

RESEARCH BULLETIN

Vol.1, No. 3.

1968 October 22.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

From the Director.

This month sees the inauguration of our new sighting investigation scheme. All those who replied to the first Research Bulletin in May by sending back to me the form on the back have now been circulated details of how they are to help the Association. In future our members will be taking a larger part in the work of the Association. We now have 128 investigators spread over the country from Edinburgh to Falmouth, from Swansea to Norwich. With the help of these volunteer BUFORA investigators we hope to examine every sighting reported in Great Britain to the depth it merits within one month of its occurrence. This target is modest. It is intended so for UFOlogy is a hobby, a past-time, a recreation, NOT a business. Of course there are gaps in our coverage, notably in Northern Scotland, Central Wales, Northern England, the Fens, and Northern Devon. If any members in these areas did not return the original form from Research Bulletin No. 1, and would wish to take part, perhaps they could write to me and let me know. The more investigators we have the better our national coverage.

Stephen Smith.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

From Our Correspondent

The excellent organisation of DIGAP and the pleasant surroundings of the Friends' Meeting House amply made up for the last minute indisposition of two of the programmed speakers at the BUFORA Northern Convention. Unfortunately John Cleary-Baker had to withdraw on the Friday evening owing to ill-health, and Les Otley was prevented from arriving in Manchester by car clutch trouble. Nevertheless, after suitable opening remarks of welcome from DIGAP, the meeting began with a fascinating talk by Norman Oliver on "Experiences of Contact Claims".

After lunch, John Cleary-Baker's place was filled by Roger Stanway, who described some of the investigations he and Tony Pace undertook at the close of 1967 into sightings around Stoke-on-Trent and their astronomical observatory at Newchapel. A very good hour's talk was interposed with interesting glimpses into the Ministry of Defence machine for dealing with UFO investigations and investigators.

Omar Fowler of the Surrey Investigation Group on Aerial Phenomena took Les Otley's place and entertained the audience with a selection of sighting stories illustrated by artists' impressions of the reports. The visual impact of the colour paintings was immediately apparent. Finally Tony Wedd gave his talk on "Skyways and Landmarks" - a well delivered talk dealing with the nature of and the ideas behind leys and orthotenes, which, despite digressions into the realms of free energy machines, entertained the more knowledgeable in the audience till about eight o'clock.

The "Any Questions" panel scheduled for the end of the program was dropped in favour of an informal gathering to wind up the day. Throughout the Convention the atmosphere had been cordial and the refreshments available were enjoyed in spacious surroundings. The Friends' Meeting House was a good choice of venue. It could have seated up to 250; but the audience ranging from 120 to 170 during the day made it quite comfortable to listen to the talks. An exhibition in the foyer undoubtedly helped to bring in several extra visitors who might otherwise have passed the meeting by.

Our thanks must go to DIGAP for organising the Convention and particularly to Chairman Bill Moore, Joan Nelstrop and Arthur Tomlinson, who received a mention in the Manchester Evening News.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

"In more than 300 studies of UFO sightings, I have made, the most convincing thing has been that all suggested that the saucers interfered with electrical systems...."

Dr. James E. McDonald, University of Arizona.

At about 9 p.m. on Sunday, September 8th, 1968, three cars were travelling along a narrow country road in Dorset, approximately two miles from the BBC's Rampisham Down transmitting station and four miles from Beaminster, and had reached a place known locally as 'Knights in the Bottom'. The cars were, in front a Rover 3 litre with an elderly couple as occupants, in the middle a Vauxhall Victor driven by the main witness, 21yr. old Paul Redshaw, mechanic, who had a friend with him, and last a new car, probably a Hillman Hunter, containing a man and a woman.

Suddenly the lights and ignition failed simultaneously on all three cars.

