

# UFO INVESTIGATOR



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

## LOW ALTITUDE OBJECT SEEN IN HAWAII

The September issue of the UFO Investigator carried a preliminary report from Hawaii. In this report, a resident had seen an unusual light moving in the night sky on July 31, 1975.

NICAP's Regional Investigator, Anthony J. Distasio became very busy, when on the evening of September 8, 1975, large numbers of people all over the State of Hawaii witnessed another unusual event. At the request of Mr. Distasio, radio station KMVI and the Maui News newspaper ran announcements that observers of the event should contact Distasio. A flood of phone calls was the immediate result. The investigator spoke in detail with thirty-three of the callers and found that all seemed to be describing the same phenomena.

The list of witnesses covers a broad spectrum of personal backgrounds, education and experience. Two of the witnesses were specially-trained, highly experienced, technical specialists. Their description of the object is given as follows: On the evening of September 8, 1975, at approximately 8:00 pm (HST) the two men who operate the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO) were driving up a mountain road toward the observatory to begin their evenings work. These men have been employed at this site for over twelve years and have a great deal of experience photographing celestial objects, natural and man made. Their observation began when they noticed a bright light in the sky and can best be described by quoting from the witnesses' report.

"I could see a bright object which was shaped just like the Apollo nose cone, cylindrical and slightly pointed at one end. A cloud of luminous gas was being

released from the other end and there was a bright orange light visible at the end where the gas was coming from. It looked just like a barium cloud experiment, only at too low an altitude."

The witnesses increased their automobile's speed, in an attempt to reach the observatory, so that they could photograph the object. Unfortunately, by the time the men arrived the object and cloud had disappeared.

Both witnesses thought "it must be a barium shot, because we have photographed several of them over the years and it looked just like one. The cloud looked like it was at a lower altitude than any I ever saw before. It had a light green color, and as it got bigger, the cloud grew into a big "V" shape. I could see striations in the cloud".

### BARIUM SHOT OR UFO

The observatory is often asked to support a barium shot project. The two SAO employees telephoned their contact who is responsible for notifying them of such experiments. They wanted to inquire as to why he forgot to tell them about the barium shot. He stated that "as far as he knew, there wasn't supposed to be any barium shot. He didn't know anything about it".

All agreed that although it looked like it was a barium cloud experiment, there were important differences. It was at too low an altitude. The canister cannot normally be seen. It did not display the typical brilliant colors characteristic of a normal barium cloud shot. In general, it was not like the usual barium cloud tests.

It is normal practice for the observatory to be notified of tests which are visible from Hawaii. No notification was received.

All up-coming missile tests throughout the Pacific Missile test range were checked and there were no tests which could account for the observations. It does not seem probable that any government agency, or subcontractor, conducted a test on the evening of September 8th.

### A COMPOSIT OF HAWAII REPORTS SEPTEMBER 8, 1975

At approximately 7:50 pm (HST), an object appeared in the sky visible from the islands of Oahu, Molokai, Lanai and Maui. It first appeared northwest of Hawaii at an elevation of almost 45 degrees. The object appeared as a small, moving, very bright light. Some witnesses felt that it was brighter than the crescent moon. This bright, distinct object was only visible for a period of several seconds.

People described the object in a variety of ways. Observers said that sparks, fire, exhaust or an orange glow was visible at one end of the object. They described the shape as a bright point, cigar-shaped, a cylinder with a blunt point at one end, a "rocket ship", and a cylindrical canister.

All agreed that a quantity of luminous material came out of the object from the same end where the orange light or fire was observed. The object quickly disappeared, but the cloud of gas remained.

Almost all witnesses from low altitudes agree that the cloud was very distinct. It had definite shape, fuzzy edges and some indistinct details were seen inside it. The color was described as white, silver-white or pale gold-white and as being very bright. Only the observers from SAO who were nearly at 10,000 feet saw a pale green color in the cloud. It is probable that their higher altitude of observation permitted a visual perception of faint details or color not available to observers near sea level.

