


UFO INVESTIGATOR

NATIONAL INVESTIGATIONS COMMITTEE ON

NICAP



AERIAL PHENOMENA

NICAP ■ 3535 UNIVERSITY BLVD. WEST, SUITE 23 ■ KENSINGTON, MARYLAND 20795 ■ A NONPROFIT CORPORATION FOUNDED 1956


NEW ENGLAND IS TARGET FOR UFO

NICAP has received several valid reports from the New England area including such cities as South Hampton, N.H., Amesburg, Mass., Nashua, N.H., and Sudbury, Mass.

A question frequently directed to NICAP is, "Can any correlation be made by recurring UFO visits?" The best way in which to answer a question of this nature is that UFO sightings seem to peak about every 5 to 6 years, that the most common description is a disc shape, and UFOs are more often seen near populace areas or around bodies of water at night. After these analogies have been made, the rest simply remains to be speculations with further correlation awaiting a more complete study of the data.

In these recent New England sightings the correlation would seem to be the close proximity of miles with one another and all of them were sighted within a 3 week period. Each of the cases that will be described in this article have undergone extensive research and study by NICAP's regional investigator Ray Fowler and our assistant investigator in the New England area, John Oswald.

SOUTH HAMPTON, N.H.—The first sighting was on June 6, 1974 at 9:30 p.m. and was reported to PEASE Air Force Base by Mrs. Vivian Stevens on June 10. The AFB took the information from the witness and referred her to the local police, who in turn informed the "Amesbury News" of the account made by Mrs. Stevens regarding the incident. At that point, NICAP's local asst. investigator, Mr. John Oswald, was immediately assigned to the case. The following account of the sighting was submitted with joint efforts by Ray Fowler and John Oswald.



While driving home after attending a PTA meeting, Vivian Stevens, with a son, daughter, and her niece noticed a red beacon-like light in the sky ahead of them. At first they thought it might be a light on a tower or at a construction site. However, all four witnesses noticed that the light was getting larger and was soon lost behind some trees. As they approached a large open area, they could see the red light shining through some trees. To their amazement, they saw a large red illuminated dome-shape hovering over the edge of the clearing. The witnesses further described the object as having a bright white rectangular shaped opening with something like blades spinning around inside. White, blue and yellow sparks spewed out at opposite sides around the base of the dome. After realizing what they were observing, the witnesses became so frightened that they sped off toward their home. At this point, the object began to follow their car and came closer and seemed to be trying to approach their car. At approximately 100 yards from this point, the object passed directly in front of them. As the Stevens car continued to drive, the UFO proceeded directly ahead of them. It

stopped, and hovered with a "bobbing, fluttering motion" about 120 feet high and approximately 400 feet away. Mrs. Stevens' niece Helen, stopped the car and got out to have a better view of the object. Suddenly, a band of soft glowing colored lights like a "string of beads" flickered on and off. After watching the multi colored lights flickering on and off for several minutes, all of the lights would go on at once with just one solid color—first red, then blue, and then green.

The UFO was described as looking like a "child's spinning top with its point truncated and having a round, not pointed bottom." (see illustration)

Suddenly the object began making very jerky motions and then started to descend toward the ground. The witnesses became very frightened and they fled the scene with undue haste. Upon their return to Mrs. Stevens home, they immediately told Mrs. Stevens older son Todd (17) about the incident and Mrs. Stevens wanted to call the police. He advised her not to, because he felt that by the time the officers would arrive, the object would probably be gone. He would look for the UFO on the way to taking his girl friend home.

When Todd and his girl friend arrived at the scene of the sighting, there were no traces of anything unusual. He then proceeded to drop his friend at her home. Upon his return to the scene he noticed a red beacon-like light in the sky also. He quickly returned home to get the rest of the family to go back and observe this strange phenomena once again. The craft was continuing with its same jerky motions as described previously.

It was agreed by the family, that they would try to have some other witnesses view the object. Mrs. Stevens went to a home in the area and brought Mr. & Mrs. Frank Cynewski back to the scene unfortunately too late to be observed by the new witnesses. During the time that Mrs. Stevens had gone to retrieve the Cynewskis' the rest of the family claimed that the object seemed to settle in a nearby swamp region. The only thing that the Cynewskis' were able to see was a distant airplane.

NICAP's assistant investigator conducted a thorough questioning with all of the witnesses involved. He made an attempt to search the swampland with Mrs. Stevens's son Todd but the terrain was much too treacherous. The AFB was contacted on several occasions and admitted that they had received Mrs. Stevens report, but would not cooperate any further.