Paul Redshaw got out and tried to open his car boot to get some tools, but although the key went in the lock the boot would not open. He used a torch from inside the car to find a piece of wire to test, by shorting, his battery. There was no spark. Shortly afterwards he tried this on the batteries of the other two cars, but they too were dead. He saw that his interior thermometer (not the engine temperature gauge) was down to zero, and found that his radiator, when he felt it not more than ten minutes after they had stopped, was stone cold. The speedometer was held at 30mph, and the clock in his car had stopped, as had his now wrist watch, which was automatic and antimagnetic. He did not feel cold and he did not hear or smell anything unusual, but he did notice that a dog was barking frantically in the distance. Redshaw's friend, whose watch had also stopped, tried in vain to wind down his window. He got out of the car and walked down the road to the Rover. He saw a dark cross mark on the road and noticed the woman in the Rover who was outside the car, seemed apprehensive. Redshaw shone his torch on the dashboard of the Rover and saw that a mounted car compass was spinning uncontrollably and that the clock had stopped. In the rear car the clock had also stopped as had the driver's wrist-watch, and his window would not open.

At about 9.30 p.m. the car lights came on suddenly. When the drivers got in their cars and switched on, all engines fired normally, and they drove away.

The next day, the site was revisited by Redshaw and a friend who had some form of radiation meter which gave an appreciable reading. Even more interesting was the fact that when Redshaw put a pen-knife on a galvanised shed, it stuck before slowly descending by its own weight. On the following day, Tuesday 10th, the area was tested with a fall-out meter (Contamination meter NaI), but there was no fall-out level in the immediate vicinity, nor were there any residual magnetic fields on any nearby sheds or other bits of metal. It was noted that there were no power lines nearby.

Redshaw's car had been checked with the radiation meter on the Monday night, but nothing was found. The car was well looked after, and the battery terminals were found to be clean.

A farmer, who was at the site at 5.30 a.m. on the morning after the incident, said that everything had appeared perfectly normal; except that he had seen a car left by the side of the road, which struck him as odd for that early hour.

Investigations by F.E. Marshall, Dorset.

? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ? ?

From our Investigations Coordinator.

The general situation as regards numbers of UFO reports still appears to be the same as it has been all year, with very few being received at BUFORA H.Q. Of these few reports, most have been very interesting and detailed. It appears that most of the UFO activity is now taking place in South America, particularly Argentina. There have been many reports of landings, little men and contact claims. Police have warned citizens not to talk of any UFOs they may see as they may be prosecuted for spreading "unwarranted fear".

I wish to take this opportunity to thank all the BUFORA members who have sent me sighting reports and newspaper cuttings. Due to the large amount of mail received (about 30 letters a week) I am unable to answer all letters personally, but can assure you that every one is carefully read. I will be most grateful if members will continue to send in cuttings and reports.

Richard Farrow.

(Address for cuttings etc.: 78 Paxford Road, North Wexham, Middlesex)

A Brief Analysis of Outstanding Anomalies in the Current Report of the United States Air Force's UFO Investigating Agency.

Having been intrigued and somewhat amused by recent conflicting statements from the United States Air Force on radar sightings of UFOs, we decided to write to the USAF and get an authoritative word on the matter. We sent two separate letters with an interval of some two months between them.

The first letter was sent by CG on 10/4/68, the reply came from the Office of Information of the Secretary of the Air Force. The most substantial part was a reprint, without covering letter, of a two-part article from the July and August issue of the 'Official Magazine of the USAF', 'The Airman'. This article, "What does the Air Force really know about flying saucers?", by Major G.W. Ogles (Hq USAF) was already known to us from a reference in the October 1967 issue of the NICAP publication, The UFO Investigator. Towards the end of the first part of the article (1), Major Ogles says:

"Radar infrequently detects 'unknown targets' which vanish from the scope as mysteriously as they appear ... however ... reports by radar controllers checked against U.S. Weather Bureau records indicate that these 'unidentified targets' usually are due to precipitation echoes from rain clouds or occur during a temperature inversion ...

"A member of Project Blue Book, the Airforce project which investigates UFO reports, told the House of Representatives Armed Services Committee in April 1966 that, "About 1.5% of the UFO sightings reported since 1947 were detected by radar. None of the unexplained cases on Air Force files were sighted by radar," he stated."

(Our emphasis).

The UFO Investigator reported that, "When NICAP produced an Air Force letter admitting that a December 1952 radar sighting was classified as unexplained, this case appeared in the next instalment of the article as an exception to the rule" albeit in a very grudging manner. Of the famous December 1952, 'Gulf of Mexico' case (2), Ogles said: "This case has been placed in the 'unidentified' class by the Air Force even though the Air Force reports there is a possible explanation for the radar targets."