## International Advisory

**QUEENSLAND, AUSTRALIA, June 24, 1975**—Mr. Eric Falkenburger saw a bright object from his car at about 7:45 pm. The object passed within about 1500 feet of his car and was just above tree top level. Mr. Falkenburger said that as he watched the UFO "suddenly shot off at a great speed and as it went, bright cone shaped search lights suddenly shone from the object".

**HAMILTON ONTARIO, CANADA, July 6, 1975**—Mr. Joe Borda was doing his farm chores at about 5:00 pm, when he noticed the sun reflecting off a shiny domed object about one-third of a mile from where he was standing. He could not judge its size, but stated that, "all I could see was a kind of dome. It was quite sizable. I thought that it might be a UFO." He disregarded the thought, and returned to his home trying to convince himself that he had seen something conventional.

Two days later, Mr. Borda was cultivating his tobacco field, and noticed that most of the plants in a circular (almost 20 feet in diameter) area had been crushed or burned. Most of the plants were flattened and many were scorched. Two greenish blue spots of oil substance were inside the circle and located about ten feet apart. Samples have been sent to the provincial attorney general's laboratory in Toronto for analysis.

Mr. Borda is now convinced that the object he had seen originally was a UFO that had landed in his field.

**SALISBURY, SOUTH AFRICA, July 22, 1975**—A large round UFO seen as a pulsating orange light was sighted at approximately 8:00 pm by a number of witnesses in the Salisbury area: Police ignored the reports at first, until a constable saw the same object while on duty. The Charles Prince Airport was then contacted, and it was found that no aircraft were in the area during the previous hour. An airport employee had also seen the object.

On July 24, the object was again seen by a Salisbury resident. At about 1:50 am, Mr. Arthur Jones, a newspaper employee, was driving home from work, when he saw a round object emitting a "quivering orange flow". The object was estimated to be about 1600 feet away and about 100 feet high. Mr. Jones claimed to see a trap door on top of the object during the several minutes he watched the UFO. The trap door suddenly closed and the object then moved away over the tree tops.

On the same night, prison officials at Khami prison saw a orange, almost circular object near the prison. The object stayed motionless at a low altitude for several minutes before moving off at a very rapid rate of speed.

**CAPETOWN, SOUTH AFRICA, July 27, 1975**—A small metallic sphere, as it fell from the sky, narrowly missed hitting a farm house. The sphere shattered a granite-like boulder upon impact. Farmers in the area reported seeing a bright UFO moving through the night sky shortly before the sphere fell to earth. The object is hollow and has a gaping hole on its surface. Close inspection revealed what appeared to be faint lettering on the sphere. If the South African government is able to uncover any additional information upon completion of the analysis, the details will be printed in the UFO Investigator.

**SALISBURY, AUSTRALIA, August 2, 1975**—A pilot of a British Airways Boeing 747 flying over Salisbury reported seeing "an orange object, low on the northwest horizon," at 8:04 p.m.

The unnamed pilot asked the air traffic control center if they could identify the object. The conversation was intercepted by someone using a pocket-sized radio with an air band.

## EDITORIAL: AIR FORCE SECRETARY BACK

By: John L. Acuff

Before Project Blue Book, the Air Force conducted UFO research under two other project names. When the first was closed, the Air Force stated that they were no longer doing UFO research. They said the same thing when the second project was ended. When "Blue Book" was concluded in 1969, the Air Force stated for the third time that they were no longer conducting research in the UFO field.

Anyone who has followed the UFO projects, knows that throughout Air Force investigations, most of the material on UFOs was classified. Case data was not available unless an individual held proper clearances and had "the need to know."

When Project Blue Book was terminated, the Air Force declassified UFO records and made them available to the interested researcher. These records were moved to Maxwell Air Force Base. Researchers were not permitted to have access to the files. If a researcher knew of a specific case by name and date, the Air Force would then pull that particular case material. This procedure hampered the researcher in his efforts, because he could not make comparison studies, etc.

