

the foremost authority on UFOs—not only in this country but around the world—is Dr. J. Allen Hynek, director of the Department of Astronomy at Northwestern University. He has held the position as chief scientific consultant on UFOs for the Air Force for over 18 years, and has investigated personally many of the most remarkable, and still unexplained, sightings. I recently received a most interesting letter from Dr. Hynek in which he expressed his own views as to the Air Force's position on airliner-UFO cases. Dr. Hynek seems to support my view as to what the Air Force reaction would be if the events I proposed took place:

"The Air Force would most assuredly say from their data to date that the reported objects do not represent any threat to air flights. . . . The Air Force might figure that there is more danger to an air flight from a meteor or a re-entering satellite than there is from a UFO."¹⁷

One of Dr. Hynek's final remarks will provide an excellent example of the attitude taken by the Air Force in this area:

"I believe it would be fair to say that to the present the Air Force does not recognise as valid any reported encounter of an airline with a UFO, although a few pieces of that sort have been listed as unidentified."¹⁸

It seems unlikely that Air Force policy would undergo a radical "about-face" if Project Blue Book received a series of reports from the ATC of airline pilots' close

encounters. Although this does not necessarily mean that an investigation would not be ordered, an order for the cancellation of flights seems unlikely: Dr. Hynek concurs with me in this regard also.¹⁹

NOTES

- ¹ Ruppelt, Edward J., *Report on Unidentified Flying Objects* (Doubleday, 1956), p. 161.
- ² *Flying*, July 1950; *Saturday Evening Post*, May 7, 1949.
- ³ *San Francisco Chronicle*, October 7, 1950; also reported in *The UFO Evidence*, published by the National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena (NICAP), Richard H. Hall, editor, 1964, p. 34.
- ⁴ *Flying*, June 1951.
- ⁵ *RAF Flying Review*, July 1957; *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW*, Vol. 1, No. 1 (1955); *London Illustrated News*, December 2, 1954.
- ⁶ Keyhoe, Donald E., *Flying Saucer Conspiracy* (Henry Holt, 1955), p. 259.
- ⁷ *Washington Post*, October 20, 1953.
- ⁸ Edwards, Frank, *Flying Saucers—Serious Business* (Lyle Stuart, 1966), p. 37.
- ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 38; *The UFO Evidence*, *op. cit.*, p. 36.
- ¹⁰ *The San Diego Union*, May 19, 1967, p. A8.
- ¹¹ Edwards, Frank, *op. cit.*, p. 35; *Aviation Week*, July 13, 1953.
- ¹² Opinions expressed by FAA Controllers R. Hinds and James R. Becker during interview and tour of facilities at Miramar ATC Center, April 12, 1968.
- ¹³ Statement of FAA Chief Controller W. Shaw of Miramar ATC Center, April 12, 1968.
- ¹⁴ Statement of Lt. Commander R. Stiles, base commander, Miramar Naval Station, April 13, 1968.
- ¹⁵ *Air Force Regulation 200-2*, "Intelligence Activities—Unidentified Flying Objects (UFO)," section 3 (a); Department of the Air Force, Washington, July 20, 1962.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, section 8.
- ¹⁷ Letter from Dr. J. Allen Hynek, April 18, 1968.
- ¹⁸ *Ibid.*
- ¹⁹ *Ibid.*

MAIL BAG

From Aimé Michel

Sir,—In his letter of February 16, 1968, Mr. Llewellyn emphasises the great similarity between a detail concerning the Valensole case and your *Fantasy or Truth?* in FSR Vol. 13, No. 4. And he adds: "A little too arranged."

A pertinent question. It is in fact evident that the facts can only be either *incoherent* (and thus suspected of being unreal) or *coherent* (and consequently suspected of being "arranged"). Faithful to my rule of *thinking of everything and believing nothing*, I accept this dilemma. One must always suspend judgement on every detail deriving solely from the eyewitness's testimony; but on the other hand, it is always interesting to discover, among details that are even suspect, general structures and, if possible, statistics. The details are allegations, the structures are facts (for example, the structures put forward by Gordon Creighton and Jacques Vallée in the same issue of the REVIEW).

As regards the question of knowing whether these structures are real or fabricated by liars, this is a classic problem in scientific methodology—when one does not know if an experiment is significant, or calculation pre-

cise, one does the experiment and the calculation.