The two-part article containing these admissions, was presented to us as the official USAF word on radar sightings of UFOs. A couple of weeks after CG received it, FSR published an article (3) by Dr. J. Vallee, who claimed that, "out of 8,260 reports examined" in USAF files, "225 were radar cases, of which 16 were unidentified and 48 classified." Vallee then listed the 16 unidentified cases, 4 of which also fell in the 'classified' category. Despite the admission in the August 1967 'Airman', and the large number of cases listed by Ruppelt (4) as unidentified, there are no unidentified radar cases for 1952 in this list.

In view of Dr. Vallee's reputation, we felt that this provided excellent ammunition for the second letter by DKM, which was duly despatched to Project Blue Book at Wright-Patterson AFB, Dayton, Ohio. The letter specifically recounted the two issues of 'The Airman', emphasising the admission that (at least) one 1952 case had been put in the 'unidentified' class, but did not appear in Vallee's list. It further drew attention to Vallee's "uncontested statements in two books and numerous articles" that he has "full access to the USAF files on UFOs". The letter specifically posed three questions:

- (1) Does the Air Force acknowledge the list of unidentified radar cases published by Vallee ?
- (2) What has happened to the December 1952 sighting - has Vallee innocently omitted it - or were the Air Force letter produced by NICAP and the acknowledgement of the 'unidentified status of the Gulf of Mexico objects in the 'Airman', both in error ? Or has new information arisen in the past 8 months, after a lapse of 15 years, which justifies the reclassification of this case ?
- (3) Is any information available on the reported tracking of three orbital UFO on radar at NORAD headquarters in Colorado ? Is this case considered identified or not ?

The letter concluded by reproducing Vallee's list of cases from (3).



A reply was received from Major James Aikman, Chief, Civil Branch, Community Relations Division, Office of Information, Office of the Secretary of the Department of the Air Force, dated 17/7/68,(5). It made only oblique answers to the three questions posed by DKM as follows:

"The radar sighting you mentioned of December 6, 1952, in the Gulf of Mexico has been evaluated as an anomalous propagation; there are no unidentified cases of radar sightings in Air Force files. However, with respect to the statements by Dr. Vallee you mentioned, books and other literature regarding UFOs and related subjects abound. The Air Force does not review, indorse, sponsor, sanction, or comment on them in any way ...

"Furthermore, the U.S. Air Force program on UFOs, Project Blue Book, has no classified files. It is the fundamental policy of the Department of Defense and the U.S. Air Force to make available to the public the maximum amount of information and records concerning their operation and activities; there is absolutely no policy of censorship pertaining to Project Blue Book. Press releases are issued when warranted, and every effort is made to keep the public informed ..."

The two sentences beginning "books and other literature.." and ending "in any way ..." are in fact quoted straight from the 1968 Project Blue Book Report (6). In view of their relationship in Major Aikman's letter to the various publications made by Jacques Vallee, it is interesting that his first book, "Antomy of a Phenomenon" (7), heads a list of recommended reading material on the very next page of the report (8). This in itself surely constitutes a form of comment, even of sanction ...

This minor inconsistency was the starting point of a very interesting witch-hunt by ourselves through the pages of the Project Blue Book Report for 1968 (hereinafter referred to as BB68). It was immediately obvious to us that, contrary to all reports, 1967 was not (officially speaking, at any rate) the busiest UFO year ever for the USA. We cannot be certain, however, whether this represents an actual lesser number of reports made to the USAF, or a juggling of figures on their part (9), or some sociological factor such as that remarked upon by several American students of the phenomenon (10). This prompted us to take a closer look at the annual figures for reports to the USAF, We had at hand several sources of statistics, namely :

- (A) Project Blue Book Report 1968 (BB68) annual figures 1947-67.
- (B) " " " " 1962 (BB62) " " 1947-61. (12)
- (C) Flying Saucers and the USAF (Tacker) " " 1947-59. (13)
- (D) Facts About UFOs (Lib. of Congress, 1966)" " 1947-65.
- (E) Unidentified Flying Objects (Hynek) " " 1947-64. (14)