An astronomical study was done and it was determined that Deneb, Vega, and Altair were prominent in the Eastern skies that evening, but the object's description ruled out stars as a possible explanation. The evaluation was concluded on the possibility of planets for the same reason.

The object's description did not resemble a conventional aircraft for several reasons. Its lack of noise, low-level erratic flight path, apparent landing in a swamp, etc., would definitely rule out an airplane or helicopter as an answer.

As of this writing, the report must remain in the "unknown" category due to the fact that the witnesses testimony seemed valid and was so evaluated by the investigators. The unexplained craft can not be explained in terms of conventional type objects.

NASHUA, NEW HAMPSHIRE, JUNE 14

Ms. Barbara LaPorte had just completed her work shift at 12:30 AM on the

morning of June 14 and was leaving the employees' parking lot when she noticed unusual illumination near a cluster of trees directly ahead of her. She stopped her car to get a better view and suddenly spotted, hovering over the pines, an object some fifty feet wide with red pulsing lights. Ms. LaPorte observed that the craft was rapidly turning clockwise, yet the lights were stationary and did not turn with the vehicle. After a few moments the object moved slowly behind the trees to the north, completely out of sight.

The witness then left the parking lot and headed toward home when she caught further glimpses of this strange phenomenon. It appeared to be quite some distance in front of her and several times would stop and move sideways before continuing its northward journey. Ms. LaPorte lost sight of it after a few minutes, and it was her impression "that other motorists also had the object in view because traffic seemed to be moving considerably slower than usual." A check with the police department, however, showed no record of any UFO reports during the night.

Barbara LaPorte left the route she was travelling to drive to the home of a baby sitter and then returned to her original route. Once again, as she headed home, she spotted the phenomenon.

After arriving home the witness immediately called the Federal Aviation Authority who reported that they had picked nothing up on radar, nor had they received any other phone calls. They gave Ms. LaPorte the phone number of NICAP investigator Ray Fowler. She then summoned a neighbor and both ladies went to the balcony to view the sky; here they were joined by Larry Roberts, who lives in the same building. Unable to see anything from the balcony, all three went for a drive in search of the mysterious intruder in the sky. As Ms. LaPorte retraced her route, each was aware of high-pitched tones at certain locations along the turnpike. No sightings occurred at this time.

After driving around for thirty minutes both women spotted an object just as the car left the turnpike. Mr. Roberts was made aware of the finding and each witness reported the circle of lights previously described. The craft made several quick movements and then disappeared. NICAP investigators were

contacted and additional inquiries are still underway to locate other observers of the sightings.

SUDBURY, MASS.—Four days after the Nashua sighting, several residents of Sudbury had occasion to witness and report unusual happenings in the night sky. It was 9:30 E.D.T. on the evening of June 18 when Mr. and Mrs. Jesse Walsh, Jr., and two of their neighbors interrupted their conversations on the Walsh patio to observe a bright yellow ball flying in an east to west direction approximately 5000 feet in the air. It was in sight for about two minutes and made no noise. Several moments later a jet plane travelled the same path; there was no similarity between it and the yellow sphere.

Thirty minutes later, while still discussing their find, the four were again startled by another bright yellow globe, which this time flew lower in a south to north direction, approximately three hundred feet east of the Walsh home. Remaining visible for about one minute, its flight changed from smooth to a wobbly descent toward the ground. Concurrently, a shaft of white light shot down toward the ground from the object's left side, moving back and forth like a search light until disappearing behind the trees.

NICAP investigators studying the incident noted that the object travelling in a south to north direction paralleled two sets of powerlines. They further stated that the description of the phenomenon does not fit a hot air or weather balloon, meteor or fireball. Skylab did make two passages over the area on the night of the sighting, but the time and direction and size associated with the sighting did not coincide with the crossing of Skylab.

COMING IN SEPTEMBER:

Australian Sightings Continue, Object Shines Spotlight on Police Car, New York Man Unknowingly Records UFO on Film and More . . .

UFO REPORTS.. AN ANALYSIS

Since NICAP's formation in 1956 the organization has gathered data on UFOs in a variety of ways. Members and others send newspaper clippings, letters and telephone calls are received, Government and other officials notify NICAP of sightings. Data comes in from all directions, but raw data isn't sufficient if solid answers are expected in any field of endeavor. In an effort to refine the data NICAP has the task of "weeding out" the good from the bad. This is done in many ways, but is always started with the way in which data is first collected. NICAP's Regional Investigators were selected because of their proven ability to analyze and to collect data and are invaluable in their ability to select the good from the bad.

