the front and back. It was like a long and narrow cylinder, not unlike a 'flying pencil'. From the ground, its diameter compared to its overall length, was quite small. I got the impression that the surface of the UFO was like that of a coiled rope or the track of a bike tire. It moved very fast, in a straight line from east to west, and without making any sound. When the object passed, it was to the southern part of the sky in relation to the observatory . . ."

Dr. Vajpey comments: "An interesting aspect of this letter is that Mr. Choudahari seems to have changed his mind about the altitude of the UFO he saw, after a discussion with his colleagues who also saw it. As I said, his first impression was that it was at an altitude of not more than a few hundred feet. But in his second letter, he corrected his earlier impression and thought that the UFO might have been considerably higher—about 4,000 feet. Since the duration of the encounter was so short, nobody was able to (photograph the object).

Further inquiries by Dr. Vajpey indicated that very few people other than the Chikaltana observers and a few airport officials had seen the UFO, probably due to the short duration of the object's flight.

Puzzle

(Continued from Page One)

out that the Air Force and NASA know a lot more than is generally accepted.

A CONTINENT AWAY AND YEARS BEFORE

In July, 1967, Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen made a tour of South America, where they contacted and visited the representatives of five countries: Peru, Chile, Argentina, Brazil and Venezuela. During one of these conversations (it is best not to be more specific) we questioned an individual who had knowledge of the landing of a UFO in a region north of Salto, Argentina, which was populated largely by Indians. News of the "landing" eventually leaked out and representatives of the press investigated. They heard a strange tale:

An object, described as plate-shaped, and metallic in color, crashed near a village in the area. Over a period of days, the occupants of the craft approached the local inhabitants, and bartering took place. The air

travelers needed water and food, while they apparently made repairs to their craft. In return, when they left, they gave the Indians a container which they had used to transport the water.

This container was shiny, soft, pliable, weightless (or approximately so) and could be crumpled, hammered, etc., but always returned to its original shape.

Somehow, one of the reporters got the container (probably either paid money or exchanged material for it) and took it back to Buenos Aires with him. The story of the Indians' strange visitors began to appear in the press, and then suddenly stopped. The container was allegedly confiscated by the Argentinian Army and that was the end of that.

Although the Lorenzens could get no firm fix on the date of the alleged "visitations", it was estimated to have been in the early or mid-fifties.

If we take the general history of each of the three incidents depicted in this article, we get a significant sequence: The crash of a disc and confiscation of same in the 1940s in the United States. The crash or landing of a disc-shaped object in the early or mid 1950s in Argentina, an artifact of which was confiscated by the military. The examination of a "strange material" in 1963 by an American employed in the American military-industrial complex.

This all adds up. It would seem that the United States learned something from the retrieval of crashed UFOs of the 1940s. Did we somehow also obtain information or samples of the material confiscated by the Argentine military in the 1950s?

Considering the maze of interwoven intelligence agencies throughout the world, it is not entirely unlikely that the 1950s Argentinian material and the 1963 material examined at Milhoff Steel are somehow related.

Now perhaps the membership can more clearly realize why the Cash-Landrum case does not represent a UFO to some researchers, but rather, our first glimpse of an experimental UFO-like Aircraft MANUFACTURED RIGHT HERE ON EARTH—in these United States!

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT SHUNS UFO INVESTIGATIONS

Ed Barker, head of the Manitoba Centre for UFO study in the Manitoba Planetarium, says the Canadian government won't part with a nickel to investigate UFO reports by hundreds of Manitobans each year. "We can get the time off (for investigations) from the Planetarium, but there's no funding. The only trips we can make are daytrips in a car," he said.

Deputy Defense Minister Robert Nixon said as far

as he knows there is no money in the budget for investigation of UFOs. Valera Powell, a spokesman for the Ottawa institute that looks after Canada's space research, said, "The Canadian government has never funded the Herzberg Institute for that purpose." The Institute has recently taken over the files of UFO sightings from the Department of National Defence. "We look after incoming reports for one year, then they go to the National Archives. We did follow up on these things a few years ago . . . but we never had any report come in that was of any scientific value," said Powell.

