

# the apro bulletin

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. Inquires pertaining to membership and subscription may be made to the above address.

VOL. 24, NO. 4

TUCSON, ARIZONA

OCTOBER 1975

## CANADIAN PHOTO CASE

### National Radio Link

Response is requested from Field Investigators and the general membership as to the feasibility and effectiveness of a National Amateur Radio Link between the field and Headquarters in Tucson, the purpose being to relay information as quickly as possible between the two.

A global network could be organized as well as enlisting the aid of foreign amateur radio operators who are interested in the solution of the UFO mystery.

Some operators may have the equipment necessary to work through the Amateur Radio Satellite. If so, please mention it when describing your station.

All members of APRO who have stations operating are asked to submit a list of their radio equipment, type of antennas, call letters and class of license. Also, include your ideas as to how a radio network of this kind should be conducted.

Send your response to:

Paul L. Talley, Jr. WA6QWT  
P.O. Box 2430  
El Cajon, Ca. 92065


Results of this inquiry will be published in the *Bulletin* as soon as possible.

\*\*\*\*\*

### Fate Editors At Fort Smith

Mary and Curtis Fuller, publisher and editor of FATE magazine, were present at the Fort Smith Conference and the Lorenzens had the opportunity to renew an old friendship and exchange views of UFOs.

Mr. and Mrs. Fuller have pioneered the publication of UFO-related material and FATE Magazine dates back to 1947. Those in the membership who are interested in the unexplained, unusual and unknown, are urged to investigate FATE. For subscription rates, FATE magazine, 500 Hyacinth Place, Highland Park, Illinois, 60035. It is also available at some newstands.



Canadian Photo No. 1

### APRO Filmed Again

On the 21st of October, 1975, cameramen and directors of *Film Ventures International* arrived in Tucson and in the ensuing five days filmed APRO Headquarters and the Lorenzens, the product of which will be incorporated into a film dealing with UFOs and other unexplained phenomena, titled "Mysteries of Other Worlds."

The original contact with Don Davison, the producer of the film, was made at the Fort Smith Conference, on the recommendation of Bernard O'Connor, editor of *Official UFO* magazine. As a matter of fact, Mr. Davison met the Lorenzens at Fort Smith and "followed them home." The film is expected to be market-tested in February and should be in the theaters fairly soon thereafter.

\*\*\*\*\*

### The Walton Case

A complete run-down on the northern Arizona abduction case involving 22-year-old Travis Walton and six other wood cutters will be contained in the November issue of the *Bulletin*.

At 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, March 18, 1975, Pat McCarthy, 19, left his home in Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, and took his camera with him in hopes of finding some hawks to photograph. He had visited the area previously and had gotten some good shots of birds, but on this particular day he saw no birds, and decided to give up the vigil at about 1:30 p.m. He was walking away from the quarry, which is located on Highway 5 near Waterdown when he caught a movement "out of the corner of his eye" and when he turned to look, noted the object resembled a "frisbee."

The object was moving too fast to be a bird and he decided he should take photos and raised the camera but had difficulty keeping it in the view finder because of its speed, but finally snapped the first shot. He didn't realize he had caught the object until later when the film was developed. Pat was sure he missed the second shot, (which he did - he got only a tree) took a third, then momentarily lost it from the view finder. After regaining it, he snapped photo Number 4. (See the accompanying diagram for the path the disc followed). He did not have the time to take a fifth exposure because the object suddenly straightened its course and moved away at great speed. Pat said it diminished in size at a constant rate until it disappeared.

The young man realized how important the photos could be, so he took the camera with the roll of film still in it, to the offices of the local newspaper, the *Hamilton Spectator*. Although he has his own darkroom he decided the film should be developed by another party so as to help establish authenticity. McCarthy, who is an amateur astronomer and is generally conversant with aircraft, estimated the object to be twice the size of a DC-8, based on the fact that he is familiar with the craft at various altitudes and the cloud formations in the sky at the time were cumulonimbus and that they are formed at between 15 and 20 thousand feet.