Usually we find that if the witness or witnesses report a UFO when a conventional explanation was available there was one of three reasons for this invalid report, i.e. they were very poor observers; they were good observers, but made their observations under poor conditions; or they decided for reasons of their own to lie about their experience. The explainable reports are not the reason for NICAP's existence. They do consume large amounts of time due to the need to make a decision on each report received. They do contain data that may someday be helpful in sociological, psychological, and data handling studies, but should not be the focus for either NICAP or those who oppose our views.

The focal point for NICAP is the approximately 20% of reports received which cannot be attributed to a conventional occurrence, even after exhaustive study, and are, therefore, classified as a sighting of a UFO. During NICAP's 18 years of existence approximately 3,000 to 4,000 cases have been classified as UFOs. It should be noted that in some of these cases the lack of sufficient data may have contributed to the classifications, but never the less, the good solid cases total to a very significant sum.

What are the guide lines used in classifying a UFO as a UFO? This is a question that has been debated by researchers for years. A simple method of classifying is to state that the object must have a reported behavior or structure which is different from any known con-

ventional object. This simple definition would be sufficient if the investigator could be sure that each report clearly and accurately described the event. However, this is usually not the case so the method of classifying must be expanded.

Witness testimony is the key to most UFO reports. This is true even in the presence of hard data such as radar returns and photographs since to analyze the hard data a description of the occurrence is needed. When evaluating witness testimony one must also evaluate the witness or witnesses and here we run into the often used word "credibility."

Witness credibility is a combination of many things, e.g. honesty, ability to observe, ability to analyze what was observed, ability to remember and report accurately, basic mental stability, depth of experience, etc. How is witness credibility determined? This is a question with as many answers as "what is art?" The easy answer is "I'll know it if I see it," but this is not acceptable when conducting a scientific investigation. The National Enquirer newspaper uses an interesting approach in evaluating credibility of witnesses in that they always ask themselves "does this person have anything to loose by making a report." If they do their credibility rating is higher. NICAP has not refined a credibility rating system (and we doubt if anyone has a completely accurate system) due to the problems in dealing with so many inter-relating factors. We do use guide lines which are tempered by the situation of each case. For the strongest rating NICAP would like witnesses who would be desired as character witnesses in court. Who by their actions in life are highly regarded by members of their community. Who have the educational, environmental and work experience which would enable them to be well qualified observers and reporters of their observations. Who have chronological and emotional maturity, etc. This is not to say that a witness having none of these characteristics could not have seen a UFO. It is just that such a witness is not without the possibility of just criticism concerning his report.

The occurrence itself is of equal importance in determining the strength of a case. The best of witnesses can report a

light moving through the sky at a great distance from their observation point and because of the lack of available information have a very weak case. The strong cases in NICAP's files are highly rated due both to high witness credibility and large amounts of available data on the occurrence.

Once a report has passed through the screening process and witness credibility and data availability are evaluated, numerous steps are taken to determine the nature of the occurrence. Consultants are contacted and hard data (if any) is analyzed in light of the witness testimony. Each consultant speciality is the subject of book length reporting. We, therefore, will make brief comment on only two subjects which have been making the news lately, hypnotism and polygraph (lie detector) testing. Both are valuable tools for the UFO researcher, but neither can be accepted as conclusive.

The polygraph measures physical changes in blood pressure, respiration, etc., which have been shown to correlate with emotional stress. It has been shown that most, but not all, people will experience emotional stress when lying and the well trained polygraph operator will recognize this stress.

Total acceptance of the polygraph results in the UFO field is tempered by the following: some people can lie without guilt and, therefore, without stress; some people have mental conditions which cause them to believe that something is true when it is not. Most people find their experience with a UFO to be an emotional one and there is the possibility that the telling of this experience would be stressful, thereby causing an "untrue" reading.

The field of hypnotism and the study of the human mind is a continually developing one and even under the best of conditions can lead to results which are subject to debate. Hypnotism can be considered a useful tool only if the person conducting the session is highly trained and has proven capability in evaluating the depth of trance and the psychological ramifications of statements.