Barker said he has two theories about the government's denial of investigation of UFOs. "Perhaps they are trying to develop a new aircraft or a new weapon. Or maybe they just don't know how to deal with it. It may be a security problem and they don't want people to know they can't handle it," he said.

At present, Manitoba does not have a UFO society that the planetarium is aware of. Barker urges anyone who sees an unidentifiable flying object to report it to the UFO study center at the planetarium. "Unfortunately, if people report a sighting to the police it never reaches us. They route it directly to Ottawa." That means the Herzberg Institute files.

11TH CENTURY UFO REPORT FROM CHINA

by
John Brent Musgrave

Sometime around the year 1086 the noted Chinese scientist and scholar Shen Kua wrote his famous *Meng Chhi Pi Than (Dream Pool Essays)*. These essays contain a wealth of information on astronomy, mathematics, geology and geography, as well as many other sciences and technologies. They are based on notes Shen Kua took as official duties brought him to many parts of China. The *Essays* include references to strange luminescent phenomena observed for many years near the town of Yang-chou. Yang-chou is located in the present-day province of Kiangsu, northeast of Shanghai. From the 7th to the 11th century it was one of China's richest trading cities, and the transfer point for Yangtze river trade onto the Grand Canal. The following account is based on a translation by Dr. Lawrence Lau.

"In the middle of the year Chia-you there was a very big 'pearl' seen in Yang-chou. It was often seen in the daytime. At the beginning, it appeared in the marshes of Tien Ch'ang county. Later it was seen at Lake Pi Shie. And still later, for ten years or more, it was seen at Lake Shin Kai. It was often seen by passers-by as well as local inhabitants.

"My friend's study was on Lake Shin Kai. One night, he suddenly saw the 'pearl' very close by. At first, it opened its chamber slightly, and light came out as though a horizontal thread of gold was laid. Soon it suddenly opened up its shell. Its size was like half of a round banquet table; and the white light from the shell was like silver. The 'pearl' was as big as a fist. The light was so brilliant that it could not be looked at directly. Within ten or more *li* (several miles) all the trees and bushes were illuminated as if the sun were rising. From afar one could only see the sky red, as if lit by a wild fire. Suddenly, the 'pearl' flew off in the distance. Floating amid the waves of the lake it was dazzling bright like the sun.

"In antiquity, there was the pearl of the bright moon. But this pearl did not resemble the moon. It was burning bright with flame, closely resembling the light of the sun.

"Po Chu-I once composed a *Bright Pearl Ode*. Po I, who often saw the pearl, was a native of Kao Yao. It has not appeared in recent years; where it has gone is not known. The town of Fan Liang was at the place where the pearl passed back and forth. Travellers who passed by there always tied their boats several nights to wait for its appearance, and named the pavilion *Wan Chu* (Pearl Playing or Pearl Appreciation)."

HILL STAR MAP CONTROVERSY REKINDLED

The famous star map allegedly seen by Betty Hill inside a UFO in 1961, and drawn by her under hypnosis several years later, is once again the subject of some controversy. The excellent three-dimensional models constructed by Marjorie Fish over a five year period led to the apparent discovery of the same exact pattern of stars as the Hill map. The key stars in the Fish interpretation, Zeta 1 Reticuli and Zeta 2 Reticuli, were apparently a pair of sunlike stars less than a light year apart. For the Hill map to stand up, all of the stars in it have to be sunlike, and that's the crucial point in some recent findings.

In the summer of 1981 a team of French astronomers conducted a survey of stars in the region of the constellation Reticulum using a new technique called speckle interferometry. They determined that Zeta 2 Reticuli is not a single sunlike star but two stars orbiting each other at about half the Earth-sun distance. Their studies of Zeta 1 Reticuli suggest that it is a similar binary system.

It now appears as though the two stars from which

most of the travel routes radiate on the Hill map are not sunlike and have a very low probability of having Earthlike planets. If this is true, the Fish models apparently produced a statistically significant but coincidental alignment with the drawing made by Betty Hill.