Aimé Michel. July 11, 1968.

The Heflin Photographs

Sir,—In reply to the letter by Mr. Charles Gibbs-Smith, published in Vol. 14, No. 3 of the REVIEW, I would like to make certain observations from the Heflin photographs.

Examination of photographs 2 and 3 shows that in the latter, the UFO has a more northerly bearing (as viewed from the truck) than in the former. This means that the UFO reversed its direction of flight before photograph 3 was taken and not afterwards, as indicated by Heflin's sketch. In order to take the third photograph therefore, Heflin had to move either backwards or more likely sideways (to his right). This is clearly demonstrated by the apparent shift of the rear view mirror with respect to both the background and the foreground when photographs 2 and 3 are compared and explains why the image in the mirror changes.

As for photograph 4, I think it can be reasonably assumed that Heflin merely drove further up the road until he was opposite the smoke ring in the

Correspondence is invited from our readers, but they are asked to keep their letters short. Unless letters give the sender's full name and address (not necessarily for publication) they cannot be considered. The Editor would like to remind correspondents that it is not always possible to acknowledge every letter personally, so he takes this opportunity of thanking all who write to him.

sky before taking this final picture and not over the fields as Mr. Gibbs-Smith assumes.

Stuart Ackley, Mary Street, Bristol 2, July 11, 1968.

Censorship and UFOs

Sir,—In the March/April edition of *FLYING SAUCER REVIEW* Ivan Brandt writes: "Even if the death of one man on this earth was definitely known and proved to have been caused by an alien from outer space—an authenticated act of hostility beyond a shadow of a doubt—can anyone believe that the presses of the world wouldn't be ringing with such news?"

Mr. Brandt assumes the presses of the world can print what they like quite freely: commonsense tells me otherwise.

Accepting that most governments suppress as far as possible information on UFOs, is it logical that newspapers are permitted to print what they wish? The answer is obviously, no.

In our own country the "D" notice system would serve admirably for censoring individual cases. The Ministry would simply phone the newspaper, tell them it thinks publication of the story might endanger national security

(e.g. cause a major panic) and the presses would grind to a halt. Newspapers would, presumably, be allowed to publish certain aspects and thus, for example, some details would be produced in the local newspaper as complete omission there would make censorship even more obvious.

An example of this censorship may have taken place on Wednesday, April 10, 1968. BBC broadcasts carried a report originating from Jodrell Bank that signals from the Russian craft orbiting the moon had ceased when the craft circled the hidden face of the moon. This was obviously a significant piece of information as it lends weight to any theories about the hidden face of the moon being used as a base by UFOs. Yet I could only find vague mention of it in one newspaper and entire omission in the others.

I do not believe that the complete failure of newspapers in covering UFO incidents and news items like the last can be entirely voluntary.

If it is, then history will surely condemn their lack of sense of public duty

Duncan F. McGregor, Glasgow W.1., Scotland, April 20, 1968.

Out with it, Mr. Keel.

Sir,—There's one thing we who are attempting to solve the UFO enigma do not need, and that is more articles like John Keel's *A New Approach to UFO Witnesses*. FSR May/June 1968).

Mr. Keel, who earns his living by writing, creates more mystery than he solves when he slyly suggests: "The UFO phenomenon is based upon what is happening to people." However he never tells us what it is that *is* happening to people.

He suggests that suitable questions to ask UFO witnesses should include things like "what the witness had for breakfast, and what kind of phone calls he's been getting." Mr. Keel also suggests we "prod his memory about his childhood."

Does Mr. Keel come out and tell us what connection there is between one's breakfast, childhood & UFOs? Of course not! Mr. Keel, it seems, loves to create mysteries.

He then tells us that after questioning enough people along these lines, our "astonishment will turn to abject horror." Then, states Mr. Keel: "You'll throw all your books on astronomy and exobiology into the garbage can."

He talks like a man who knows something important, but what does he really say? He is just adding more mysteries and not solving any.

I call upon Mr. Keel publicly to state what he knows about these things which will cause us all "abject horror",

and stop hinting around. I asked him this some time ago when he hinted at knowing "the answer", and he referred me to the Bible for "clues". At the time he suggested that Deros or Devils are behind it all. Now he refers us to the breakfast menu and our childhood. If the things which Mr. Keel hints at discovering are as important as he claims, why doesn't he stop playing guessing games and come right out and say what it is?