Field Investigator Carol White interviewed Pat McCarthy on behalf of APRO and the information related above

(See "Canadian" - Page Three)

**THE A.P.R.O. BULLETIN**

Copyright 1975 by the  
AERIAL PHENOMENA  
RESEARCH ORGANIZATION, INC.  
3910 E. Kleindale Road  
Tucson, Arizona 85712  
Phone: 602 - 793-1826 and 602 - 326-0059  
Coral E. Lorenzen, Editor  
R. Michael Rasmussen, Assistant Editor  
Norman Duke, Richard Beal, Brian James,  
Lance P. Johnson, Robert Gonzales, Artists

**A.P.R.O. STAFF**

International Director ..... L. J. Lorenzen  
Director of Research ..... James A. Hardar, Ph.D.  
Public Relations ..... Hal Starr  
Secretary-Treasurer ..... Coral E. Lorenzen  
Membership Secretary ..... Madeline H. Cooper  
Staff Librarian ..... Allen Benz  
Office Manager ..... Sheila Kudrie

**CONSULTING PANELS**

**Biological Sciences**

Anatomy ..... Kenneth V. Anderson, Ph.D.  
Biochemistry ..... Vladimir Stefanovich, Ph.D.  
Biochemistry ..... Herbert N. Nigg, Ph.D.  
Botany ..... Robert J. Hudek, Ph.D.  
Botany ..... Robert Moller, Ph.D.  
Exobiology ..... Frank B. Salisbury, Ph.D.  
Microbiology ..... Mohammed A. Athar, Ph.D.  
Zoology ..... Richard Etheridge, Ph.D.  
Zoology ..... Burt L. Monroe, Jr., Ph.D.

**Medical Science**

Medicine ..... Louis E. Daugherty, M.D.  
Medicine ..... Benjamin Sawyer, M.D.  
Medicine ..... B. A. Te Poorten, D.O.  
Medicine ..... R. Donald Woodson, M.D.  
Psychiatry ..... Jule Eisenbud, M.D.  
Psychiatry ..... L. Gerald Lauter, M.D.  
Psychiatry ..... Michael A. Persinger, M.D.  
Psychiatry ..... Berthold E. Schwarz, M.D.

**Physical Sciences**

Aeronautics ..... Rayford R. Sanders, M.S.M.E.  
Astronomy ..... Daniel H. Harris, B.S.  
Astronomy ..... Leo V. Standeford, Ph.D.  
Astronomy ..... Walter N. Webb, B.S.  
Astrophysics ..... Richard C. Henry, Ph.D.  
Civil Engineering ..... James A. Hardar, Ph.D.  
Civil Engineering ..... Charles E. Martin, B.S.  
Computer Technology ..... Vlastimil Vysin, Ph.D.  
Electrical Engineering ..... Brian W. Johnson, Ph.D.  
Geochemistry ..... Harold A. Williams, Ph.D.  
Geology ..... Philip Seff, Ph.D.  
Mechanical Engineering ..... Arlan K. Andrews, Sc.D.  
Metallurgy ..... Robert W. Johnson, Ph.D.  
Metallurgy ..... Walter W. Walker, Ph.D.  
Optics ..... B. Roy Frieden, Ph.D.  
Physics ..... Michael J. Duggin, Ph.D.  
Physics ..... Richard F. Haines, Ph.D.  
Physics ..... Garhard H. Wolter, Ph.D.  
Physics ..... Robert M. Wood, Ph.D.  
Radiation Physics ..... Horace C. Dudley, Ph.D.  
Seismology ..... John S. Derr, Ph.D.

**Social Sciences**

History ..... David M. Jacobs, Ph.D.  
Linguistics ..... P. M. H. Edwards, Ph.D.  
Parapsychology ..... Harold A. Cahn, Ph.D.

Philosophy ..... Norman J. Cockburn, Ph.D.  
Philosophy ..... Robert F. Creegan, Ph.D.  
Philosophy ..... Emerson W. Shideler, Ph.D.  
Philosophy ..... Kathleen M. Squedrito, Ph.D.  
Psychology ..... Terry L. Maple, Ph.D.  
Psychology ..... Michael A. Persinger, Ph.D.  
Psychology ..... R. Leo Sprinkle, Ph.D.