SCIENTISTS IN SUPPORT OF UFOs

(A paper presented by Arthur Bray to the McGill Alumnae Society, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, February 17, 1982.)

This paper was presented in response to a presentation by Dr. Peter M. Millman, Herzberg Institute of Astrophysics, National Research Council, Ottawa, Canada.

INTRODUCTION

Dr. Millman is a scientist, and a very capable, respected one at that, and I am highly honoured to share the platform with him. As I am not a scientist, I am at a major disadvantage from the start as far as credibility is concerned. I will, therefore, call upon a number of other scientists to assist me even though they are not present.

Dr. Millman has expressed a scientific point of view. However, his is not the *only* scientific point of view on UFOs and this is the thrust I intend to take tonight.

I will not discuss specific cases as time does not permit. It would probably take an hour just to deal adequately with one case. I will therefore argue the case for UFOs in a general way, in the thirty minutes allotted.

Dr. Millman's view seems to be that if sufficient information were available, *all* reports of UFOs could be explained in terms of known natural phenomena, man-made objects, hoaxes, tricks of the eye, etc. He has seven maxims of UFOs, as follows:

1. There is no new thing under the sun.
2. Seeing is not believing.
3. Instruments can deceive.
4. Beware the printed word.
5. Records are never complete.
6. Man makes mysterious machines.
7. Knowest thou the ordinances of heaven?

All knowledgeable UFO researchers were aware of these general truths previously, but Br. Millman deserves credit for putting these together concisely and clearly for the first time, and publishing them.¹

I happen to agree with all seven of these. So where is my argument, you will ask. Please bear with me.

Argument

Statistical studies of tens of thousands of reports show that about 90% can be explained in ways Dr. Millman suggests. Dr. Millman feels that if more evidence were available, the remaining 10% could be similarly explained.

However, studies have also shown that this 10% consists largely of those cases with the *most* evidence, the *most* witnesses, the *longest* viewing time and the *highest* witness reliability, resulting in the *highest* degree of strangeness. The multiple-witness cases include reports where anywhere from two to dozens of highly reliable people were witness to the same event. What is the probability that three or four or a dozen witnesses *all* have the same visual defect, or *all* suffer the same hallucination at the same time? Or that they *all* misinterpreted what they saw, or *all* took part in some gigantic hoax of a highly complex nature? I don't claim that such situations are impossible, but the chances against this, in so many recorded cases, are astronomical.

The 10% also includes the close encounter cases (often within a few yards) and cases of physical injuries including radiation burns and other physical effects, the *causes* of which remain unknown to medical science.

Concerning the multiplicity of evidence, we have, for example, cases where a UFO is reported not only visually by multiple highly-trained observers (eg. air controllers and pilots) but radar lock-on is obtained by military aircraft, ground radar confirms the event, and communication and fire control systems are knocked out during the identical period. I know full well that there are some technical explanations for such cases *in general*, but there are far too many cases which have not been *specifically* explained in an adequate way.

It is easy enough to talk about radar anomalies, weather inversions, tricks of the eye, etc., but when all these explanations *fail* to adequately explain many reports, we are still left with an unknown phenomenon.

This is not just my view. I am supported by many highly-qualified scientists in the fields of optics, astronomy, atmospheric physics, etc., who have carefully investigated a large number of these unknowns and readily admit they *cannot* explain them. It is a simple truth that their failure to explain these cases has led to their continuing interest and application of scientific methodology to the problem, and why they are convinced that there is definitely something unknown involved.

In short, this 10% comprises the cases containing the evidence which *contradicts* the conventional explanations so readily applied by some who wish to dismiss it all with a sweep of the hand. This 10% represents the true UFOs, (Unidentified Flying Objects). The other 90% are not UFOs at all, but IFOs (Identified Flying Objects). The 10% actually amounts to thousands of cases.