The Department of the Air Force has now offered the records of Project Blue Book to the National Archives and has placed the following restrictions on the release of the records: "During the study of UFO activity, in order to obtain candor and cooperation from witnesses, the Air Force assured them that their names would not be publically disclosed. Therefore, we recommend appropriate deletions of the following identifying data be made before permitting public access to these records:

- A. Names of witnesses and other data which would identify the witnesses.
- B. Those portions of investigating reports regarding the individuals who reported sightings, such as:
  1. Conclusions of the investigator.

2. Confidential sources of information, i.e., credit bureau reports, neighbors, etc.
3. Investigative techniques.

The Military Projects Branch of the National Archives is engaged in a "pilot project" to determine the feasibility of implementing these restrictions prior to accepting the records from the Air Force.

The original "declassification" was a step forward in the field of UFO research. Limited access to data is better than none at all. It would seem that these new restrictions are a step backward.

Item "A" of the restrictions, which calls for the deletion of material identifying the witness, could be accomplished without hindering research if the person's background is left intact. In many cases, witness credibility is a key point. The name can be omitted, but it is necessary to evaluate the witness' ability to observe and report factually on their observation.

Item "B" calls for a much broader deletion. If conclusions of the investigator, investigative techniques and confidential sources (credit bureau reports, etc.) are omitted, research on many cases would almost have to be re-done from start to finish.

NICAP is in contact with both the National Archives and the Air Force concerning these new regulations. We are attempting to clarify the definition of "public access" as used in the working of the restrictions. NICAP and other legitimate UFO research organizations have always honored the witnesses request for anonymity and would continue to do so when using Air Force records (without the necessity of deletions). Does "public access" apply to research organizations? We would hope that it does not. The restrictions as now stated would almost destroy the value of the records. Can the National Archives devote the budget and manpower necessary for such an extensive task? If they can't, what is the status of the records? Do they remain at Maxwell AFB? Would they still be given to researchers with the witnesses names intact as they have been in the past? Why did the Air Force decide to change the "ground rules"? All are important questions and NICAP is seeking the answers.

NICAP's relationship with the government agencies has been excellent for many years. We receive cooperation and

## SIGHTING ADVISORY

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

**August 14, 1975—Stockton, California.** Dan Long, a controller at Stockton Metropolitan Airport, sighted a UFO at 9:35 pm. He stated that the disc shaped object was at an altitude of about 2000 feet. The disc then moved upward while emitting a glow of green tinted smoke and flashing red lights.

Mr. Gary Duran and two friends also saw the same object while walking near the airport.

UFOs have been sighted for a two week period throughout the Stockton, San Jose-Gilroy area by numerous witnesses.

**July 14, 1975—Washburn, North Dakota.** A college administrator and his wife sighted two unknown objects at 12:30 am. The objects were highly-illuminated in white light which pulsed intermittently in an irregular pattern. The bar shaped objects moved in arcs across the sky almost directly overhead and traveled in a southwest direction. The second object passed the first then seemed to move straight out of view.

**September 18, 1975—Kellogg, Idaho.** Several reports of suspected UFO sightings were reported during the week of September 13. Added speculation came when a news bulletin stated that equipment in the city radio building had burned out at the same time the sightings were made.

The object was described by a police officer as well as local citizens as being very high and "alot larger than a star."

technical assistance from NASA, the Army, the Navy, state and local police, etc. Even with the Air Force's official position of "being out of the UFO research field", we have received some measure of cooperation and hope that it will continue in this effort.

## UFO PHOTOS AVAILABLE

NICAP is pleased to offer to members only, a photo package which consists of four of the best photo cases available. Along with the photographs, members will receive a descriptive brief of each case. The photos are 5 x 7 black and white glossy, suitable for framing. The exceptionally low price for this unique offer is \$5.00. Don't delay, mail your check or money order to NICAP today while the supply lasts.



You chop up more suet! I'll try to reach someone at NICAP . . .

## POLICE CONTINUE TO COOPERATE

Enfield, Connecticut Police Chief, Walter J. Skower, sent a notice, printed herein, to the officers in his department. Cooperation of this nature is very much needed and extremely appreciated by UFO researchers.