**REPRESENTATIVES**

Argentina ..... Guillermo Gainza Paz  
Australia ..... Peter E. Norris  
Belgium ..... Edgar Simons  
Bolivia ..... Fernando Hinojosa V.  
Brazil ..... Prof. Flavio Pereira  
Britain ..... Anthony R. Pace  
Ceylon ..... K. P. K. DeAbrew  
Chile ..... Pablo Petrowitsch S.  
Colombia ..... John Simhon  
Costa Rica ..... Rodolfo Acosta S.  
Cuba ..... Oscar Reyes  
Czechoslovakia ..... Jan Bartos  
Denmark ..... Erling Jensen  
Dominican Republic ..... Guaronix Flores L.  
Ecuador ..... Gen. Raul Gonzales A.  
Finland ..... Kalvi Hatanen  
France ..... Richard Niemtzow  
Germany ..... Capt. William B. Nash  
Greece ..... George N. Balanos  
Guatemala ..... Eduardo Mendoza P.  
Holland ..... W. B. van den Berg  
Honduras ..... Julian Lanza N.  
Ireland ..... Martin Feeney  
Italy ..... Roberto Pinotti  
Japan ..... Jun'ichi Takanashi  
Lebanon ..... Mantis El Khatib  
Malta ..... Michael A. Saliba  
Mexico ..... Roberto Martin  
New Guinea ..... Rev. N. C. G. Crutwell  
New Zealand ..... Norman W. Alford  
Norway ..... Richard Farrow  
Peru ..... Joaquin Vargas F.  
Puerto Rico ..... Frank Cordero  
Philippine Republic ..... Col. Aderito A. deLeon  
Rumania ..... Tiberius A. Topot  
Sierra Leone ..... Bernard J. Dodge  
Singapore ..... Yip Mien Chun  
South Africa ..... Frank D. Morton  
Spain ..... Pedro Redon  
Sweden ..... K. Gusta Rehn  
Switzerland ..... Dr. Peter Creola  
Taiwan ..... Joseph March  
Tasmania ..... William K. Roberts  
Trinidad ..... Eurico Jardim  
Turkey ..... Adnan Gur, Ph.D.  
Venezuela ..... Jose M. Pascual  
Yugoslavia ..... Milos Krmelj

**A.P.R.O. Membership including Bulletin:**

U. S., Canada and Mexico ..... \$8.00/yr.  
All other countries ..... \$9.00/yr.  
Subscription to Bulletin Only:  
U. S., Canada and Mexico ..... \$8.00/yr.  
All other countries ..... \$9.00/yr.

Newspires, 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.

**Editorial**

APRO's policy through the years has been to keep editorial comment to a minimum in order to devote *Bulletin* space to what is felt to be the highest priority - the UFO case itself.

However, developments in the field of UFO Research in the last few years prompts us to utilize this space to bring the general membership up to date.

The history of UFO research is punctuated with periods when the UFO subject enjoyed attention in the press and acceptance by the general public. The most sustaining of these periods began with the "flap" (high UFO activity) of 1965 and has been perpetuated through the last ten years.

It is a common phenomenon that when UFOs become more or less popular, new UFO groups proliferate like dandelions in a well-fed lawn. Most are local affairs but after the sustained public interest of the late 1960s this trend took a new turn.

This new tendency has worked to fragment the power in the field; each new group attempts to proselyte the established experts in a play for prestige.

New approaches are important and welcome. Some groups have structured themselves in ways that augment and complement previously existing efforts. Precision Monitoring Systems of San Diego and Project Starlight International of Austin, Texas, are examples of constructive non-conflicting efforts.

The newest group was announced in late 1973 after the pronounced UFO activity in the Southeast U.S. Named the Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS), it is headed by J. Allen Hynek, of the Lindheimer Observatory, Northwestern University, and former scientific consultant to the U.S. Air Force's Project Bluebook.

This proliferation of UFO groups makes operation in the field quite difficult at times. Occasionally a UFO incident is reported and representatives of two or more organizations show up to investigate. In some instances investigators caution the witnesses not to co-operate with other organizations, demonstrating an amateurish proprietary attitude which does little to promote confidence among the public. APRO Field Investigators, however, have not been guilty of such behavior.

The Center for UFO Studies is funded by a small grant and has only one full-time employee and therefore its scope is limited. In an attempt at inter-organizational cooperation, APRO has agreed to investigate cases upon request from CUFOS, inasmuch as CUFOS has no investigative body, but maintaining our corporate integrity.