Dr. Millman and I agree on 90% of the reports, (the

IFOs). It is on the 10% (the UFOs) where we part company. Only this 10% of reports can be classified as UFOs. A report of something strange in the sky does *not* make it a UFO. Initially it is simply a report of something unrecognizable by the observer. It only becomes a UFO after *thorough* investigation by competent investigators fails to identify the stimulus for the report. This 10% does not belong to the same statistical population as the identified 90%. They must be treated separately in any study.

We are frequently told how unreliable lay observers are, in reporting unusual events, and witnesses to traffic accidents are usually held up as the classic example. Yet Dr. Millman himself has gone on record that, with respect to meteors, it is only by receiving reports of observations "from a large number of people that we can make a scientific study of these objects".² Dr. Ian Halliday of the National Research Council has confirmed this in a statement where he said "the [Meteorite Observation and Recovery Project] relies on public feedback".³ This being the case, why do some scientists insist they cannot conduct a scientific investigation of UFOs based only on the testimony of witnesses? I find it strange that lay witness observations are valuable for the study of meteors but are considered *unreliable* when it comes to UFOs.

Dr. Bruce Maccabee, an optical physicist with the Naval Surface Weapons Center in Washington, D.C. is of the opinion that the simple fact that 90% of reports *can* be explained attests to the ability of observers to report accurately. He states that "the fact that the USAF Project Blue Book Report #14 investigators were able to categorize most of the various reports as arising from known phenomena (balloons, aircraft, astronomical, etc.), added to the fact that most of the reports did *not* fall into the separate category known as "insufficient information", means that the human observer is generally well calibrated for the observations of phenomena which the observer himself cannot identify".⁴ More on this Special Report later.

Even the famous Condon Report from the University of Colorado with all its scientific expertise failed to explain about 30% of the cases studied. In one case, they even concluded that "this is one of the few UFO reports in which all factors investigated, geometric, psychological and physical, appear to be consistent with the assertion that an extraordinary flying object, silvery, metallic, disk-shaped, tens of meters in diameter, and evidently artificial, flew within sight of two witnesses".⁵

It is a fact that there is and has always been, a great deal of government secrecy regarding UFOs. This is not *opinion*—it is *fact*. I exposed this as far as Canada is concerned in my second book recently.⁶ A similar situation exists around the world. In the U.S.A. in particular, the Freedom of Information Act has recently enabled a number of Americans, through court action, to force the release of thousands of pages

of UFO documents, many of which were highly classified from a security standpoint, proving that the FBI, the CIA, the NSA and the National Security Council have all been deeply involved in UFO research all along, during which years they vehemently denied it. They *lied*. The U.S. court actions have now established this. If UFOs don't exist, why the secrecy?

Mr. Peter Gersten, a New York attorney who was instrumental in winning court cases against the U.S. Government said last year, "The nature of the UFO controversy has changed dramatically over the past four years. There is now a new case for the UFO and the evidence for it is in government records".⁷

One of the CIA documents released makes it clear that a national policy was recommended as to what the public should be told in order to minimize risk of panic.⁸ Subsequent events make it clear that this policy was adopted. If all UFOs can really be explained why would there be any possibility of public panic? The question wouldn't arise. A world-wide reporting system was recommended at the same time, to be conducted through U.S. Intelligence channels. Subsequent disclosures through the U.S. courts show that this was also done.

It is also now clear that Project Bluebook, the twenty year U.S. Air Force study of UFOs was primarily a Public Relations program. The data released under the Freedom of Information Act clearly demonstrate that some of the best UFO cases (those that clearly affected national security) were never even sent to Project Blue Book.⁹ Many were sent to the NSA and National Security Council, the chairman of which is the President himself. The curtain of deception played its role.

Despite this, one of the most curious aspects of Project Blue Book is that in one respect it resulted in what is probably the most scientific study of UFOs to date. At one stage, the Project contracted with Battelle Memorial Institute for a statistical analysis of their data. This culminated in Special Report #14 in 1955, mentioned earlier.¹⁰

Dr. Bruce Maccabee, who made a very thorough study of this report, says that the investigators can only be criticized for being unscientific in the presentation of their conclusions, which down-played the statistical evidence in the body of the report.¹¹ The same situation occurred with the Condon Report at the University of Colorado. As I said before, they failed to identify about 30% of the cases studied, yet Dr. Condon concluded that UFOs don't exist.