If he thinks that we are all the playthings of the Devil and the Earth is really Hell . . . come on out and say so. Some of us may not go along with this theory but at least it will be out in the open where we can all study it. We can't very well study something which he insists upon making a secret.

I heartily dislike unnecessary mysteries. We have enough already. Ralph Rankow, Broadway, New York City, N.Y. 10001. July 22, 1968.

No "Men in Black"

Sir,—I am writing with reference to John Keel's article in FSR May/June 1968 entitled *A New Approach To UFO Witnesses*. It is entirely possible that he is most correct in his assertion that extensive area coverage and in-depth witness investigations are quite necessary in the solution of the fantastic mystery we face. Unfortunately few part-time seekers after the truth have the time and finances for this kind of effort. The writing-off of all the data learned in the past by Ufologists both great and small is of course a great error on Mr. Keel's part. Without their groundwork he might now find himself in danger of committal to some institution.

In 1966 and 1967 in a five county area here containing 75 witnesses who had seen 37 unidentified objects (mostly at low altitude, and four on or just above the ground—I keep only the most undeniable sightings) I did not have any manifestations of men in black, telephone warnings, etc. Possibly that only happens in real hot spots where the UFO division of the CIA feels a need of disruption. I do have two cases of intermittent poltergeist activity in farmhouses approximately a mile and a mile and a half respectively from the site of a near-landing of an orange flat bottomed domed object. However the activity began in 1960 and the near-landing came in 1966.

I agree with Mr. Keel's basic ideas for the most part, found his article most interesting, and hope you will carry more in the future.

Don Worley (Special Investigator, Coral and Jim Lorenzen's APRO, Southeastern Indiana area), Connersville, Indiana, U.S.A., July 15, 1968.

Reply to Dr. Kauffmann

Sir,—Dr. Kauffmann's report to FLYING SAUCER REVIEW (see *Mailbag March/April 1968*) on the Seventh International World Congress of UFO Investigators in Mainz (November 3-6 1967) is likely to give a totally false picture to the English-speaking readers of your highly esteemed journal.

The German Press is shockingly misinformed on the subject of UFOs. The reports in the illustrated magazines as well as the programme on Channel 2 of the German TV Service were so biased that numerous spontaneous protests were made to the various editors concerned.

It is an insult to the honour of all the speakers at the Congress that Dr. Kauffmann considers only Professor Oberth and himself—"a citizen of the USA, residing in Switzerland"—should be taken seriously.

It is a certain fact that the talks given by the 24 lecturers from the Congress participants of 23 countries and both hemispheres were *extremely well* received, and that only Dr. Kauffmann's remarks marred what was otherwise a fully justified success.

The distinguished audience had a feeling of confidence towards all the speakers, except only towards Dr. Kauffmann; such is the fact of the matter.

At this International Congress devoted to our subject of common study, not only were countless problems aired, but films and photographs were shown, extracts were read from the books of Frank Scully, Edward Ruppelt and Frank Edwards, and we also heard reports from American UFO investigators, the contents of which reports attracted very great attention in the USA and were widely disseminated. (See *Visitors from Space* in UFO-NACHRICHTEN Nos. 142 and 143).

Dr. Kauffmann could have given an objective report on the global importance of the *Mainz UFO Resolution* and *Proclamation* that were sent to Secretary-General U Thant and to the 131 member-states of the UNO. Also on the lectures by Colman von Keviczky, Director of ICUFON—New York, on the USAF's documentary film *The Truth About Flying Saucers*, on the exhibition (first ever in Europe) of UFO photographs, on the showcases of international books and periodicals on UFOs, the countless interviews, the statements to the press, the radio and TV transmissions, the special UFO franking-stamp—the first time ever—of the German Federal Post Office. That would have served the cause of truth and would have interested the readers of FSR.

Witnesses in testimony of this are the approximately 2,700 people who participated during the four days of the Congress: investigators, scientists, reporters, plus visitors from the following: Argentina, Belgium, Berlin, German Federal Republic, Denmark, England, France, Finland, Holland, Italy, Yugoslavia, Luxemburg, Norway, Austria, Rumania, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Hungary, Venezuela and the USA (California—New York—Virginia).