In view of Hynek and Vallee's attitude

**Book Review**

**The Edge of Reality; a progress report on unidentified flying objects.**

by J. Allen Hynek and Jacques Vallee

This work, which is primarily a series of conversations between Hynek, Vallee and psychologist Arthur Hastings, is not an introduction to ufology. They state that it is primarily intended for "those already well acquainted with the UFO problem"; however, if this is so there seems to be little need to spend six pages discussing items that should be considered as common knowledge; e.g. truly unidentified sightings exist, the objects have a definite pattern of behavior, the phenomenon is worldwide etc.

(See Review - Page Three)

**Corrections:**

We regret occasional printing and/or editorial errors which seem to be unavoidable. In the September 1975 issue of the APRO Bulletin, the following should be noted:

Page 3, Column 3, Paragraph 4, Line 13, should read: hypnotic regression, *not* aggression.

Also, Page 6, Column 3, headline: UFO REPORT should read: A Progress Report, *not* 4 Progress Report.

Page 1, Column 3, 1st line in the August, 1975 Bulletin should read 1975, *not* 1974 as printed.

Thank you for your forbearance. (The Editor)

\*\*\*\*\*

(See Editorial - Page Four)

# Canadian

(Continued from Page One)

is based on her excellent report.

The exciting element of this case is the fact that the configuration of the disc seems to match up exactly with that of another disc-shaped object photographed by Helio Aguiar at Piata Beach, Bahia, Brazil, on April 1959. (See the photos accompanying this article). The flat surface (generally assumed to be the bottom of the disc) of the disc appears to have symbols of some kind whereas the disc in the Hamilton photo case was apparently too far away and in the wrong position for a view of that portion of it.

Also, in photo number 1 of the Hamilton case, the disc's position makes the dome appear larger than that of the Aguiar (Photo number 3) object. However, the area of the flat part of the Aguiar disc presented to the camera indicates that it is tilted slightly away from the viewer, thus showing more of the flat surface and less of the dome than seen in the Hamilton photo.

Thus we can assume that had the Aguiar disc been photographed *edge on* as the Hamilton object seems to have been, it would have presented more of the dome area, and would indicate a perfect match.

The Hamilton photos presented here, are a portion of greatly enlarged 8x10 black and white glossy copies. The image, although sharp, is very small, even in the 8x10s. In the Aguiar photos, the photo analyst lined up the photos with the ocean's surface to demonstrate the angle of elevation and, distance above the ocean. In the fourth photo, the dome is reflecting a great deal of light and the rim more or less blended into the sky background.

Pat McCarthy was using a Praktica Nova 1 (1966) camera, made in Germany, a Hanimar 135 mm lens with a focal length F2.8. The film was Kodak plus X ASA 125. The whole episode lasted 30 seconds.


\*\*\*\*\*

## Review


(Continued from Page Two)

Hynek then proceeds to state why the Center for UFO Studies (CUFOS) came into being: viz. to meet certain specific needs [". . . to provide a *central* source for the gathering and dissemination of reliable information . . ."]. This does not seem to mesh with statements later in the book about the cooperativeness of CUFOS or Larsen's statements (1975 *MUFON Proceedings*) of non-competitiveness. Ironically, Vallee seems to put himself in the position of


(See Review - Page Four)



The Helio Aguiar Photos



Canadian Photo No. 2



Canadian Photo No. 3

## Review

(Continued from Page Three)

unwittingly (?) criticizing what Hynek is doing re CUFOS, viz. centralizing, by praising *Lumieres dans la nuit* and their "we are not going to organize and centralize, no central files" philosophy. Vallee also shows a certain amount of disdain for organizational ufology.

Both Hynek and Vallee state that there is a strong case for the psychic aspects of UFOs. While speculating that the solution may be in the parapsychological realm, Hynek suggests a nuts and bolts three pronged approach toward a solution — computer usage, photo analysis and magnetic detection. Vallee urges publishing all case information in plain English and advises against the use of computer codes.

Hynek notes that the occult seems to be quite different from the UFO phenomenon. Both authors state that there is no occult school that has a tradition of UFOs, no occult tradition of occupants or contact with the Little People. They point out that you find the same kind of skepticism among the high priests of the occult as you find in the high priests of science.