My point is that governments have had a deliberate policy to hide from the public the facts about UFOs, and to debunk them. It is now clear that *government spokesmen* have not been telling us all they know.

Many scientists share my view that the unexplained residue of reports (the UFOs) may represent *some* form of extraterrestrial visitation, their particular origin being unknown.

In all cases, these scientists express *personal* views, rather than an official government line. They are examining the UFO phenomenon on their own time and at their own expense. They are not bound by any "official viewpoint". They speak out on UFOs because they are dissatisfied with the debunking by governments and by many other scientists. They have examined the most puzzling cases in that 10% of reports representing the unknowns and found that they cannot, in reality, be explained as natural phenomena, man-made objects, hoaxes, tricks of the eye, etc. They have ruled out all conventional explanations.

Now I put it to you that those scientists, by going against the conventional government and scientific viewpoint (that is, as publicly-expressed), are putting their reputations on the line. They are convinced of the case for the reality of UFOs (whatever UFOs may be) and stress the need for greater concentration of scientific expertise to find out what UFOs really are.

Now let me quote just a few of these scientists (and one or two other scholars) who have gone on public record to express their views on the matter:

Dr. Robert F. Creegan, Professor of Philosophy, State University of New York at Albany (and APRO Consultant):

"As early as 1954, I had gone on record stating that something other than error and hoax must be involved in the UFO reports, taken as a whole. The extraterrestrial hypothesis is a strong one though not conclusive . . . the UFO problem is in part the concern of military intelligence, in part the concern of descriptive and theoretical science and in its ramifications is related to virtually all human interests."¹²

Dr. B. R. Frieden, Professor of Optical Physics at the Optical Sciences Center, University of Arizona (and APRO Consultant):

"The UFO phenomenon is . . . a true enigma wrapped up in a mystery. Unfortunately, to this date, no progress has been made toward explaining the phenomenon, despite investigations by scientists the world over."¹³

Stanton Friedman, the only space scientist in North America known to be devoting full time to the subject of UFOs. He is a nuclear physicist with many years experience in developing fission and fusion rockets and nuclear power plants for space applications:

"The evidence is overwhelming that the Earth is being visited by intelligently controlled vehicles from off the Earth."¹⁴

Dr. James A. Harder, a Mechanical Engineer, and Professor of Hydraulic Engineering, University of California at Berkeley (and APRO Consultant):

"Quite apart from the tens of thousands of volunteer reports, the thousands of reports from law-enforcement officers, military officers, and others

with a *duty* to report should convince anyone familiar with the evidence that UFOs are objectively real and that the least complicated (most parsimonious) explanation is that they are extraterrestrial spacecraft."¹⁵

Dr. J. Allen Hynek, Professor Emeritus of Astronomy at Northwestern University, (former Consultant to the AF Project Bluebook) and now Director of the Center for UFO Studies in Chicago:

"... the subject is much more complex than any of us imagined... It has paranormal aspects but certainly it has very real physical aspects too... I am more inclined to think in terms of something metaterrestrial, a sort of parallel reality... I have the impression that the UFOs are announcing a change that is coming soon in our scientific paradigms."¹⁶

The late Dr. James E. McDonald was Professor of Atmospheric Physics, University of Arizona:

"After examining around a thousand UFO reports and directly interviewing several hundred witnesses in selected UFO cases of outstanding interest, and after weighing alternative hypotheses, I find myself driven steadily further toward the position that the extraterrestrial hypothesis is the *least unlikely hypothesis* [my emphasis] to account for the UFO."¹⁷

"It [the UFO] is the greatest scientific problem of our times."¹⁸

(To be Concluded in the next Issue.)