Furthermore, the Guests of Honour: Dr. Jur. W. Mueller of Wiesbaden, former Oberbürgermeister of Weimar, and Honorary President of the German Goethe Society; Bürgermeister Karl Delorme, representing Oberbürgermeister Jockel Fuchs of Mainz; Director Jedzini, President of the German branch of Federal Union, Frankfurt; Honorary Member of DUIST, Professor Dr. h.c. Hermann Oberth, our principal lecturer; Dr. F. E. Stranges, LL.D. Ph.D.; Miss

Lynn Catoe, Science Reference Specialist and Senior Bibliographer of the Library of Congress, Washington, D.C.; and Dr. Ricciotti Lazzeri from Italy. All these were among the prominent participants of this Congress which was unique for Europe and for the whole world.

Karl L. Veit, President, Director of the German UFO/IFO Studiengemeinschaft (DUIST) E.V., July 8, 1968. (translated from the German by G. Creighton).

(continued from page 16)

published a restricted booklet showing how the UFOs performed on radar on the famous night of August 13, 1952 around Washington, D.C. Other radar sightings mentioned by Edwards were (1) August, 1965. The Air Force radar base on the Keewenaw Peninsula reported watching a flight of UFOs on radar over Lake Superior, and (2) In May, 1964 officials at Holloman Air Force Base which guards White Sands Missile Range in New Mexico, reported that their radar had been tracking a UFO for two days, at intervals.

Please, don't let any spokesman for the authorities tell you UFOs have never been tracked on radar! It simply isn't true.

Sources:

- ¹ *Flying Saucers—Here and Now!* by Frank Edwards.
- ² *The Truth about Flying Saucers*, by Aimé Michel.
- ³ *The Report on Unidentified Flying Objects*, by Edward J. Ruppelt.

PERSONAL COLUMN

Rate: 5s. 0d. (70c.) for first two lines; 4s. 0d. (55c.) per line, or part, thereafter.

WANTED: SECONDHAND UFO MAGAZINES. State price and condition to D. Rodway, 217 Norwood Road, Herne Hill, London, S.E.24.

URGENTLY REQUIRED in good condition: **FLYING SAUCERS HAVE LANDED** by G. Adamski and D. Leslie. Quote price to Mrs. Bolwell, c/o Mrs. E. Spencer, 49a Kings Grove, Peckham, London, S.E.15.

I COME FROM TOMORROW. Well-known UFO writer seeks publisher for 80,000-word novel about Tallus, who regresses from A.D. 4000 to 1980 to see our civilisation destroyed by Comet. (FSR, Box 01, 21 Cecil Court, London, W.C.2.)

WANTED FOR IMPORTANT LIBRARY, back issues of FSR as follows: Volumes 1 to 3: all numbers; Vol. 4: 2, 3, 6; Vol. 5: 1, 4; Vol. 8: 4, 5; Vol. 9: 4, 5, 6; Vol. 10: 2, 3, 6; Vol. 11: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5. Write to J. M. Lade, FSR, 21 Cecil Court, London, W.C.2.

UFOs — UNIDENTIFIED, UNDENIABLE

By Roger Stanway and Anthony Pace

A factual and objective report by two amateur astronomers. 30 photographs and illustrations relating to 70 unexplained UFO sightings made by 200 witnesses in the North Midlands of England in 1967.

Accounts of discussions with the Ministry of Defence, R.O.C. and many others.

A wealth of interesting information for all serious UFO researchers.

Obtainable from: **Newchapel Observatory, Newchapel, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, England.**

Price: 12s. 6d. plus 1s. 6d. postage and packing. (Overseas 18s.—US\$2.20—including sea mail postage and packing.)

ADVERTISEMENT

IN 1919

with the publication of *The Book of the Damned*, Charles Fort opened the door on the problem of UFOs.

But this was only a small part of the data which Fort collected and published: astronomy to zoology — few fields escaped his attention.

INFO, the International Fortean Organisation, was founded in 1965 to carry on his work.

Membership is \$4.00 (or 33 shillings) per annum anywhere in the world, and includes the **INFO Journal** and the **INFO Newsletter**.

INFO
P.O. Box 367
Arlington, Virginia
22210 USA