Neither Hynek nor Vallee have many good words for any of the other groups. Both use a shotgun approach when a rifle is needed. Hynek says "... their besetting sin is that they exist by popular membership. So anybody who has ten bucks can join. They have no way of screening out crackpots." And Vallee states "The vicious circle here is a) they sincerely want to do research; b) to do research they need money; c) to get money... they have to go to the public; d) to get money from the public they have to advertise; e) to advertise they spend the money they do have. So ninety percent (90%) of the money they do get goes into public relations and they turn into a PR organization." To which Hynek adds "Their bulletins are often nothing more than PR things... They're publishing just enough to titillate the interest of their subscribers." These are strong words and they offer nothing to back them up. While some groups may be this way it is unfair to attribute this to all.

Throughout the work Hynek and Vallee give their own opinions as indicated above. A number of Hynek's, though, seem to be an apologia for his USAF years.

By use of the scenario, many hypotheses are put forward as food for thought. These can be summarized as:

- 1) UFOs are the product of an *outside alien* source.
- 2) UFOs are the product of an *Earth-bound alien* culture.
- 3) UFOs are *secret government weapons*
- 4) UFOs are *inherent in human genetics*

and are part of a built-in defense mechanism that reveals itself only in times of extreme social stress.

- 5) UFOs are from *other universes* with different wanturn rules. For example, Hynek says "... the thing that I'm uneasy about [is]... the whole craziness of the thing, the whole absurdity — it's another world, another realm that seems to have some interlocking with ours, and what we're describing here is just that interlocking." "

This, I believe, is an important book as it gives some definite insights into the thought processes of two well known scientists; however, it is definitely overpriced at \$14.95.

Allen Benz  
Staff Librarian, APRO, Inc.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Editorial

(Continued from Page Two)

toward other groups and their methods, (See Allen Benz's Book Review) we can only cooperate to a certain extent, our experience having taught us that there is no sizable funding available for this work and we must depend on the membership which has always been the backbone of civilian UFO research. It was the need for additional funds in order to progress and pursue needed projects that prompted APRO to involve itself in the Broadcasting business, producing our new radio program, "UFO Report."

While we will continue to investigate flyovers and cases of that nature, the thrust of our future efforts will be the study of landings, landing traces, occupants and abduction cases. APRO has 11 of the latter under investigation at the present time.

The Rapid Reaction teams will be utilized to support the Field Investigators in important investigations and the financial returns from "UFO Report" will help to finance the activities of the teams.

\*\*\*\*\*

## "The Two"

In July of 1974 a middle-aged couple walked into APRO's office and held a conversation with office manager Sheila Kudrle and Betty Darr. The gist of it was that they were some sort of emissaries and that within a year and a half they would be assassinated and would be taken up by a UFO, rejuvenated and returned to earth for some sort of revivalist movement. Needless to say, Mrs. Kudrle and Mrs. Darr were flabbergasted at the story and Mrs. Kudrle emphasized the fact that they did not seem to be proselyting and did not seem to be

concerned whether their story was believed or not. The woman, who called herself Bonnie, was well-dressed and nourished with a short haircut. The man, also well dressed, answered to the name Herff.

When all the furor became public about the two people who were recruiting people in Oregon and California to give up their worldly goods and follow "The Two," Bonnie and Herff's photos were shown on television and they were recognized by Mrs. Kudrle and Mrs. Darr. Ensuing press reports indicate that the efforts of "The Two" are either a result of self-delusion on their part or are a part of a very clever confidence game.

Although APRO has literally reams of newspaper copy on the two, the information above is the basic story and since the story broke, no one has been able to locate the group. They have allegedly traveled from Oregon to California to Colorado, then Nebraska and then Illinois.

This article is a result of requests from the membership for information on the couple inasmuch as they have tied their evangelistic crusade to the UFOs. However, it is not felt that "The Two" have any real connection with the UFO phenomenon but that they probably merely latched onto the subject because it has enjoyed considerable respectability and acceptance in the past few years. They have been identified as Marshall Herff Applewhite, 44, the son of a Texas Presbyterian minister and Bonnie Lu Trusdale Nettles, 48, of Houston, Texas. Applewhite has served four months in jail in Brownsville, Texas, in the fall of 1974, for allegedly failing to return a rental car which had been reported stolen, and Miss Nettles was arrested but not prosecuted for the alleged misuse of a credit card. In view of all this, we do not feel that this subject is deserving of further discussion in the *Bulletin*.

\*\*\*\*\*

## United For Objectivity

The interorganizational meeting at Fort Smith, Arkansas, is now history and most of those attending agree that it was an unqualified success. APRO was represented on the program by Dr. James Harder, Dr. R. Leo Sprinkle, Dr. Richard Haines, Kevin Randle and Jim and Coral Lorenzen.