A comparative tabulation is as follows :

| Published | =1960 | 1962 | 1967 | 1966 | 1968 |
|-----------|-------|------|------|------|------|
|           | (C)   | (B)  | (E)  | (D)  | (A)  |
| 1947      | 79    | 79   | 79   | 79   | 122  |
| 1948      | 143   | 143  | 143  | 143  | 156  |
| 1949      | 186   | 186  | 186  | 186  | 186  |
| 1950      | 169   | 169  | 169  | 169  | 210  |
| 1951      | 121   | 121  | 121  | 121  | 169  |
| 1952      | 1501  | 1501 | 1501 | 1501 | 1501 |
| 1953      | 425   | 425  | 425  | 425  | 509  |
| 1954      | 429   | 429  | 429  | 429  | 487  |
| 1955      | 404   | 404  | 404  | 404  | 545  |
| 1956      | 778   | 778  | 778  | 778  | 670  |
| 1957      | 1178  | 1178 | 1178 | 1178 | 1006 |
| 1958      | 473   | 590  | 590  | 473  | 627  |
| 1959      | 364   | 364  | 364  | 364  | 390  |
| 1960      |       | 514  | 514  | 557  | 557  |
| 1961      |       | 488  | 488  | 591  | 591  |
| 1962      |       |      | 469  | 474  | 474  |
| 1963      |       |      | 393  | 399  | 399  |
| 1964      |       |      | 532  | 572  | 562  |
| 1965      |       |      |      | 886  | 887  |
| 1966      |       |      |      |      | 1112 |
| 1967      |       |      |      |      | 937  |

Tacker's figures parallel those of the Library of Congress publication up to 1959. It is interesting that these figures, published 6 years apart while agreeing with each other, differ widely from the figures quoted, only two years after the Library of Congress booklet, in the BB68 report. All three, moreover, differ at various points from the figures in BB62, and from those in source (E). It cannot escape the reader's notice that the figures in the final column, up to the year 1959, are in general considerably higher than those quoted by reliable authorities for the previous seven years. We recognise that some increases may be expected to arise from the addition of reports received or processed after the compilation of the annual figures; but surely this cannot account for sudden changes in figures (1947-51, exc. '49) that have been stable for 15, 16, 18 or 19 years - changes moreover of 54, 9, 24 and 40% over the figures that have been consistently quoted over a known interval of seven years. It is unfortunate that we are unable to refer to annual figures for unidentified reports other than in BB68, for the evidence implies that the effect of this incredible increase in the number of reports has been to decrease the percentage of unidentified reports, which we suspect have remained constant in terms of real numbers. As such is indicated, indeed, by the drop in overall percentages unidentified for these periods quoted in BB68, namely 1947-52, 1953-54, and 1955-61. The overall percentages for these years as quoted by the two BB reports available to us are :

|           | BB62  | BB68  |
|-----------|-------|-------|
| 1947-1952 | 19.74 | 16.77 |
| 1953-1954 | 9.13  | 8.84  |
| 1955-1961 | 1.94  | 2.30  |

The explanation for the rise in the total percentage unidentified for the last period is, we submit, to be found in the falls of the number of reports recorded for 1956 (13.90%) and 1957 (14.60%). This relationship tends in fact to support our argument that percentages as quoted in BB68 have fallen as against those quoted in BB62 because of the rise in the total number of sightings for the first two periods. The reason for the non-continuance of this trend, or rather its interruption, at 1956 and 1957 might be sought in the original large number of reports for those years. If we theorise that heavy-handed USAF statisticians have been at work to reduce the overall percentages of unidentified reports, we might also theorise that they considered 2.30% a satisfactorily low percentage -- not too much different from the 1.94% quoted in BB62 -- to arrive at after reducing the alarmingly high number of reports in 1957. We accept that a certain amount of rise and fall might be expected to arise from the redating of reports made around the beginning and end of the year, but we cannot accept that this could affect respectively 108 and 172 reports, nor can we see why the drop in those years (or the rise in the other years) was not approximately made up by redating of reports from surrounding years. One cannot help wondering if the USAF has found an effective way of 'unreporting' a report.

Having got this far, we next proceeded to perform an elementary analysis on the figures published in BB68. The results were interesting and instructive. They will be covered in the second part of our article in the next edition of the Research Bulletin.