PRESS REPORTS

By Joe and Doris Graziano

WISCONSIN

April 4, 1982 - St. Croix Falls - Chuck Linnell was one of many people who spotted reddish-pink balls in the evening sky. He was driving on Rt. 95 around 8 p.m. when he saw what looked like a light on an airplane. As it got closer, it got bigger and brighter, "so bright you couldn't look at it." The big reddish-pink ball was about at treetop level and there was a glare shining in the trees and on the ground. There was smoke coming from the top of the ball, which moved silently beyond a ridge and disappeared.

Orin Succo and his grandchildren, Jason and Katie, had just finished milking and were leaving the milkhouse at 8:04 p.m. when they saw "two big fire-red objects" off towards the river. The children went into the house to get their father and uncle, Jerry and Jeff, and they all watched two "big pinkish, reddish" objects with a "mass of smoke going straight up from the ball." One object disappeared behind a hill and the other moved east at a steady, moderate speed. "Something dropped out of the ball that appeared to be on

fire. Then the red just shut off and looked like a yellow light the size of a flashlight," said Orin. It then moved rapidly away until it was out of view. Orin walked to the house, and when he checked the clock it was 8:13 p.m.

The Joe Mallery family saw 2 lights in the sky towards the southeast at about 8 p.m. They were "reddish, pinkish balls, one about the size of a basketball and one about the size of a soccer ball." The balls seemed to come down closer to the ground with "smoke coming up from them."

Jane Green was driving home around 8 p.m. when she saw two "very bright reddish balls" to the northeast. She parked the car and went into the house to get her husband, but when they came out the balls were gone.

MINNESOTA - February 27, 1982 - Gaylord - Sibley County Deputy Bennitt Bade and Ellerd Mathwig, a part-time officer, were responding to a call around 2 a.m. when they spotted a fast-moving object at treetop level. "It had a bunch of green lights that were not flashing," said Bade. "It had like a smog or fog underneath it and it was clear out that night." The object was only in view for 5 or 10 seconds.

Henderson Police Chief Norm Pettis was driving toward Gaylord at about the same time when he had a similar sighting. An object with blue, green and white lights passed directly over his patrol car. He also reported seeing a smog or fog under the object and heard no sound. Sibley County Deputy Kevin Guggisberg and several people in McLeod County also reported seeing what is believed to be the same object.

March 4, 1982 - Waterville - Craig Gilbertson was heading east on Hwy. 60 around 7:30 p.m. when he spotted some strange lights in the sky. He actually saw two different sets of lights and estimated that each sighting lasted about a minute.

In the first sighting, Gilbertson reported seeing three objects "in triangle formation" which flew over his car as he drove slowly. Each object had 3 red, white and blue "constant" lights on the front. He could hear a sound that "wasn't as loud as the sound of a plane."

About 3 miles further down the road, Gilbertson briefly spotted a "red, flashing light". About 10 degrees to the east of the red light he saw a "clear, blue strobe" flashing quickly. Le Sueur County Deputy Terry Wento also reported seeing a "blue-white light" about 1:45 a.m. on the 27th of February.

April 22, 1982 - Stillwater - Four persons saw a flashing silver disk swoop down over downtown Stillwater at about 12:30 p.m. Sally Dalluhn came out of her book shop and saw several people gathered on the sidewalk. Then she saw the disk, metallic in appearance, come out of the northwest and head out toward the river. It cruised about 2 feet above the water for

some distance then up and over Houlton Hill. She said the object was about 2 feet wide, shallower in depth, and moving at a rapid clip.

Dalluhn said when the disk headed out over the river she felt certain it was about to crash. But it leveled out and started gaining altitude then disappeared in a puff of smoke.

Lloyd Arndt, Sue Jacoby and Julius Beer also saw the object. Arndt and Jacoby said that the object was flashing in a very regular pattern and moved along at the speed of an airplane.

David Magnuson, Dave Jaehne, Pat Sparks and Barb Christianson were in a car crossing the Stillwater Bridge when they spotted the object. As it grew nearer and passed overhead, Magnuson said he is quite sure it was a toy balloon. However, a couple of facts still leave the issue in doubt.