In some ways the Fort Smith meeting exceeded expectations. Registrants came from as far away as Canada, California and Florida. Miss Gloria Gourlay, APRO Field Investigator, whose artistry graced the program cover, journeyed from West Germany to attend.

The most impressive visual item on the

(See United — Page Five)

# United

(Continued from Page Four)

program was Project Starlight International's display of the equipment normally deployed at their research site near Austin, Texas.

The most positive entry with respect to the conference theme "United For Objectivity," was a joint resolution presented by Dr. Richard Haines, APRO Consultant and member of CUFO's scientific board. (Copies of this resolution are available to members providing a business-size stamped self-addressed envelope). This resolution, which was endorsed by all the organizational leaders present, emphasized the importance of accurate and responsible public education and the importance of (1) avoiding duplication of effort, (2) improved inter-organizational communication and (3) agreement on basic "areas of emphasis" for each. Up to this point, the tendency in UFO research has been toward fragmentation and duplication of effort. Let's hope that this conference has at least halted that trend and perhaps reversed it.

At the very least, appropriate dialogues have been initiated.

APRO has implemented a policy of mutual exchange of published information and will offer technical help and advice to other groups in certain specific areas in the near future.

The accolades for the success of this event must unquestionably go to Bill Pitts for his heroic efforts in bringing it about. But for all his efforts the New York Times and Time magazine extended him the indignity of placing false words in his mouth.

Mr. and Mrs. Lorenzen would like to thank the many field investigators and members who attended the Conference. Information from Mr. Pitts indicates that APRO members composed the major part of the attendance.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Rapid Reaction

In order to augment our Field Investigators network, Headquarters is organizing teams of investigators which will have the capability of going to the scene of a UFO incident in the shortest possible time. These teams will consist of a pilot in a light plane at his disposal, and an interviewer whose responsibility will be to record interviews and oversee investigations and eventually submit a written report to Headquarters.

One such team is located in Tucson, another in Denver, Colorado, and other teams are being formed in Iowa and New Jersey. These Rapid Reaction Teams will



Seen above are Dr. Richard Haines, APRO Consultant in Physics, Dr. James A. Harder, APRO Consultant in Civil Engineering, Mr. Lorenzen, APRO's Director, APRO Field Investigator Bill Pitts, Stanton T. Friedman and Phillip Klass at the Fort Smith, Arkansas UFO conference. Mr. Pitts hosted the conference. Photo courtesy of Linda & Doug Gorrell.

fly to the airport nearest the site of the incident and work with local field investigators to complete the case.

In those instances where private planes are not available, the teams will utilize the facilities of the commercial airlines so an attempt will be made to locate Rapid Reaction teams at all the major airline hubs. Members of APRO's scientific consulting panels will head up such teams if at all feasible.

Field Investigators with flying experience and a current license, whether they own an aircraft or not, are invited to write Headquarters giving specifics.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Mutilations

During the Fort Smith, Arkansas conference, a discussion led by APRO Field Investigator Kevin Randle dealt with the continuing phenomenon of mysterious cattle mutilations. It is felt by some that the cattle are being mutilated by UFO occupants. Besides the fact that this does not seem to be a logical explanation, there is no case of a cattle mutilation where it has been established that a bona fide UFO sighting was made at the same location prior to the event. It is generally felt by investigators that the mutilations have been carried out by a satanic cult of some kind. In the past few months when mutilations were numerous in Colorado, an unmarked helicopter

(army green in color) was seen on more than one occasion. In one instance it was photographed, and although from a distance, it was easily identified as a helicopter. A helicopter with the silhouettes of two men clearly visible, chased two girls on horseback until they were rescued by other riders.

The hypothesis generally accepted by investigators is that the perpetrators rope an animal, remove it to another location several hundred feet away, do the butchering, then return it to the location where they originally procured it. In this way there would be no tracks and no evidence of the blood-letting and butchering.

\*\*\*\*\*

## Member Duties

Occasionally the APRO staff feels the need to remind the general membership of their obligation to forward news clippings within a reasonable length of time after they appear in the papers. Some members are very conscientious about this, others allow clippings to accumulate for some time, send them all at once, with some of the reports being weeks or months old. We urge all of you to submit clippings of what appear to be good, sound cases as soon as they appear.