#### NOTES AND REFERENCES:

- (1) Page 7 of the reprint article.
- (2) Described at length in 'Flying Saucers from Outer Space'. Keyhoe, 1953.
- (3) Vallee, 'Analysis of 8,260 UFO sightings - a study of cases reported to the USAF', Flying Saucer Review, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 9 - 11.
- (4) Ruppelt, 'The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects', 1956
- (5) Original on file with the BUFORA.
- (6) Project Blue Book, 1968, published February 1968.
- (7) Vallee, 'Anatomy of a Phenomenon', Chicago 1965, London 1966.
- (8) Project Blue Book 1968, p. 6.

Other titles listed include: Meteors (Olivier), Photographic History of Mars (Slipher), The Moon, Meteorites and Comets (Middlehurst & Kuiper), The Nature of Light and Colour in the Open Air (Minnaert), and the astronomical journal Sky and Telescope (Harvard College Obsy.), as well as two other books on UFOs - The World of Flying Saucers (Menzel & Boyd), and the much villified UFOs - Identified (Klass).

- (9) Frank Edwards, 'Flying Saucers - Serious Business'.

- (10) John A. Keel, 'The Sinister Men in Black', Fate magazine, Aug. 1968, & Dr. J.E. McDonald, 'Unidentified Flying Objects, Greatest Scientific Problem of our Times', pp. 8 - 9.
- (11) 'The New Report on Flying Saucers', Fawcett, Greenwich, Conn. 1967
- (12) Flying Saucer Review, Vol. 8, No. 4, pp. 11 - 13.
- (13) Tacker, Lt.-Col., Lawrence J., Princetown, N.J., 1960 - Tacker was Blue Book's Information Officer for several years, but was finally posted to Germany because (so it is generally supposed in the American Press) of his "uncompromising rudeness" in dealing with queries on UFOs. His book is described in FSR (8:3:31) as "officially sponsored" (a 1200-word review appears in FSR (7:4:19-20); so its absence from the recommended reading list might appear unexpected. The book however does reveal the appalling lack of scientific treatment of UFO reports by the USAF condemned at length by McDonald.
- (14) Hynck, 'Unidentified Flying Objects', Encyclopaedia Britannica, 1967.

Carl Grove.  
Donald K. Mills.

+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +

From BUFORA Translation Section

Original from: J. Vuilloquez (France). Translation by: B. McLaughlin, (Gravesend)

CANADA: Quebec  
Night of 29/30 July 1967  
00.30 hrs. and 01.00 hrs.  
and June 1967 at Duberger.  
newspaper LE SOLEIL Quebec  
Wed. 2nd August 1967.

by D. Loger

Mysterious Flying Machines seen at Quebec and St. Damion.

The Mysterious Phenomenon Research Society (S.R.P.M.) informs us through the medium of its president Mr. Jean Casault that new incidents concerning flying saucers have been seen towards the end of last week.

Two different groups could have seen the same phenomenon around 01.00 hrs. on the night of Saturday/Sunday. Mr. Casault has remarked that other people must have seen the same phenomenon and he would like to contact them so that he can discuss the observation.

The first person to see the object in question was Mr. Guy Potvin who was at St. Damion de Bellechasse. It was half an hour past midnight when he observed a luminous object about the size of a grapefruit which was falling and zigzagging. He added that the object kept on falling.

Mr. Casault remarks here that a shooting star never zigzags and that it dropped while describing an arc. Mr. Potvin told Mr. Casault that he had seen the same object again a few minutes later on, but in the opposite direction.

One group of people saw at about 01.00 the same night an object which, according to Mr. Casault, resembles the one seen at St. Damien. These three people were on the Rue St. Ursule in a southerly direction and they noticed an object over the plains. The object came towards them when suddenly it branched off.

One of those people who named himself as Mr. Carbon stated that the object was dark but it was darker on one side in the shape of a cylinder. One woman who was with Mr. Carbonneau and who doesn't want her name mentioned, says the object was a huge size and was in the shape of a half moon. A shining light preceded it while flashes like fireworks came from behind.

The object, seen at Quebec, like the one at St. Damien, emitted no sound.

Mr. Casault tells us it resembled the one seen last June by the police in the town of Duberger.