If this kind of cooperation were instituted by police authorities throughout the country, UFO research would be greatly enhanced.

Is your local police department giving maximum assistance on UFO reports? If not, perhaps they would be interested in seeing what the Enfield Police Department is doing.

Special Order #75-20 Date: May 7, 1975  
From: Walter J. Skower Subject: UFO's

All reports of unidentified flying objects shall be fully investigated and a case report number issued to each incident.

In addition to the regular case report form, a special report form titled "Report on Unidentified Flying Object(s)" shall be made out as completely as possible and attached to the original case. This report form has been supplied to us by NICAP—National Investigations Committee on Aerial Phenomena. In any particular incident a form should be made out for every individual making or involved in a sighting, including police officers.

If a continuing sighting of a U.F.O. is reported, effort should be made to take police photos of the object. If this is possible, take photos from as many angles as possible and try to include a point of reference in the pictures, such as skyline, buildings, cars, trees, telephone poles, etc.

Most U.F.O. reports will be of routine nature and investigation will consist primarily of interviews of witnesses after the fact. If, however, any unusual phenomena occur in addition to sightings, special investigation should be conducted as quickly as possible.

Should there be any reports of landings, physical damage, or a significant possibility of physical evidence, the scene will be safeguarded and physical evidence accumulated promptly for laboratory testing. Disruption of any power source is a significant factor.

This Department does not want to sensationalize reports of "Flying Saucers". Therefore, news releases will be factual and incidents will not be blown out of proportion by speculation.

Copies of "NICAP" reports will be sent to "NICAP" at 3535 University Blvd., West Kensington, Maryland 20795. To facilitate this procedure a copy of the case report and "NICAP" reports will be forwarded to the Chief's office for information and mailing.

If a major and corroborated UFO incident occurs which would allow for gathering of physical evidence or the need for scientific investigators and/or equipment, then NICAP (Tel. 301-949-1267) and the "Center For UFO Studies" in Evanston, Illinois will be contacted immediately. At such time, inform them of the situation and, if they indicate an immediate interest and wish to respond with personnel and/or equipment, they will be given full cooperation. If such arrangement would require any unusual or prolonged deployment of Police personnel, then the Chief of Police or Police Lieutenants will be notified.



MEMOS  
FOR  
MEMBERS

Members residing in Canada and Mexico have been paying dues at the same rate as members residing in the United States. Effective with their next renewal date, Canadian and Mexican members' dues will be the same as all other foreign countries, i.e., \$12.00 per year. Increased postage rates and monetary exchange rates make this change necessary. Renewal notices will not indicate the new rate change until they are reprinted.

## FEEDBACK / Readers write

Subject: Manhattan UFO Sighting (Sighting Advisory—Aug. 1975)

I have talked to the witness a couple of times on the telephone. His testimony is interesting but hard to pin down. It would seem that his estimate of the size of the object hinges entirely on his assumption that its altitude was 3000 feet. The way in which he has drawn the triangles I find confusing. The distance X (which he calculates to be 7229 ft.) is shown as smaller than the distance (of 2500 ft.) to One Lincoln Plaza. The inconsistency of scale does not invalidate the schematic diagram, but it does make me wonder if the object's altitude may not have been somewhat less than his original estimate.

He backs his judgement regarding the observation by mentioning that for a week after the sighting he spent a lot of time watching aircraft for differences or similarities.

He indicated the possibility of confirmation by police witness. Apparently a friend told him that the New York Times had a small mention of the police claiming to have seen a similar object over the Hudson River. A check with the New York Times Information Desk disclosed that the Times no longer provides telephone information. A check with Police Information—the officer in charge gave a firm denial that any such release had been given to the press or that there was any record of a recent sighting.

He also reported the sighting first to the N.Y. Times city desk where he was greeted with a laugh, then in Washington to an ex-project Blue Book Air Force colonel. The colonel suggested that he call McGuire Air Force Base and the Franklin Institute. Neither expressed any interest.

The findings are somewhat inconclusive, but it is surprising that an object as large as suggested should not have received more attention from other observers.

Diana Russell  
Regional Investigator