\*\*\*\*\*






Diagram of Path of Canadian UFO. (See Pages 1 and 3).

## Making Intensity Estimates And Measurements

(Part IV)

Richard F. Haines, Ph.D.

This is the fourth in a series of articles on standardization of terms, concepts, and procedures related to the perception of unidentified flying objects (UFO). This article reviews basic information on the following topics: Visual Psychophysics, Estimating Luminous Intensity and Luminance, and Measuring Luminous Intensity and Luminance. These subjects are so extensive and complex that the primary objective of this brief article can only be to provide the most basic terminology and measurement concepts that are relevant and to provide references for those who care to study these subjects further.

In keeping with a practice adopted in previous articles in this series, those words that denote the stimulus are kept separate from those having to do with the observer's perceptual response. Because a "light" is defined as both a stimulus and a response in English dictionaries, it is both ambiguous and technically incorrect to say, "I saw a light." It is correct to say, "I saw a point (or extended) source that was continuously visible and about the same apparent magnitude as the star Sirius; the source was visible for about 30 seconds and was located at such and such a celestial position."

An important fact to remember is:

### — ONE'S VISUAL PERCEPTION IS HIGHLY PERSONAL AND VARIABLE

It is not possible to be sure that another person's perception of an event is the same as yours or that your own perception yesterday is the same as your present perception of exactly the same object or event! This personal factor makes it difficult to obtain truly reliable information on UFO sightings.

#### Visual Psychophysics:

The scientific discipline of "visual psychophysics" treats a broad body of sensory phenomena under controlled experimental conditions using specialized investigative methods and equipment. The methods used allow mathematically descriptive statements to be made about the degree of relationship that exists between the magnitude of the stimulus (in this case a UFO) and the magnitude of the sensory response that it produces.

It is well known that most UFOs are first perceived visually which means that the luminous energy they reflect or emit exceeds the eye's "threshold," i.e., the level of excitation energy necessary to produce a correct response of "I see something." We experience luminous energy as "light;" this experience is a result of a complex series of nervous and photochemical processes that originate when at least one photon (a basic quantity of luminous energy) strikes a rod or cone receptor (cf. ref. 4). The other events that take place must be omitted here. Experts still do not understand how the many patterns of space/wavelength/time/intensity-coded

neural signals are translated into a conscious experience.

"Radiometry" is the measurement of energy or power of electromagnetic radiation while "photometry" is the measurement of only those wavelengths that excite (produce a response in) the human visual system. Reference 1 (Pp. 9-12) provides conversion factors for going from radiant to luminous measurement units. The visual system responds differently to different wavelengths. Knowledge of this fact should help UFO researchers who wonder why one "hue" (often called "color") appears more intense than another even though both are equated in terms of their radiant power in watts.

The effectiveness of a stimulus in producing a "brightness" sensation (i.e., the experiential counterpart of "luminance") is determined by weighting the stimulus' luminous energy, wavelength by wavelength, by the eye's "spectral sensitivity." This laborious procedure is made easier by using a properly designed photometer.

The eye can perceive wavelengths beyond what is usually considered to be the visual "spectrum" if the wavelengths possess sufficient energy. This is shown in Figure 1 (reproduced from ref. 5 by permission). A one degree arc diameter, luminous source was imaged either upon the "fovea" (the 2° diameter retinal area of most acute vision where the line of sight intersects) and 8° arc above the fovea (labelled periphery). The limits of the typically cited spectrum are also shown for comparison. Theoretically speaking, an object that emitted *only* wavelengths above about 850 nm and below about 1000 nm at energy levels varying above and below threshold would alternately appear and disappear. Of course it might reflect other wavelengths and become visible and/or it might absorb wavelengths and physically block background objects from view. When the eye is fully dark-adapted, infrared radiation is perceived only with the peripheral retina and is seen as colorless. The light-adapted eye is most sensitive to 555 nm and the dark-adapted eye to 511 nm (ref. 7).

(To be continued in the November Issue)

\*\*\*\*\*

## Sorry!

Headquarters is sorry for this delay in the publication of this issue of the *Bulletin*. The Fort Smith conference, the filming by Film Ventures International as well as an unusually heavy workload related to investigations, has delayed work on publication. However, it was felt that the work on the Conference, the film and the Travis Walton case justified the tardiness.