When all is said and done, the UFO researcher, NICAP members and other interested individuals must evaluate what

they read and hear. Once this is done speculation and sensationalism are put in their proper place and the more solid cases can be studied in an effort to solve one of the greatest mysteries of modern time.

FOREIGN ADVISORY

April 26—St. Johns, Newfoundland, Canada. Several people in the St. Johns area recently reported seeing a "big, orange, glowing ball" which resembled an airplane on fire. One observer who said she was frightened by the vision stated that the object appeared to be falling until it averted to an upward sweep and disappeared. Another went on to comment that there was a big, black shadow where the ball had been. The witnesses reported the sighting to both the city police and the National Harbors Board.

April 16—Wellington, New Zealand. A mysterious object brought people out into the streets with binoculars at mid-morning in New Zealand when a silver sphere with crescent-shaped wings appeared in the sky. Two air force jets were sent to the area but pilots could trace nothing. The head of the science department at a nearby college had released two balloons filled with hydrogen as an experiment, but definitely stated that because of the height at which the object was seen, approximately 25,000 feet, the balloons could not possibly be considered the solution to the phenomenon.

May—Nuernberg, Germany. A guard looking through a star-light scope at an ammunition storage area near an airfield spotted an unusual sight at about 9:30 one evening in May. He alerted the staff duty officer at the airfield who went into the tower and also witnessed the object. It was described as being curved on the top and flat on the bottom with a white light and two red lights. Civilian airport officials reported that there was no aircraft in the area at that time. A helicopter was dispatched to investigate the craft, but the pilot could not locate it.

SIGHTING ADVISORY

Preliminary information on new reports. Details and evaluations will be published when available.

May 24—Bremerton, Washington. A man and his wife spotted four UFOs around 10:00 PM and described them as being circular and approximately fifty feet in diameter. Each circle contained eight or ten bright spots which would fade and then reappear quite bright. The objects were visible for ten minutes.

April 25—Marion, Michigan. A Marion resident awakened her husband at 5:00 AM to witness strange objects in the early morning sky. They were intensely bright, giving off a yellowish-white light, and appeared to be rotating. The couple watched with binoculars for about thirty minutes before the UFOs vanished.

April 28—San Jose, California. On this Saturday night near 10:00 PM two mystery lights were observed in the sky. An FAA tower controller at San Jose Airport confirmed seeing one of the red-to-orange colored lights and approximately fifty people called the newspaper desk to report their sightings. Most callers reported that the lights hovered for five to eight minutes over the area before descending.

May 3—Sheridan, Wyoming. A total of fourteen UFOs have been sighted in Sheridan County, Wyoming, since March 12. Dr. Kenneth Ohm, professor of astronomy at Sheridan College, has been receiving and reviewing the sightings. A few of the observances can be attributed to the star Sirius, which is very bright in the western sky at 8:30 or 9:00 PM, but certainly not all. All of the sightings have been witnessed by more than one person, and have occurred in the early morning and late dusk and at night.

CLIP BOARD

NICAP depends almost totally on membership dues to fund all research and operational activities. Approximately 86% of the organization's total income is from dues payments. The remainder is from contributions, sale of publications, membership pins, etc.

Even though NICAP is the largest and most widely publicized of UFO organizations many individuals do not know where to turn for information. You could do NICAP and your friends a favor by recommending that they consider membership.

As a small token of NICAP's appreciation we will send you, at no charge, a sterling silver lapel pin (regular price \$4.00) for each new member you obtain. Be sure to have them mention your name with their application so that we may send your pin.

A few autographed copies of "UFOs: Interplanetary Visitory" by Raymond Fowler are still available from NICAP. If you have not ordered your copy send check or money order from \$7.90 to NICAP to assure receipt of a first edition copy.

Correction: In the June, 1974 issue of the UFO Investigator, regarding college courses on UFOs, the correct location for the University of Alabama is Tuscaloosa not Montgomery.

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

July 20, 1974

Dear Mr. Acuff:

I listened with great interest to your discussion of flying saucers on station WCAU.

I having flown airplanes since 1936 covering all types from military to bush flying, I can speak with authority on the subject of unidentified objects.

As you are no doubt aware, a pilot reporting such an object especially in the military, is required to fill out reams of forms, so he does not report them.

If you would like to hear from experienced pilots on the subject please write to:

Ye Anciente and Secret Order for
QUIET BIRDMEN
1900 Euclid Avenue, Cleveland, Ohio.

Sincerely,

Art Bowley
4111 Revere Road
Drexel Hill, Penna. 19026