The wind speed and direction recorded at Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport between noon and 1 p.m. was 18 knots from the southwest. The object was heading south. It is also unlikely that a toy balloon would disappear in a puff of smoke as reported by several of the witnesses.

NORTH CAROLINA - March 12, 1982 - Maiden - Robert McRee and Jack Bolick, both local Postmasters, were out driving with their wives, Raydell and Julia, when they spotted an unusual object at about 9:50 p.m. It appeared to be like a self-luminous airplane at about 45 degrees up and a half a mile away. The lights were not glaring and did not cast a beam, but rather appeared like one large window of light about 4 feet high and 12 feet wide.

As McRee stopped the car and pointed the object out to the others, it suddenly began to get smaller as if shutters were being closed from the top and bottom of the rectangular light. The car started down the road again and turned around and returned to the same spot, but the witnesses could see nothing. Checks with local airports and the FAA radar center revealed that no planes were in the area at the time of the sighting.

April 18, 1982 - Monroe - Roland Lowery and his family were on the way home from church at about 9:30 p.m. when they spotted a group of strange lights in the sky. A red and a blue (or green) light were side by side with a white light just underneath circling "like a patrol car" light. About 200 yards to either side were 2 amber-red lights.

The Lowerys then went to the Gill family home to tell them of the sighting and both families decided to drive through the area in search of the lights. When they got to Flint Hill they saw a flashing red light that appeared to be over the Lowery house, at treetop level. Below the big red light was a smaller one and a faint line separating them. Above them, about 50 yards to either side, were 2 blue lights and a small yellow light was above all.

When they drove to the Lowery house, the lights appeared to have moved in the direction of Monroe

Airport. Both families gave up the search about 11 p.m. with the object still in the sky. After the Gills returned home they noticed several planes flying over the area where the object was seen.

OREGON - March 19-22, 1982 - Eugene - Eugene residents reported strange darting lights in the sky to Eugene Police on the 22nd, the fourth night in a row such reports have been made. Police Lt. Jim Horton said calls have been coming in at the rate of 10 to 15 a night, usually between 10 p.m. and midnight.

Chris Snyder and his two roommates watched the objects for about an hour in the western skies. He said 3 bright orange objects flew in horizontal formations, darted into diagonal formations and covered a wide expanse of sky. Through binoculars, the objects appeared to have a flame that flashed when they moved.

(Editor's Note: This is another one of those instances in which I was in the right place but engaged in the wrong activity. I was in Eugene from about 4 p.m. on March 18 through 4 p.m. on March 21st to attend funeral services for my brother, Eldred C. Lightner, and paid no attention to radio broadcasts, the local newspapers or the night sky.)

CALIFORNIA - March 20, 1982 - Simi Valley - A 15-year-old girl was riding her bicycle home from a friend's house around 7:30 p.m. when she spotted a "freaky, really weird thing in the sky." She said the object was about 200 yards in the air, the size of a house, egg-shaped and white with little square yellow windows around the rim. The object made no sound and didn't move as the girl nearly pedaled into a parked truck while looking up at it.

About 5 seconds after spotting the object, a little green light began flickering from the center of the bottom. "Six or seven people across the street were looking at it, like they were in a trance," the girl said. Becoming scared, she quickly pedaled her way home without looking back. She went in and told her family, but the object was gone by the time they came out to look. The girl also recalled that "dogs were barking like crazy" while she was watching the object.

PENNSYLVANIA - March 23, 1982 - Neshannock Twp. - An off-duty police officer, Anthony Antavio, noticed something "sort of following" him around 5:30 a.m. and looked up to see an object hovering about 75 yards over his house. He went in and awakened his mother and they both described the object as an oval or round shape, 2 to 3 car lengths long, casting a brilliant white light.

Antavio contacted Ronald Bonivengo, a Shenango Twp. officer, who arrived at the Antavio house and saw the same object. The two officers got into the police cruiser and drove down state Rt. 65 with the object following them, hovering directly above the car. They returned to Antavio's home and contacted another officer, asking him to bring a camera. By the time the officer arrived the object was gone.